

**City of Coral Gables Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting
July 22, 2021
City Commission Chambers
405 Biltmore Way, Coral Gables, FL**

Blue Ribbon Committee Members

**Chairperson Felix Pardo
Board Member Aramis "Mitch" Alvarez
Board Member Robert Behar
Board Member Willy Bermello
Board Member Glenn Pratt
Board Member Javier Salman**

City Staff

**Assistant City Attorney, Gustavo Ceballos
City Architect, Juan Riesco
Historical Resources Director, Warren Adams**

Public Speaker(s)

**William Arthur
Sue Kawalerski
Samuel Lawson
Gordon Sokoloff
Maria Magdalena Estupinan
Maria Longo (phonetic)
Alexander Adams
Enrique Bernal
Maria Cruz
Jackson "Rip" Holmes**

Board Member Pardo: Mr. City Attorney, I'd like to say something. Just to clarify, the board members all received -- this is something that I came up with because I was both at the Sunshine

meeting and at the Commission meeting where I heard the public and I spoke to the Commission twice. I just took down some notes and I put these. This is not meant to be disrespectful to the board members. This is just to put a mark down of what the key issues were before you start your presentation, so they all understand.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Not a problem at all.

Board Member Pardo: Thank you.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Before we do the presentation, I'd like for all the board members to give a quick introduction of themselves. It's just for the purposes of everyone knowing who exactly is on this board and the -- and how we're basically going to proceed forward. I'll go ahead and address after.

City Architect Riesco: My name is Juan Riesco. I'm the City architect.

Board Member Pratt: Glenn Pratt. I'm the representative member for the Board of Architects.

Board Member Salman: I'm Javier Salman, former Planning and Zoning Board member for eight years and now chairman of the Board of Adjustment.

Board Member Alvarez: My name is Aramis Alvarez, also known as Mitch, practicing architecture on my own independently, and doing small projects that show up in housing.; ex-member of the Board of Architects for two terms.

Board Member Pardo: I'm Felix Pardo. I'm a practicing architect. I've sat on most of the planning -- as chairman of the Planning and Zoning Board, and I sat on the Board of Adjustment two different times, as the chairman of the Board of Architects and a few other things -- a few other committees.

Board Member Bermello: I'm Willy Bermello. I am chairman of Bermello Ajamil and Partners, architects and engineers, practicing architect, residents of Coral Gables for 47 years, and former member of the Board of Adjustment of the City of Coral Gables.

Board Member Behar: Robert Behar. I'm an architect. I have practiced and lived in the Gables for over 30 years, currently a member of the Planning and Zoning Board, and past member of the Board of Architects.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Great. So, I'm still pending the resolution, but I'll go ahead and give a quick brief and overview to all of the people who are watching and in the room. So, if you are aware, in our last City Commission, the Commission decided to create this panel specifically to review Section 5-200 of our current Zoning Code, which is the Mediterranean standards. As part of their resolution to create this committee, they required that all members, as you just heard, are all architects. Five of you were elected and -- were appointed, my apologies, by each one of the Commissioners, and then you have the board as a whole, appointee, Mr. Pratt, and you have the City architect that comprises the seven members of this particular board. And as was previously discussed, the topic of our discussion will be structured strictly around 5-200 and all of the standards that we currently apply in our zoning code. The issue has come up a couple times about process and other aspects of our zoning code that is outside the boundaries of this particular sub-committee, of this blue-ribbon committee. We are going strictly on the Mediterranean standards, how they apply and what we believe would help the City implement this Mediterranean bonus in a more concise way. And as Mr. Pardo so -- put so eloquently, we tend to stray off the intent of this Mediterranean bonus. So, with that said, does the board want to --? Are there any motions to elect a chairperson?

Board Member Salman: I'll make a motion to elect Felix Pardo as our chair.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Is there a second?

Board Member Alvarez: I'll second that.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Mr. Pardo, do you accept that nomination?

Board Member Pardo: Sure, I accept that.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Okay.

City Clerk Urquia: All in favor? All in favor?

The Board Members (Collectively): Aye.

City Clerk Urquia: Any opposed?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Well, I'll turn it over to you, Mr. Pardo. I'll be sitting right over there, if there's any legal question that do come up, feel free. And if there's any other questions, the City Clerk and the City architect are more than here -- more than happy to help out in any way we can.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you.

City Clerk Urquia: One quick thing, Mr. Pardo. Also, at the request of Mr. Pardo, Mr. Adams is here. He has been asked to be present at the meetings in case any questions arise with his expertise.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. Alright, so one of the issues that has come up that has been brought to the Commission specifically and the Administration, is the certain issues based on developments that have already been built and/or are under construction. So, getting back to the original standards of the Mediterranean and the intent of the Mediterranean bonuses, which goes back to

1986, the bonuses were created specifically and for the design of Mediterranean architecture in keeping with the original intent of what the founder George Merrick had intended from an architectural and planning standpoint. So, in 1984, a specific building was built at that time called the Bank of Coral Gables, which is on the corner of Ponce de Leon and Almeria Avenue. At that time, that was the first commercial heavily Mediterranean Revival building erected in the commercial district. And this was in answer to several glass boxes that had gone up and other styles that had gone up, which worried at that time, the Commission and many of the residents. So that was back in 1986. After that building was built, there were a series of other buildings that were also designed using a Mediterranean Revival design, and Mitch Alvarez had to do with the Colonnade building, which was designed in such a way that the developers, Michael Fung and David Weaver, were instrumental with Mitch to be able to save the historic Colonnade building, which still stands there today. They developed around it. If memory serves me right, they were able to obtain 11 variances from the Commission and they were able to, number one, save the historic building, and number two, inspire again, more of the Mediterranean Revival using all sorts of elements there. Then the Hyatt building was built on Douglas and Alhambra, and those three buildings, I think basically went up -- if memory serves me right -- without the implementation of the Mediterranean ordinance, which was also known as Chapter 30(xxx) in the former zoning code. So, once the Mediterranean bonus regulations were added, the intent was clear on the purpose, and we can have copies of the original zoning code, specifically the purpose, where you see exactly what the intent was at that time. Over time, the Code has evolved and there was a major rewrite in 2007, and that was adopted by the Commission and basically took all previous resolutions -- basically nullified them and started off new with this zoning code, which had a few kinks in it, and that has been altered over time. So, the reason that we are here is that there is a concern or a perception of a lack of compatibility between existing neighborhoods and new developments. Now, although our charge is to be specific on Section 5-202, which are the Mediterranean bonuses, please keep in mind that Section 5-102, which are design standards, is very clear that the Board of Architects and the City architect has 20 factors that they have to be reviewing of the projects that come before them, first on a preliminary level, and then as a final adaptation. We have the City architect here, and we have a very capable representative of the

Board of Architects here. And the -- sometimes what has happened is in the discussion of these projects that are asking for Mediterranean bonuses, apparently, sometimes the massing, the height, the uses, the compatibility -- which are all part of 5-102 -- are not necessarily looked at with a keen eye because somehow, they think that these are zoning issues. So, therefore, one of the things that I think that this board should consider and discuss is on Section 5-102, which are the design standards, to make sure that based on the fact that the Board of Architects has the charge and it says specifically, must evaluate each one of the factors, because of that, I would like to ask the City architect and the representative of the Board of Architects to make sure that they can confirm that this is something that even though it may not have been done recently, will be done in the future.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chair, can I ask a question?

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: Maybe I heard him wrong, but I thought the City Attorney had said that this panel is going to be focused on Section 5-200.

Chairperson Pardo: True and...

Board Member Bermello: Are you suggesting that we also consider...

Chairperson Pardo: No, we're not legislatively -- what we are talking about is altering or amending only 202.

Board Member Bermello: Right.

Chairperson Pardo: 201 design standards are perfect there, but it's a matter of execution.

Board Member Bermello: Right. And...

Chairperson Pardo: But the board -- you know, you've sat on the board.

Board Member Bermello: And some issues may be of compliance rather than whether it's on the...

Chairperson Pardo: Correct. And that's when -- since we have -- and you're absolute -- a hundred percent right. Since we have the City architect and the representative of the Board of Architects, just wanted to make sure because sometimes either because they may be instructed or they may assume that -- you know, these things that they should be looking at, which are in black and white and don't have to be changed in any way, shape or form under design standards for all projects is a clear signal that they have to be looking at that in order to make it more compatible, in order to make it more pleasing to the surrounding neighborhood.

Board Member Bermello: To me -- and I guess at some point, we'll all get into a discussion from our personal experience in working in the City, and you've alluded that part of this reason is a number of projects that I'm sure citizens have responded, maybe not in a positive way. And you know, we all go through the City and we all see projects that you sometimes wonder how they actually happened, and some of these are not too far from here. And in many cases, I see two things, I guess, that maybe even any regular citizen would see. Buildings that seem to encroach right up to the public right-of-way with absolutely no front setbacks, no sense of arrival. And if you drive today on US 1, you are stricken by what you see in at least two very large projects. Usually, when you have the opportunity and you're blessed with that opportunity of having -- of being the architect for a large project is a tremendous responsibility of stewardship, not just for your client, but for the community that you serve. And as I look at the ordinance and you look at the abilities of someone to encroach, and it's written in black and white, you know, and you don't have to go too far as to why those buildings are so close to the public realm, because we allow it.

Chairperson Pardo: Correct.

Board Member Bermello: And you know, and I think those are areas that we can -- I would certainly focus on. You know, I always wondered -- and he happens to be a client of mine. I wasn't the architect, but how was the Aloft built so close to Le Jeune Road, a high-speed traveled arterial, the same on US 1. So, I think there are areas that we can go in and tweak. I recall -- let me just -- I got enough white hair to remember when the Mediterranean bonus ordinance was -- and what they were trying to accomplish. And as an incentive, you know, obviously, the FAR, because, you know, we're in a free society and you get more by providing incentives than by being punitive and requiring someone to do X, Y and Z, and allow the marketplace. But what happens is that in the definition of what is Mediterranean, which is what we all strive to, and we've come up with a series of elements and components that if you do X, Y and Z, you're Mediterranean, and that, therefore, it's going to be a good design. And as it often happens, you don't have good design. You do get those elements, you can check the box, but you're left with something that is less than desirable. There's a particular project done by one of our colleagues here that I love. It happens to not be Mediterranean, but it's sensitive, it's well-designed. It's modern. It has a beautiful tree on the rooftop. And you know, maybe, you know, just good, complementary, sensitive design with well-planned urban design response to the neighborhood. You talk about complementary and -- so maybe it's a time that good, sensitive, smart building be given maybe as much due as a particular style. If you read about George Merrick, I mean, he was a master in sales. And you know, at that time, just past the Columbus exposition, you know, and the (INAUDIBLE) movement, the City Beautiful movement in this country, he came up with a plan that he thought would be the best way to sell. When it got tough, he came up with different styles. So, as we know -- so maybe it isn't just a cookie-cutter of the Mediterranean, which obviously needs to be looked at. But I know before today, I've talked with many of my colleagues, and I think we aspire to make sure that we have excellent design. Maybe it doesn't come sometimes by way of Mediterranean. I've seen some projects done on Ponce de Leon that I think are extremely charming, which are more on the Bahamian/Bermudan style. I forget -- I don't know exactly who's the architect behind them, very pleasant. So, maybe we look at that. I would focus on what other bad things that we're all reacting to. And for me, the issue of encroachment is a serious item. You

know, I don't care what age, where you come from, where your background, your intellectual ability. You drive down US 1 in some of these projects and you see the -- and then you're impacted by the mammoth factor of it, not because of the FAR, but because they're very large land areas, and there's a lack of green space. It's not even the height. It's the fact that it's almost like on steroids. That's kind of like my sense of it. I mean, I grew up in major cities that have much more height. You know, as an architect, I designed one of the tallest buildings in Miami, the Four Seasons, so it's not an issue of height offends me. But it's -- when it's done with elegance and sense -- and I think one of the things we have here is, you look at the Mediterranean ordinance, one of the things that it allows you to do is do certain things that I think it becomes a problem. And also, this issue of how do you define "Mediterranean ordinance"? And too many projects can check the box, and they're -- in my opinion at the end of the day, they're not really Mediterranean. They're not Mizner architecture. I even wonder whether there's Mediterranean ordinance when you get past a certain height. If you look at great cities in the world, many of the major cities in Spain or Paris, and after seven stories, you know, it's tough. It's like, you know, you do a 19-story building or a 15-story building, and you try to make it Mediterranean, it's a very tough order. So...

Board Member Behar: It's not appropriate. It's really not (INAUDIBLE). It's not appropriate. And I agree with you a hundred percent. I mean, we have a lot of the same, you know, concerns. I think that what's happening is -- and the fundamental problem is that, yeah, you check those boxes and you put, you know, elements in a composition of the building and you get the Mediterranean, you know, applied a hundred percent. I look at the building that, you know, you're referring to every day. It's in front of my office. And you look at the massing, the articulation, the volume metrically. That building doesn't give anything that it should be considered to be -- in my opinion -- Mediterranean. I think that when you look at the composition and the component of a real Mediterranean -- which, by the way, I don't even think it's seven stories. When you go to Italy, you go to Spain, they're building like three, four, or five stories. And you know, when you see the articulation of those buildings, it's a more broken-down massing. When we look at some of the examples that we've seen lately, they're not. They just go up, and that's a building that, you know, from the get-go that project was -- should never have been allowed to have gone up to that

height and that massiveness. And I think that's the problem we have. I don't think that we should be, you know, focusing on the little detail because you could put a lot of -- for lack of a better word, decoration on a building and you're going to get the 3.5 Mediterranean bonus, you know, incentive. I think it's more important to create spaces, public spaces, to the public benefit that truly make it a more -- a better project for the community. And I think that, you know, in my opinion, this is not broken. It needs to be fixed.

Board Member Bermello: The other thing is, it seems to me that the overwhelming drive is make it as tall and as many units as you possibly can; squeeze it in there, you know. A lot of our clients, you know, they come to us with that mentality. And you know, and they're reacting to the flow in the marketplace. But I mean, we live in a residential community that is really -- the core of Coral Gables is families, families, not one-bedroom tiny units, not two-bedroom tiny units, but people that have kids, people that want to stay here after they age and get to like my age. And maybe some of the things that we should think about is what can we do creatively, thinking outside the box, Mr. Chair, to -- within the Mediterranean, to create the incentives where large units for families are not penalized on the same level as you were doing a one- or two-bedroom units. And that if you decide to provide more open space, provide less units, provide less height, that there be an incentive, an economic incentive to do that. Right now, the incentive is just the opposite: How can you build it as tall as possible; how could you build it with as many units as possible. And maybe we should, in our thinking, introduce -- I'm not saying to change the code, but I'm saying maybe introduce the incentives which don't exist today. And I will tell you, for example, Armando Colina is currently developing a project where the old police building is, which is going in that direction for family living. He's not trying to have as many units as you can. He's trying to have the right units for this community. And so, I think we're giving an opportunity to -- here sitting on this panel -- address some of the issues that I think maybe should have been addressed years ago. And I'm happy to be sitting here with all my colleagues, and hopefully, we can come up with some great ideas that will be well received by the community, and that hopefully will -- I know the project (INAUDIBLE), because you're stare at it in front of your offices every day. I go through those too going into my office every morning. And not to belabor the point or the developer or

the name of the projects, we all know which ones they are. We know that they're -- something went wrong, and unfortunately, we can't erase it. They're going to be there for many, many, many years to come. We look at it every day. It reminds us of the importance of what we're doing here today. And you have my commitment to try to make sure that we do this right, and that we have good design and not just design by checking boxes. You added this detail, so you got it, and then the rest is a mess. So...

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you. Thank you both. I just want to read into the record very quickly, the 20 things that are in the -- in Section 5-012 (sic), design review standards, which really get pulled into because these -- the Mediterranean component of it has to address this also. So, all design in Coral Gables has to address this. And that is that it says, "In applying the standards set forth in Section 5-102, the Board of Architects shall review each of the following items on the application: Number one, aesthetics. Number two, architectural compatibility with neighboring properties and uses. Number three, architecture. Number four, building and building components, including" -- and then there's a litany of accessory structures, arcades, loggias, building appendages, including the following: balconies, et cetera, et cetera. You can read it. D, building entrances, exits for vehicles and pedestrians. E, building height. F, building materials, textures, fenestration, and surfaces. G, building openings. H, building scale and mass. I, building façade step backs, not setbacks, but step backs -- although step backs will be addressed under the Mediterranean. J, building rooflines, a design, then lighting, parking, paved surfaces, signage, stairs, ramps, escalators, et cetera. But the key elements there are architectural compatibility with neighboring properties and uses, building height, building scale and mass, and building façade step backs. So, when you go to 202, right now, we have a series of boxes that we get checked off. If it's residential, you have 6 out of 12. If you have commercial, it's 8 out of 12. I may have them backwards, but the thing is, you check these different things off. The funny thing is that when you look at those checkoffs, some of them have nothing to do with architecture, but you can check them off. So, how do you value someone that is stepped back, a building at great cost to make a tall building look more compatible to its neighboring areas? And then you give them the same

credit for having something which is minimal or silly. What I think we should try to strive to do is to alter those checkoffs.

Board Member Behar: Incentives.

Chairperson Pardo: Those are all incentives, and they were intended to be incentives from the get-go. And the reason that we suggested back in 1984 to the people that we were meeting with -- and that was that we knew that it cost more money to build, but we would have a better product to be able to build it that way. But the point is that when you look at 502 (sic), you have an incredible amount of noise. It has nothing to do with the symphony. Though I took my -- me personally, I took 502 (sic) -- and I encourage all of you to do the same thing -- and I made a few marks, and this is something that I think we should discuss. Because when you go to the charts, it is so discombobulated from the original intent and the word -- the words were clear. So, those incentives are the ones that have to be looked at again. Because when you give someone in feet 70 feet more -- or 70 percent more rather, in feet, in height, not floors, but in feet, or you give them 18 percent more floor areas, or you give them an incentive of having less parking, and then having sat on the Board of Adjustment, how difficult is it to a homeowner to get a variance, a setback variance? They have to basically have a triangular parcel where at no fault of theirs, they cannot enjoy the same setbacks that their neighbors have. So, this is one of the few cities for variances that it can't be a self-imposed variance. But then you take this enormous building -- as Mr. Bermello said -- and now there are no setback. You could go to zero. In fact, you could encroach into a public right-of-way, so it could become even more imposing. Now, there may be areas, and there may be instances where that is okay, and also, depending on where it is. Having a colonnade to cover someone's sidewalk, the same as in Belonia, having an arcade that has a setback and amenities where it becomes more park-like because it's facing a residential area, those are two different circumstances. And the other thing I wanted to mention to all of you is that I think that sometimes if something goes wrong, the blame is normally squarely on the Board of Architects. But sometimes those projects, by the time the Board of Architects sees them, there's no flexibility anymore. So, a schematic preliminary coming into the Board of Architects, where the Board of

Architects and the applicant and the architect have more flexibility to be able to respond to their comments, especially when you're looking at height or massing or many of the key elements of design, I think it would be appreciated by the applicant and by the owner, because at that time, that flexibility still is there. But the problem is that many times -- I won't get into it -- but many times, those projects that already come before the Board of Architects are basically already cooked. And sometimes, once that souffle is cooked, you can't just add salt and pepper. You have to do it during the process. And that is, I think -- the funny thing is, if you go back to the 1986 Chapter 30 Code, it says specifically in black and white -- and we have here, of course, Mr. Warren Adams, from Historic. He was kind enough to provide me at my request a copy of the original 1986 graphic that gave the examples of those eight buildings that are in the Code now, and it had had a very delineated -- you know, these are the elements, not just leave it up to somebody's imagination. And then it also had the actual code there. And in the Code, it said that when the preliminary would come in, and once the Board of Architects would approve the preliminary, then it would go to Zoning for a computation verification that everything was okay before the final plans went back to the Board of Architects for final approval. It is in black and white. And I think that when that was written 30-some odd years ago, it wasn't a bad idea. Because if you go to Zoning and you cook it all and you come back to the Board of Architects for the preliminary review, it's already so far ahead that it gives the Board of Architects less of a say in what the final product should look like. That's something that I'd like you to think about. Yes, Mitch.

Board Member Alvarez: I'd like to make one suggestion, and then make comments, if that's...

Chairperson Pardo: Can you speak into the mic?

Board Member Alvarez: I think each one of the members here have lived through enough projects in his lifetime to learn from visual observation, reaction from the people, comments. We all have families. I go around with my daughter-in-law, or with my wife, and they say, "How did the board ever approve this? This should never been approved." You know, they don't know anything other than what they hear through the environment of family-related architects. But at the end of the

day, they're all sensitive, very sensitive to setbacks. They're very sensitive to how a building touches the ground, at what happens when it gets down at the ground where people interact with the building. They were very sensitive how the building creates environment by transparency, fenestrations, whatever. And many of these things need a tool for the Board of Architects. I think the architects need to have leverage with the zoning. The zoning behaves like a straitjacket. Every time any one of us has taken the pencil to put together a project has realized that zoning is a limiting consideration. If there is enough leeway before decisions are really taken for good or bad, before projects are delayed forever, that interaction -- it was very wisely presented that the zoning interaction with the architects before application of zoning codes -- and you mentioned it, bonuses, incentives. This restriction of the height, 12 feet -- I mean, 12 building floors or 15 building floors. I think people -- once you have a certain height building, whether it's 12 or 14 or 15 is irrelevant. It's not between 12 and 30, but it's between a range. What really transcends is why is it not set back. I don't have a place to walk. My sidewalk is impaired. Where is the transparency? What are you offering the citizens that walk around it every day to go to work or go to school, or go wherever, you know. There is -- the public is reacting intuitively. Personally, I think the biggest bad thing I've seen happen in the City is the building that Agave company is building on the front of the park, and that's a major, major massive building. It doesn't fit in the scale of Coral Gables. And they tried to embellish it with beautiful details, costly details, beautiful, covered arcades with protruding canopies incorporated, while series and beautiful, but the fact remains that it's gigantic to the scale of the City. So massive...

Chairperson Pardo: You're talking about the Plaza.

Board Member Alvarez: Massing is a nominal consideration.

Chairperson Pardo: The Plaza building.

Board Member Alvarez: And a lot of the things...

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE) Circle.

Board Member Alvarez: At an early interaction between the architects, the board, individual architect -- with the zoning, as a practitioner, give them some freedom. Let the people in Zoning drop the straitjacket and open a little bit to understand what is the objective of the project, you know, and let the process of creation of the space be evolving, and many other things. I think each one of us could put a list to experiences, thoughts that each one develops as we move around and live and bring it in for our next meeting. Put it in writing, recommendations, and let's create some opinion consensus that is favorable.

Chairperson Pardo: Mitch, when you did the Shops of Merrick, how did you work with the City because of all the open spaces and the tiering of the shops?

Board Member Alvarez: Well, we confronted enormous opposition just because people thought that the traffic would be brutal. I tried to explain them. (INAUDIBLE) company had put \$800,000 for traffic improvements on the table, and that means traffic lights, turnarounds, rotundas, landscaping, signals. I have never experienced any traffic problem there. And as a matter of fact, the way the project evolved, it's a beautiful project. It's an urban space like the City has no other, where you can bring your family, babies, kids, older people, and spend a Sunday afternoon. It's enjoyable. But there was enough flexibility and there was no straitjacket there, and the spaces were allowed to exist. If everybody approaches a development where you have to maximize the square footage because the FAR tells you you can build 3.0, and you're just building 1.85, you're nuts. You're crazy. Your clients will tear you apart and tell you you don't know what you're doing. When we did Douglas Entrance, we had to live to a maximum of 3.0. And I said, "No, it's not 3.0." Preserving the historic Douglas building makes the site impossible to achieve 3.0 because the parking you got to put in with demand so much space (INAUDIBLE). We can build so much parking, and that's going to determine how much building square footage you're going to build, and not the 3.0 by zoning. So, it was initially by the project developer to preserve the existing old building in detriment to the mathematical yield of the 3.0 zoning. With that, you know, flexibility,

if you offer the flexibility at the design stages with interaction between the City, the appointed City officials at Zoning, and the architect's group, it will benefit everybody, and you will have a better product.

Board Member Bermello: You know, this concept of flexibility and the early intervention of the Board of Architects before the straitjacketing, I think will be a step in the right direction. I recall, Felix, on a project that we were doing, we were willing to set back our building twice the required setback. It was a ten foot. We wanted to make it 20 feet. But we wanted to provide a porte-cochere so the driveways and people could park under it and get out without being abused by the inclement weather, right? Well, the porte-cochere, or the canopy, did protrude into the setback of the ten feet, that we were recessing the entire building, 20 feet. That's an example of flexibility, that when you see someone that is giving a public good, which is more than just an ornament, but providing (INAUDIBLE). Something that I think any neighbor -- I think if you did a survey of what issue bothers people the most on the project that I think you were alluding to, it's that encroachment on the public right-of-way, lack of a setback, without a doubt.

Board Member Salman: The other issue and the other big issue, at least for me, is one of massing and not having the proper step backs at a six- or seven-story level that becomes much more of an urban scale project for a city of this size. And its intent with regards to Merrick's plan and vision for the City, if you look at the original plans for the entire city and the build-out, it was not to be all high-rise, although he allowed and included in those designs, you know, buildings of 10 and 12 stories without a problem. But if you look carefully, they were all set back, not at 100-foot level, at a 50-foot level. Just that alone wouldn't transform the building on US 1 that we all seem to object to, a building on US 1. The second issue here that I see besides the overall massing, which may be part of a submittal requirement for the Board of Architects to review before there's any decoration, fenestration, or detailing -- and you know, we have powerful tools that we didn't have in 1986 to be able to do. The ability to do electronic modeling, insert it into the site so we can all see it before it happens, maybe that becomes part of the requirements for the review.

Chairperson Pardo: It's used in many other...

Board Member Salman: And it's used all the time.

Chairperson Pardo: And I'm sorry, including percentages of push and pull, et cetera.

Board Member Salman: Exactly. But those are tools that we have at our disposal that need to be incorporated into -- in the modernization or whatever comments that we have, that we come to consensus as to what should be done. And the final issue that I see is the resistance of floor plate. I think that anything that is within the bonus area needs to be of a different floor plate, that it can't be the same shaft going up, but it needs to set back or change in such a way to address the fact that that bonus is there and that it's being used properly. You know, we can go back to -- there's some modern buildings that do that admirably well. Just on the other side of the complex that we all have a little bit of heartburn on is a building designed, you know, in the early 90s. It was a commercial office building. And I think Mitch's office did it because I remember meeting with the...

Board Member Alvarez: Which was that one?

Board Member Salman: The one on the park.

Board Member Alvarez: Regions Bank.

Unidentified Speaker: Regions Bank.

Board Member Salman: The Regions Bank, the Regions Bank. The building's completely set back. It's set back at the corners. The corners are addressed architecturally, and the building slowly evaporates at the top. You know, the top couple of floors is different. It's set back. It's an open loggia at the top. It completely transformed a completely modern building into what I think

is probably a wonderful expression of a modern -- you know, an abstract and Mediterranean building, and it's -- no one's ever objected to that building.

Chairperson Pardo: I want to...

Board Member Salman: So, I think that the numerical application -- if we look at the issue being one of a numerical application of the Code, the way it's written, where it's, you know, 8 out of 12, 10 out of 12, it is unweighted. You can choose the ones that you want to meet and get the bonus and walk away from the ones that you don't want to meet. And I think that they all need to be there, and I think the buildings that include all of them would not be objectionable. And it would not be a straitjacket for the design professional dealing with it.

Board Member Alvarez: The straitjacket (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Salman: And would allow for the creativity and the open public benefit that the bonus was intended to create in the form of open spaces, in the form of public galleries, in the form of proper setbacks and step backs, and in the creation of -- because towers are by definition way-finding vehicles. We use towers to know where we're at. In medieval times, people knew where they lived based on the triangulation of the church tower, right? And so each was different, and it wasn't by accident. It would have been easier to build them all the same. But the reality is that each has -- each building needs to have its own identity and not just be a formulaic representation of the Code. And I think that's primarily what has been missed here is in the application of the Code has been much too formulaic and allowed for the exception of some of the key and critical components; those of open space, those of step backs, and those of a development with regards to the upper stories that are being given as a bonus. And if we can address those three issues, I think that this committee will be successful.

City Clerk Urquia: I just really quick want to remind the different board members to speak directly into the microphone because we are getting complaints that some of the audio is not carrying through.

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE) in Italy is known for its towers.

Board Member Salman: (INAUDIBLE), right.

Chairperson Pardo: So, that's something -- and by the way, Mr. Adams, the largest building, historical building that we have is the Biltmore Hotels. If memory serves me right, the 12 stories are in the tower element and the wings are only seven stories, is that correct? Mr. Pratt, you've been awfully quiet.

Board Member Pratt: No, I'm absorbing, I guess, all of the comments and thoughts. There are a number of things, I guess, that people have spoken, and one of the things that you kind of alluded to was that the Board of Architects looks at, just as like boxes or things...

Board Member Salman: I didn't...

Board Member Pratt: No, I'm not -- I'm just talking to Felix, I'm sorry. And no, I think that, you know, the Board of Architects reviews in totality the entire design with respect to, you know, its location, its massing, and you know, the fenestration, all of the things that go to create better design and better architecture, which is, I think, you know, the bottom line that the BOA is trying to achieve, and to get the most they can and the most benefit for the City and the residents and the people that are going to be using the space so that there -- it becomes a much more usable urban area and, you know, promotes the vitality that the City, you know, really needs in order to have businesses and downtown residents, you know, stay here and drive in. Mitch and I've sat with numerous members of you on various boards over the years, and I know that we all have tried to, you know, look at the projects, and to -- and Robert, you know -- you know, we all have come

back many times on projects with suggestions or addressing comments that the BOA makes to try it and give another thought or directive to, you know, projects. And I know that Mr. Bermello -- you know, we've -- in projects that he's presented, the Board of Architects really looks thoroughly at the project, and it's not something that we're limited or in terms of time or, you know, ability to review. The -- and also, to Javier's comment, and one of the things that I think it would be suggested having more three-dimensional studies and massing studies as a part in all of the large projects that the Board of Architects sees, that's generally a requirement. It's not required in terms of something written in a document, but just as all of the architects that produce larger structures, you know, that's one of the first things they generally do is study the massing. And there's so many different things that go into creating the three-dimensional -- the volume of the building. But I think what I really want to get home though is, to Mitch's point, what really ties the hands of most presenters, as well as the Board of Architects, is that we have a zoning code that is very restricted and that limits in terms -- it has, you know, a number of limitations that don't allow the use of certain things that would benefit the project, such as parking. You know, parking is -- there's a requirement for parking that I think, you know, has always been a difficult issue to resolve and integrate into the project, and because having all of the parking generally with a commercial level and, you know, a parking pedestal and then the commercial development or residential development on top of that, you know, it creates -- it just generally creates a large volume. And I think that that's what, you know, is being talked about, and that's generally the problem that most of the buildings that people are talking about that we're referring to as being, you know, the buildings that are causing issues, the ones on Dixie Highway, is because they have to -- they have all of the parking to accommodate on the site. And so, you know, I don't know that that's something that is going to probably be something that will be continued to be looked at and resolved and potentially tweaked in the future as more autonomous vehicles and Uber and people, you know, leave their -- you know, people living in those environments, in the more urban areas, you know, decide not to have two vehicles, and can do with only one, you know, or take public transportation. You know, I think there needs to be something that's addressed with, you know, parking. But I think that, you know, to a large extent, you know, a lot of the problem is really driven by just the volume that the Zoning Code creates. And you know, I think that if there were some flexibility

given to -- and I see it in the new code that there is, you know, some more allowance for the Board of Architects to review and, you know, provide some relief for other -- or for the designers to be able to manipulate step backs or that there is some flexibility -- because you know, when you start saying that everything has to happen at a certain level, not everything works -- not all projects are identical. And so, there has to be some flexibility built into it, and I think that, you know, that's something that I would hope that maybe we could take a look at too in terms of, you know, how that's developed.

Board Member Alvarez: You have to give the architect a bargaining tool with the client. Set your building back five feet. He's going to look at me and say, "I got a hundred feet of frontage. Five feet costs me 500 square feet per floor. Twelve floors costs me 6,000 less building." If I tell him, "Don't worry about it. We'll build it. Instead of 12, you're going to have 13 stories, and those 6,000 feet you're going to recuperate on floor number 13," that's an incentive for this man. If you give the (INAUDIBLE) a starting -- it's just an illustration of a measurable situation. If you give the power to the architect, interaction with the zoning, knowing that the zoning is not going to be a wall like this, no, they're going to hear you and deal with the project. That's a tool for the architect to defend why he should have five feet setback. It's an example. It could be 10, it could be 5 or 4 or something, depends on the site.

Board Member Bermello: Mitch, along the...

Board Member Alvarez: It opens the door.

Board Member Salman: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: Along those same lines that you're mentioning, and that Glenn is mentioning, for example, in the Code, back of house, mechanical rooms, electrical rooms on the ground floor are not counted towards the FAR. But that same room at the executive level is counted towards FAR. So, what happens is, obviously, you cloud the ground floor, which is the

area that impacts the most the adjoining neighborhoods, as opposed to allowing more open space because you translate, and you take some of those spaces and you put them on a second or third level. Well, right now, the Code is still prescriptive numerically and quantifiably that it straitjacket's the designer and the Board of Architects because it seems like the whole pressure is towards being able to replicate and provide compliance of what is by as of right. Everything is aimed at that. What is as of right? That you can say, you check these boxes, you can go past go and collect. There's no process, and we all work in a world of process. But that process is eliminated by a prescriptive formula, quantitative numbers that sometimes doesn't make any -- if you look at what is the difference between a commercial, a mixed use, and a residential use, that the amount of landscape, open space should be different. It's not the use. It's where the location is, right? I mean, if you're in a suburban area, the amount of landscape should be a little different than if you're in, you know, ground zero on Miracle Mile...

Unidentified Speaker: Right.

Unidentified Speaker: Right.

Board Member Bermello: And your property is, you know, lot to lot.

Unidentified Speaker: Right.

Board Member Bermello: Right now, if you look at how it's measured, it doesn't take into account the obvious. And we end up with a lot of bad situations because of that prescriptive formula-based system that takes out the concept of a site plan review process where there's flexibility and allows the architect to do something really great, as opposed to, "No. I got to do it like this because it's only five percent," and this will be only -- and if it's more than 14 feet, it's the second four. If you're doing retail space, you want the floor to be as high as possible. You could get a (INAUDIBLE). So, for right now, if through this process we can introduce some sense of common

sense that the ultimate result is what we're after -- not necessarily having a cookie-cutter process that generates what we've seen today, you know.

Board Member Pratt: Just to your point too, Willy, I think that -- you know, you mentioned the project about, you know, the ten-foot or wanting to make a greater space and providing more green space and open space on the ground plane. And I think that, you know, for the most part, the public or the general public, that's really the only space they really participate in is the ground plane and...

Board Member Bermello: Right.

Board Member Pratt: Green space and whatever commercial or restaurants or, you know, facilities are in that ground floor. And I think that if there was -- I mean, we all -- I mean, that's, you know, our paramount duty is, you know, to design something nice. We all strive for that. I mean, we're not -- nobody's looking to be a show-off architect, you know. We all try to make the best projects we can, but if we had the ability to do exactly what you're saying, to make bigger green space or larger green space and make the amenities nicer on the ground plane, there should be some -- like Mitch was saying, a landowner or a client is going to be -- they're not going to want to give up space on the ground floor, which is premium space, to pedestrians or to people that are not, you know, paying rent. They want, you know, the most space -- the rentable space or usable space they can potentially get. But it seems to me, like if you're looking -- you know, and I go back to - - there were nice buildings being built before the Mediterranean bonus. Tom Spain and I did the 550 building back in 1982, and I think that's been a nice building amenity.

Chairperson Pardo: 550 Biltmore Way, for the public.

Board Member Pratt: I'm sorry?

Chairperson Pardo: 550 Biltmore Way for the public...

Board Member Pratt: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: To know which building.

Board Member Pratt: Just down the street with the lion. But -- you know, so there were -- yeah, the -- when the glass buildings were made in 19 -- back in the early 80s, the response -- you know, there was a backlash to that -- and that was also kind of an architectural style at the time too. You know, and the response was to create some method to give developers incentives because those were inexpensive buildings to build. They were basically a concrete deck and a curtain wall. It's not nearly as expensive -- and you can get, you know, a 3.0 or whatever the FAR was at the time, I think, 3.0. And you could -- you know, that was -- it was inexpensive to build, and you got a lot of square footage for the dollar. Unfortunately, it didn't, you know, really benefit the urban environment that much or the residents. It benefited the developers. And so, you know, that's really one of the reasons why the Mediterranean bonus -- and sometimes -- because I go way back too -- and when it was originally tossed around, back when Ron Robinson and others were promoting it, and there's been over the years -- or as I've personally seen, there's been a number of side discussions as to whether it should be called the Mediterranean bonus or whether it should be just bonus incentives for creating better architecture and greater urban, you know, amenities and making better architecture for the City. Whether that's, you know, Mediterranean or some other style, whatever the architect or the client desires. And I think that, you know, the -- I don't recall how the point system really came into, you know -- and the boxes that you're referring to, how those came into being with .3 and .2. You know, and maybe one of the things that we might also consider or study would be maybe instead of having such a large group of, you know, of .3 or .2, make it into smaller increments and identify the elements that you're looking to try and achieve so that if somebody wants to really create a nice building with a lot of public amenities and ground plane upgrades with, you know, different treatments, that they can do those things, you know, without having -- and if they want to create a -- you know, do all of that in a Mediterranean style, they can get the .5, but that their -- yeah, I think if it's maybe broken down into smaller increments,

it may be easier to judge also for, you know, the -- and to quantify in terms of, you know, the different reviews that the design is going to have to go through, whether it's the DRC or preliminary Board of Architects and final. The other thing I think that would be a beneficial thing is -- I think Willy mentioned it too -- is that, you know, when you do a large project, it's not that it's fully baked. It's just that there's so many things that go into it that, you know, you've got to accommodate all the utilities, FP&L, you know, all the services and all the different components that go to service and make the project work. You can't move around those things easily. A lot of times your hands are tied when it comes to FP&L and where, you know, service is going to go into the building and how you access the building for parking. So, if there were some type of review before the DRC, before things become -- as you said -- fully baked, if that maybe was something that is done -- kind of a non-binding, but just like the DRC really isn't a non-binding type of a review. It's just really a review that all of the departments give their comments and with respect to, you know, whatever the project needs to comply with. But maybe the BOA or some type of a design preliminary -- pre-preliminary -- if that's even a word -- could be instituted where, you know, there could be input from the board into -- before things get to the point where they can't be changed.

Board Member Alvarez: Actually, we have the mechanism -- we have the Board of Architects, which is...

Board Member Behar: Mitch, speak into the mic.

Board Member Alvarez: The board is composed of people that are in real life practicing and confronting situations. So, if we're going to present a real case scenario and you have the client with specific needs, his vision, and his capacity financially for the project, and the Board of Architects is the instrument to come to the meeting and request a meeting with the full participation of the zoning, not the guy who's pushing the zoning review normally. The zoning people that are capable to lead, create, and adjust to a zoning condition as the project evolves and is presented,

not the guy that is everyday looking at, "Oh, you exceed two feet in the front." No, this is not the person there. You need the people higher in thinking and...

Board Member Pratt: Oh, that have the vision for the City.

Board Member Alvarez: Yeah, for the City. In a spirit of working together very much, you can integrate it into the Board of Architects without appointing him as member of the board, but it could become a special review board for projects of a certain character (INAUDIBLE) and significant. Because we do that among ourselves. We appoint seven architects with a tiebreaker. All board members sit, and we devote two, three hours, sometimes, the full morning for a project. But we're missing that element, which is the person representing the zoning and planning with capacity. Nobody's going to chew him up because he said something that somebody didn't like. And we had a City Manager once that was that type of guy who chewed somebody up if he didn't like what he said. You're dead. We don't have that. In this participatory manner, we can have the flexibility to do exactly the points that we're discussing here.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chair, I think what Mr. Pratt is saying I think is so important, which is before you go to the DRC -- once you're in the DRC, you're already straitjacketed, and we've used that term, because at that point, all the points -- and then you can't really move. If you come for a pre-VDRC hearing with the Board of Architects -- and maybe it's not in every project, but maybe it's on projects over a certain size. Because what we're talking about here is, you know, massing, building spacing, encroachments. We're not talking about single-family homes, right?

Board Member Pratt: No, I think it's -- yeah, I think it's...

Board Member Bermello: So, projects over a certain size, over a certain magni -- or at certain locations...

Board Member Alvarez: Locations (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Bermello: Or it could be next to a historic structure or in a particular street. I mean, we can come up with where the -- that project is reviewed and the architect from the applicant is given guidance which will cover and temper the DRC. And when they get to certain points of, "Well, you're two feet off here," they say, "Wait a second. This project is going to go. That's not the important issue here. Look at what they're doing here with open space, with building setbacks," you know, "The step backs after 45 feet or 50 feet," whatever. You know, so that -- because right now, everything is dealt with the same way. You could be off one bicycle and that is as important as an encroachment, and so there's something off.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. And that's what the case is, that the way these incentives are done, it's wrong. But the other reason that we're here, very specific, is because the people that are here in the public and the people that are on Zoom listening, people are concerned that one day they've got, you know, a low density next to them across the street, and the next day, they have a 16-story building. You know that compatibility portion I think is also part of what -- you know, part of this discussion. I remember many years ago that one of the larger developers came in who put the first -- the closest building to Douglas right on Miracle Mile. And when they came in, they were talking to Planning. And Planning wanted a 15- or a 16- or 14-story element right on Miracle Mile. And it just so happens I chaired the Planning Board at that time, and I refused. I refused until they flipped that massing toward the back street away from Miracle Mile. That made all the difference in the world in the scale -- the human scale, whatever. Now think of it this way. Most of the people that are here, and most of the people that are concerned that live in the single-family area, that live where it's one and two stories, and they get to open their front door and see these big buildings, the buildings have to have come how? Really listen carefully to those neighborhoods. From a massing standpoint, from a height standpoint, and from a use standpoint -- use is also very important, not just as you say (INAUDIBLE)...

Board Member Alvarez: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: Because the use -- if you put something across the street from a single-family area and you have commercial uses, and then when the people go to use those commercial uses and you have delivery trucks and you have employees, I'm not so concerned about the people that go to shop there or go to an office there. I'm more concerned about the employees because that employer may not pay for that monthly parking charge. So where is the employee going to park? Right in front of somebody's front door...

Board Member Alvarez: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: On the swale...

Board Member Alvarez: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: In their single-family area.

Board Member Alvarez: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: That's where the incompatibility and a lot of the concerns from the citizens are.

Board Member Alvarez: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: And so, the use part in those design standards is there for a very good reason. And sometimes...

Board Member Pratt: But Felix, to that point, you -- first of all, you know, the Zoning Code and the Comprehensive Plan is in place, and you're not permitted to have, you know, 16-story buildings next to...

Board Member Behar: Next to a residential.

Board Member Pratt: Single-family residences. You know, that's the reason that they have the stepping down, you know, from high-rise to mid-rise to low intensity and single family.

Chairperson Pardo: And I'm talking about not only the filtering into these single-family residential areas because it basically destroys the area, you know.

Board Member Pratt: But I don't understand what you're talking...

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Pratt: You have a (INAUDIBLE).

Chairperson Pardo: For example -- I'll give you an example. We talk about use. I gave the use of maybe like retail or employees parking in the residential areas. Let's go to another thing, noise. So, all of a sudden now, you have music. There was a consultant here a couple weeks ago before the Commission, a week ago before the Commission. The consultant talked about 80 decibels. He played 80 decibels here in the chambers. You know, which way is the wind blowing and that kind of thing. But still, at the end of the day, you know, they were talking about the hours of operation. We have to be -- I think we have to also be proactive because if we bring zoning in here, you know, to opine on projects or be there as a resource for us, we also have to make sure that we, as the architect of the City, we also look at the compatibility issue when it comes to the comprehensive land use plan, when it comes to these things. Because at the end of the day, you could have a building that maybe this space over here is for the single-family residential, but you have some of these intensities over on the other side. That makes all the difference in the world. The sound, et cetera, is over for the other side.

Board Member Behar: But where specifically because I'm not aware or not familiar with where the single family really abuts a -- in the Comprehensive Plan, the only areas that abut a commercial is Le Jeune Road, some portion of Le Jeune Road, a little portion of Bird in front of Merrick Park, and I think that's about it. I don't think there's a -- anywhere else where you have single family abutting a 16-story building. I mean, I -- unless (INAUDIBLE) and...

Chairperson Pardo: Robert, you're correct. You're correct, and that's one of the reasons that when you abut single family and duplex, that you can't be any higher than...

Board Member Behar: Than 45 feet and you have to step it back a hundred feet, and that's a good transitional way to keep that intensity from the residential.

Chairperson Pardo: Exactly. There are some -- because of the mixed use, because of the mixed-use component within residential, you already have existing conditions on Biltmore Way, for example, where you have commercial uses inside of residential that exist there now. Parking becomes an issue because of the implementation of parking in those areas. The residences want it for people that have come to visit them in the residential area, but then you have these commercial, almost auxiliary uses there. So, some of those exist; there aren't many. But the key here, for example, right now is if you want to live in the CBD are, you're going in with your eyes open. You know, you know that you're going to have more activity. You're going -- but if you're living in a single-family community, and you can hear the sound traveling a certain way, when we look at these buildings, you know, there's maybe a way that we can re-orient some of those uses and activities in a certain way that would maybe soften, you know, the possible negative impacts on those areas. But you're correct. Most of those are in the main arterial (INAUDIBLE). And because of that, fortunately, the only exception that I know on Le Jeune Road is Coral Gables High School because Coral Gables High School is not considered residential, so therefore, one of the buildings was able to go right up to the site, you know, and it went straight up. If you look at the Bacardi building, which is further north on Le Jeune Road, if you notice, it's stepped down. And that originally -- staff was trying to force the developer -- Armando Codina -- to actually put the

high vertical portion, and the neighbors were able to convince Mr. Codina to step it back the way that it was intended to be able to protect that scale, et cetera, you know, from the side. So, one of the things that we should look at -- and this is another question I have, I think, for the attorney. You're on the spot. You know, we have a lot of people from the public here that are sitting here and listening. And up to now, you know, we're kind of getting our sea legs, if you will, to understand, you know, what the direction of this committee will be, you know, for this in the future meetings. The question I have is, I've been told that, you know, the public is invited because it's a public meeting. I've been told that the public does not necessarily have to participate unless we open this up. So, at the same time, there is nothing, I think, from keeping comments to be sent to this board from the citizens, which are both on Zoom and here in person. And depending on what this board would like to do, I think it -- I think this is all depends on what you all want to do. I think we should open it up just this first meeting, this first meeting, to the public to at least -- for them to say, "Hey, don't miss this or don't miss that." I mean, this depends on what the board would like to do. And I'd like to listen to the architect -- the City architect before that happens. But first of all, Mr. Attorney, what do you say?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: My apologies. That microphone is not working, and I want to make sure I'm on the record. It is up to the board, it's up to the Chair, whether you want to hear from the public and allow public comment. That is strictly within your purview. That is your choice. That being said, given today that day is the first meeting, I think given the time, I think the remaining portion of your meeting probably will be better spent narrowing down the focus of what parts of 5-200 you guys want to take a look at, provide -- maybe discuss what aspects of maybe the design standards, maybe, you know, the tables -- Tables 1, 2, and 3, which I believe I think would be the primary focus of this committee; assign how you want to break that down for future meetings. But it is strictly up to you whether you'd like to allow comment now or at a future meeting. I think maybe it may be a little bit more useful once you have a bit more direction, you have a bit more work done in the modification of 5-200, and then allow public input at that point. But it is 100 percent up to you.

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Attorney, the only reason I even brought it up is since it's the first meeting and we have to -- we want to basically put everything on the table so we know what direction we're going, that would be the only reason I would...

Unidentified Speaker: Mr. Chair, I would...

Board Member Pratt: I would say let them talk now. I mean, we're all voicing opinions.

Unidentified Speaker: Now is the time for them to say something.

Board Member Pratt: Unless, you know, there's a time constraint.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I, once again, defer to the board. If that is the will of the board, I will just ask that they try to limit the discussion to the purview of this board. So, I know there's been a lot of discussion. There's been a discussion about DRC, zoning designations, how their setbacks -- that's just outside the boundary of this blue-ribbon committee. So, I would ask that any comments be directed towards the Mediterranean bonus, specifically 5-200 and any of its subsections.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. How does the board feel?

Board Member Behar: No, I think we should. I think we should.

Board Member Pratt: On the Board of Architects, we always encourage the public to talk, and if there's...

Board Member Behar: If I may just address something because, you know -- yeah, we're learning and we have a straitjacket, or whatever you used. Unfortunately, the reality is we cannot change zoning that easy. So, whenever you're dealing with a project, it's not like, you know, if I give more

incentive, more open space, I could go another story. Well, really, it's not that simple. And so, I think we go back and really concentrate on how do we make what we have today better, okay. And Glenn and I have had a conversation of those points. Maybe we don't -- you know, we break it up, the incentive, a little bit more to be able to get something better where the public benefits. But the zoning part that we've been talking about, I'm sorry, I don't think we have any opportunity to do that today or for this committee to do anything.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Pardon my interruption. Just -- I believe -- I'm sure that those discussions happened before, but now since you are a part of this blue-ribbon committee, any discussions in regards to the Med bonus should only happen amongst the Chair in the Sunshine, so at publicly noticed meetings.

Board Member Behar: This has happened in the past.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I know. That's -- I'm just -- I just heard it, so I just let everybody know.

Board Member Behar: (INAUDIBLE) four years ago, we've been going at it.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I figured.

Board Member Bermello: Can I --? Before -- because I agree a hundred percent, Chair, that we should open it up for public comment, at least in this specific first meeting. But I know -- are we going to be closing the meeting at 6? Is that the game plan?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: That's up to the board. It's currently scheduled from 4 to 6, but...

Board Member Bermello: Because the only thing I would recommend, Mr. Chair, is that since I know you've made some comments already, some write-ups, that maybe those get distributed to each member of the panel...

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: And that we have a task or homework...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: That we take and read your comments and that we add, subtract, multiply, whatever, and come back, and in some way, consolidate...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: The combined comments for this board, that we then have like, let's say, a redline that consolidates and doesn't duplicate. If three of us are saying the same thing, let's not say it three times. We'll all be in agreement so that we have -- maybe by the next meeting or two meetings from now or whatever the date that you set on the timeline -- a redline version that addresses the comments that I think we're all...

Unidentified Speaker: Talking about the same thing.

Unidentified Speaker: Talking about the same thing.

Chairperson Pardo: Same thing.

Board Member Bermello: We're all talking about the same thing. I don't think anybody here is saying anything different. We're all saying it eloquently in our own words. But it'd be good if we

-- you started it. Maybe we can then add to it and get those comments to the City Attorney. And if then they can re-distribute back a redline that we can all see, that'd be great.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Mr. Clerk, do we have any future meetings already scheduled, or should we...

City Clerk Urquia: Not yet. That was going to be one of the next questions.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah, okay, great. So, I think Robert was right. And basically, what we're going to do is take the points and we can erase them or whatever but come up with a point system. Back in the day, in '86, what they did is they actually took every type of component and they gave it to you in square footage instead of points. It was always based on square footage. If you do this, we'll give you one square foot for every one square foot of this you give us. So, you know, in FAR. That's the way it was done originally. Now, it's points. So, I would say try to keep to the points. So, rewriting the factors, you know, that the -- those factors for the additional -- those elements, and then, I think, waiting, that would be the homework.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: The attorney said the limits...

Board Member Alvarez: I think we're getting into a lot of detail there maybe. I think we...

Board Member Bermello: Just 5-200; is that correct?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: That is correct.

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: Could you send to each one of us 5-200 in Word?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Not a problem. I can go ahead and have that...

Board Member Bermello: That would be very helpful.

Chairperson Pardo: 5-200 and only dash one and dash two.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I don't believe there's anything else. I think it's only 5-1 and 5-2. There's no other subsection.

Chairperson Pardo: Send it separately, if you could.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Yeah, it's 5-201 and 5-202. But 5-202 is literally only a couple of sentences highlighting particular buildings that meet the Mediterranean style.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. Mr. Clerk, can you do what you do with your cards for speakers? If there would be anyone that would like to speak tonight, if you could please approach the Clerk so they could fill out the -- Thank you, Mr. Attorney.

City Clerk Urquia: And in the meantime...

Chairperson Pardo: And also, Mr. Architect, would you like to bring in --? Would you like to say something because you haven't said anything into the record yet.

City Architect Riesco: I don't have anything to add. I think what's been discussed is pretty much on point. I think some of the discussions are veering from Mediterranean bonus point scenarios into zoning issues, and I think that there may be some overlap and maybe some confusion there. You know, we're talking a lot about tall buildings and massive buildings, and some of those things are direct responses to zoning classifications, land use issues that are allowed, and therefore, are not really a portion of the Mediterranean -- you know, the Mediterranean bonus is a small portion

of what's allowed by zoning. And I want the public to really be clear about that. The Mediterranean bonus points allow you one story -- on Table 1, one story and a .3 FAR addition. And the second table allows you an additional .2 and another story. So, at the end of the day, as Mitch said earlier, you know, the difference between a 14-story and a 16-story building is not that impacting versus an 8-story building and allowing a 16-story building. So, I just want to be clear on that point, that we need to stick to the concept of the Mediterranean bonus, but the Mediterranean bonus does not allow a 16-story building. It's a condition of zoning and the zoning designation allocated to that site, and the Mediterranean bonus is a portion of that. It's not fully responsible for that, and that's what I want to be clear that it's understood here. Because there may be some misconceptions in the public that the Mediterranean bonus is allowed a 16-story building. That's not true. Mediterranean bonus may allocate an additional floor or two and some additional FAR, but it does not allow you to go to 16 floors, okay. And I want to be sure that that's on the table and everybody understands that. That's the only comment I want to reiterate.

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Clerk, can you call the first -- thank you.

Board Member Pratt: No, Mitch had something to say.

Chairperson Pardo: Oh, Mitch, I'm sorry.

Board Member Alvarez: I just want to add one thought here for the people out there. Don't confuse quality of design with overloading ornament on a building. Just because you put arches, barrel tiles, and fenestration (INAUDIBLE), you got a Mediterranean building. That's the worst thing that we can do as people and as designers. Don't let that make you think that this is a Mediterranean building just because -- that's a cliché and a bad one.

Board Member Behar: Mitch, the wiser -- the older you get, the wiser you get.

Chairperson Pardo: That's why he's sitting in the center. Mr. Clerk.

City Clerk Urquia: Okay. So, the first speaker we have is Mr. William Arthur.

William Arthur: Good afternoon. Many of you know that I'm an architect. I was speaking with a lot of the people who are here today, and I just wanted to share with you my thoughts on what I've heard. A lot of these people have some really interesting stories about buildings that they've watched get built over time. Some of these people have been living in Coral Gables all their life and seen a lot of changes. I think that their expectation is, is that somehow out of this committee will emerge lower density and reduction in -- increases in setbacks and reduction in building size, which we know is not possible as a part of this committee. What I would maybe think about -- my question is, is how do you think the committee would be looking at maybe purifying the Med bonus table? There's a lot of things in there that it seems to me, as a young architect, that are probably more zoning related than Med bonus. And then my other thing to think about is when applying the table and looking at the seven buildings that are the examples, half of those buildings are quite small. Most of them are under 5,000 square foot. How would we apply those elements to buildings that are half a million square feet or more, in the case of the Plaza?

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you, Mr. Arthur. I really appreciate it. I remember your grandfather very well. Also, a very good architect, to say the least.

City Clerk Urquia: Next speaker is Ms. Sue Kawalerski.

Chairperson Pardo: And by the way, Mr. Arthur, the Douglas Entrance and the Biltmore are a fairly good size, but not the size of the buildings that we're talking about, and you're correct.

Sue Kawalerski: Hi. Good evening, gentleman. I'm Sue Kawalerski. I live at 6830 Gratian Street, right down the street from you. And tonight, I'm representing the Coral Gables Neighbors Association. I'm the president of that association, and there are thousands of people that belong to it, so I'm representing a very august group. But I want to say, I really commend all of you up here.

You are very intelligent people. It's obvious you're intelligent, you're creative, and you know what you're doing. I particularly liked when Mr. Bermello started out because it seemed like you have a real sensitivity to what the residents want. I think all of you do. In fact, I would like to see this panel meet all the time, not only on the Med bonus, but just to have these kinds of discussions about where we want the City to go and what we want it to look like. I know that you're handcuffed. I know that you're handcuffed meaning not only by the Zoning Code, but when you're sitting on a board, you're only hearing certain projects. You're not discussing, you know, the whole world view at that point. I think this kind of panel should, you know, go on beyond this Med bonus opportunity, and I think this is an opportunity. It's an opportunity to get intelligent people together, creative people together, set a new course, build on the best and not what has just been acceptable. So, we're relying on you. I have to tell you, the residents on the Zoom call, the residents that email me all the time, we're really relying on you and we respect what you do. And when you said, you know, like the ground space, you know, how residents interact with the ground, yeah, we want to interact on the ground. And what we've been seeing on US 1 with the Paseo de la Riviera and the Gables station, you can't interact with anything but concrete. You know, it's -- they're walls. We're becoming a walled city. We don't want that. You know, this is a very special city. When we drive down US 1 from Miami, we should know that we're in the City of Coral Gables. And when we leave the City of Coral Gables, it should be very obvious that we're someplace else. And I think at this point in time, when we're talking about future development, the US corridor, there's a lot to build up on the US corridor. This is how we look to the world. I mean, US 1 is an extension of I-95, right? So, we should look different, not only on the US 1 corridor, but in the Riviera neighborhood. You know, that is a residential neighborhood, and the Paseo de la Riviera is a blessing in disguise because it was the first project that went up, and I think a lot of people said, "Oh, my God," when they saw it come out of the ground because no one realized what it was going to look like and how it would impact the neighborhood. And I got to tell you, it catalyzed residents, and that's a good thing. The residents know best. You're all residents. I think you're all residents.

Unidentified Speaker: We are.

Ms. Kawalerski: You know best. You know what you like and what you don't like. And I know you get pressures probably from your clients. They want to build higher and more dense and no parking and whatever. But I know that you have a responsibility to your neighbors because we are your neighbors. So, we put the good decisions in your hands, and let's make this more than just a Mediterranean bonus committee. Let's go beyond this after we're done with this work. Let's go beyond this and have a continuing discussion. Thank you.

Unidentified Speaker: Thank you.

Unidentified Speaker: Thank you.

(APPLAUSE.)

City Clerk Urquia: So, the next speaker is Mr. Samuel Lawson.

Samuel Lawson: Good evening. When I hear all of you speak, I feel like we're in incredibly safe hands because you clearly have the best interest and the knowledge and experience. And I feel like if we just take you and put you in charge, everything would be fine. I don't think that's the way it really is going to work, but that would be great. I only know one person on the board -- it's Felix -- but I really loved what you were saying about in general architecture and the difference between Mediterranean and other styles. So, while the Mediterranean construction is extraordinarily beautiful, I think that it's, you know, juxtaposed to other incredible forms of architecture is something that should not be forgotten. If you look all over the world, there are incredible projects going on everywhere, and they pop up overnight in major cities across the world with some of the most amazing glass and steel beautiful structures ever. Lake Gary, for instance, and everything else; there's a beautiful structure in downtown Miami. What I heard though -- my son goes to Cornell, and if you've ever gone to that -- or he did. He graduated from Cornell. If you've ever gone to that campus, there's an example there of incredibly beautiful older building,

and juxtaposed next to it is something elaborate and modern that's really cool too. Unfortunately, there are a couple of buildings on that campus that are also -- were very ugly, that were recent additions over the last probably 40, 50 years. So, the one thing though is that absolutely that it seems what's important that you're all talking about -- and I can tell you, I represent a small community of neighbors too. We call ourselves the Youth Center community, for lack of a better term, because we all basically about the Youth Center. It seems that the -- you know, it seems like the idea of green space and setback or step back or whatever is important, but what I've heard that is an issue -- and I'm wondering if you're planning to address it in this committee -- because it seems like this is definitely the architectural piece of it. But what it also seems like is there's something going wrong in the process of translating this into like the final product. So, I don't know how far you can reach into that. So, you know, you may create this effort and do all this great work and it sits there in this piece that you redline and correct and edit, but then that being translated into something that actually happens, it seems like, from what I've heard, there's a problem there. I don't know where it is. I don't know why it's there. Also, I heard at the City Commission meeting, Mayor and Commissioners talking about the fact that, you know, when they were discussing a moratorium -- a temporary moratorium, they talked about the fact that they needed to do their job and they needed to get together and vote on projects and that no project could come through yet that they had voted on. And others had talked about the fact that they had voted on projects, and they were very proud of their voting record and the projects that they approved and disapproved. But I also heard through the grapevine that a lot of projects that end up built in Coral Gables actually don't make it to the City Commission to vote on. So, again, I'm talking about process things that I'm wondering, with all of your, you know, clearly, you know, incredible architectural background and your care and love for what this is going to look like, what can you do beyond just editing this ordinance? Last thing I would say is that it seems like -- and I agree with what you said. And by the way, I'm amazed at Merrick Park. We've been enjoying that place for years, and we never had any traffic issues there. And I think that building those -- you know, dipping in when these developers are coming in to really work on the surrounding traffic, et cetera, is absolutely necessary. I had something else. I can't think of it now. But I think the biggest thing is what can we do beyond what is the architectural design and edits that you make

to dip into the process and actually make it happen? Because that seems to be a problem. Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you.

Unidentified Speaker: Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: Just so you know, the projects that don't go before the Commission, those projects -- those are the ones that are under the other section that isn't being changed. But the Board of Architects is responsible, you know, for looking at massing, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. There are certain types of projects that must go to the Commission, and then those are normally the larger projects, the projects that have more impact. But all projects are important that go to the City architect and to the Board of Architects. And therefore, because of the Code and because of what the City architects -- in other words, the Board of Architects -- review, they're reviewing the design criteria, which is another section of the Code. And what we're talking about is a section of the Code that gives bonuses; in other words, above and beyond what is permitted by zoning.

Mr. Lawson: And so I do remember my other point. So, by the way, I've been involved as a professional and my profession is in data analytics. And I've been involved in all sorts of process things that you can all imagine in my career, so I understand process and all the intricacies. I don't understand this one, but I know something is up. The most important point that I think I should have come up here to make was, I think what you said at the beginning, which is that the Mediterranean bonus -- which I don't know much about either -- seems to impact Mediterranean style construction. But there's a lost opportunity to embed in that the same type of bonus structure for all types of architecture, that way those don't fly under the radar and don't get the same loving, you know, TLC that they need. So, one hundred percent, because there's going to be all kinds of construction around here that won't be Mediterranean in design, and it definitely needs that focus. So, that's the point. Thank you.

Board Member Pratt: If I could just respond to you, as the representative of the board. All projects that come to -- any project that's being proposed to be built, whether it's a single-family residence or a multistory building or anything, changing your windows or your roof tile, anything that is on the exterior of the building or any new projects go before the Board of Architects, all projects. And so, any -- whether -- there's no projects that fly under the radar screen. Everything is reviewed by the BOA or the City architect.

Board Member Behar: And there's a process because after that, it goes to the Planning and Zoning.

Board Member Pratt: Well, if it's seeking -- yeah, if it's seeking some type of request that require special permissions from the -- from Planning and Zoning or the City Commission.

Board Member Behar: Nothing goes under the radar. Everything has a process, whether single family or multifamily project, they go through a process.

Board Member Pratt: That's one of the reasons why the City of Coral Gables, the overall fabric of the City is such an enhanced place because everything is reviewed by the BOA.

Mr. Lawson: I'll leave quickly so other people have an opportunity.

Board Member Pratt: But thank you for your comment.

Mr. Lawson: The one thing that I heard -- again, because I've heard a little bit more about the rumbling of the process. The one thing I heard -- and -- is that the Board of Architecture (sic) is sometimes in some way circumvented on -- you know, not circumvented. Let's not use that word, but doesn't have the -- that somehow, you know, different exceptions pass through that maybe the Board of Architectures (sic) would not have found favorable. I've -- you know, so listening to the City Commission meeting online and the Mediterranean ordinance section, I heard a lot of public complaints about possibilities or things that changed in scope as they went along, and maybe didn't

follow the original Board of Architecture (sic) approval or oversight. I don't know, but again, I'm a little bit, I think, more focused on the process of it actually coming into play.

Board Member Pratt: You know, as a current member of the Board of Architects, I'm unaware of anything like that that you're referring to, but if there is some instance that somebody could actually document, I would -- you know, I think the City architect or, you know, I'm sure the City staff and Development Services would be happy to talk with you or review those things. But the BOA is strictly pro bono. We meet weekly. All the members are architects within the City and either live in the City or have their offices in the City or both. And there's no outside agenda or anything that the Board of Architects has other than just to try and promote Coral Gables and make Coral Gables the best we possibly can.

Mr. Lawson: I think there's about a two-and-a-half-hour video that crossed over this -- that covered this section of the Med -- the proposed moratorium on the Med ordinance. And there was a lot of detail from citizens there, so I'm not going to try to recount it, but it was interesting.

Board Member Pratt: I would speak to anybody, I guess, that's listening on Zoom or that made those comments previously. I did watch both the City Commission and the workshop. I don't know that I totally recall what you're referring to, but I would encourage anybody that's watching or in the audience now that if there are some instances or documents that, you know -- I'm not exactly sure I totally understand what you're -- what the implication is you're saying, but I can tell you that the BOA is -- it doesn't have any agenda other than, like I said, to make good architecture for the City, or to try and elicit as best projects that is possible.

Mr. Lawson: Well, thank you. And we've worked with the board at our home -- at our residential home, and we had a great experience. I thank you for that. And thank you all. I can tell you're incredibly motivated and I think we're safe in your hands, so thank you very much.

Board Member Pratt: Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you.

City Clerk Urquia: Next speaker is Dr. Gordon Sokoloff.

Gordon Sokoloff: Hi. Thank you very much for being here and for spearheading this project, Mr. Pardo. I spoke in front of the Commission last week, and I represent the Ponce Neighbors Association, and that is a group of residents who live along Ponce de Leon. And right now, they are dealing with the noise level. They're concerned about the future noise level coming from the Plaza. They've been dealing with the noise coming from the construction, and now we're also deeply concerned about a project in the pipeline, a 16- or 17-story building right across the street from Christie's. So, we're very concerned about that, and we're an example of neighbors that have to deal with that. And hopefully, this board will -- all of you being residents of Coral Gables, that's something that we all have in common. The other thing that I'd like to tell you is, I was the Chairman of the Transportation Advisory Board for the last nearly two years. I sat on the board for eight years. I termed out. Now, I'm the vice chairman of the Parking Advisory Board. I'm also born and raised here and heavily vested in living here, like you all are. As such, I'm concerned about the infrastructure of Coral Gables, the user ability. And as -- in my position, what I plan on doing is -- and the Mayor knows about it and several of the Commissioners I've talked to -- is actually form a counsel of boards so that you guys aren't necessarily sequestered. I'm trying to organize a board of representatives from all the 32 boards in the City so that we can communicate with one another. And I think it's important because we represent the citizens, and that's kind of important. You talk about being handcuffed by the zoning codes. I'm not so sure that you're not handcuffed maybe by the DRC because that's the first stop where some of these projects come to. And so, when you have a project that gets by the DRC that's, let's just say, the 16-story building being approved that's zoned for a seven-story, you know, zone, and then suddenly it's in your hands, you're already trying to deal with something that's been ushered in by the City staff. And it's not -- I'm not anti-City staff, but I believe that the staff needs to be directed by the Commission and the Commission is elected by us, and we all need to be on the same page. And I think that the

City staff needs to be reined in and understand that the people, including you, it seems, don't want this city overbuilt with things like the Plaza that we're seeing. It's a gorgeous building, but it's completely out of scale. It belongs in Las Vegas or New York. But these are efforts that I'm going to make, and I really hope that you are able to tighten up the Mediterranean bonus significantly so that developers aren't, you know, using everything they can to go taller, bigger, and more dense, which ultimately takes away from our quality of life. Thank you very much.

Unidentified Speaker: Thank you, Doctor.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you.

City Clerk Urquia: Next speaker is Maria Magdalena Estupinan.

Maria Magdalena Estupinan: Good afternoon. My name is Maria Magdalena Estupinan. And I'm very concerned about what I've heard here today. I have a couple of questions for you. I believe we, the residents, wanted a moratorium because we wanted to put like a stop to the excess of development. My concern is you're all architects, and you're very, very connected with developers. And I hope that this will work out because we asked for the moratorium to see what the -- this bonus was allowing the developers to kind of bypass the Zoning Code. I can tell you that we are not mad. We are beyond being mad, okay. We want results. I know that design is very important, but the most important thing is to kind of stop the -- or take out the loopholes that they have, these developers, to do whatever they want. Now, why am I concerned? Because I heard the word "incentive" many times here today, like we can give some -- more incentive or a different incentive. We don't want any more incentive. We want to stop the excess of development. We don't want to become another Brickell, and that's where we're headed. Now, my question is, are we going to do this every week? Are we going to have the same day and the same hour? Because it would be good for the people to know that every Thursday at 4 o'clock, we're going -- meeting. Okay, and we'll be able to have like at least half an hour for our input. When you finalize the whole thing,

how do we know, okay, that it's not going to be worse than what we had before? And again, I thank you and I hope that this works out, but I'm concerned. Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you.

City Clerk Urquia: Next speaker is Ms. Maria Longo (phonetic).

Maria Longo: Hi. I want to thank you for your time here. And I want to tell you that I'm one of those people that when some buildings get built, wondered how did that happen? How did it even happen? How come -- did it go through the architectural board? I'm in favor of Mediterranean Revival architecture in the City of Coral Gables. I see the value. One of my favorite cities is Santa Barbara. And especially, I see the value because Miami is very diversified, and we already have Brickell, and then we have Wynwood, and we have the Design District, and we have Doral. And then we have a city like ours that was founded by an extraordinary person with an incredible vision, who started traditional architecture, who traveled, who sent his architects that traveled to the Mediterranean in Europe, and went to New York, certain neighborhoods in New York. I think one is Tuxedo. And he understood and he studied the movements, the City Beautiful movement, the garden movement, and I'm in favor of it. But I have a question for you, Mitch, because I love the Colonnade Hotel, the way that it was done. I love the building in front of the Ponce Circle. And I'm wondering, okay, what happened that you get some really good buildings, and especially back in the 20s. We have the Biltmore Hotel, which is beautiful. It's enormous and it's beautiful. I don't want what people call Pollo Tropical. So, how did you accomplish -- how were those buildings accomplished? What was there then that we don't have now that we are seeing so many poorly designed buildings, that they don't have a human scale? You know, they say that beauty is in the eye of the beholder, but I think most people recognize ugliness too. And it affects me personally, and it affects everybody, and it affects long-term. I mean, we want to go to Paris, why? We want to go to Aspen, why? We want to go to Santa Barbara. What do those places have that people love and they're romantic and they're beautiful. And you walk and you feel a sense of well-being, a sense of place. So, my question is, what happened then that --? Why can't we go back to

doing things the right way? And I have a suggestion for you. I used to be a teacher, and I was a pretty strict teacher, but I was a good teacher. Actually, I won the award in 1998 Teacher of the Year in the entire county. And I was wondering, and I would like you to consider, since design is important -- right? -- because we know that you can get really good design and some people cannot get a good design. My suggestion would be two things. One -- Mitch, you mentioned it -- is the review panel and some sort of process where there's another review panel, maybe with some anonymity, because I think it's kind of complicated sometimes -- (INAUDIBLE) wouldn't know if it is or not, but I would be uncomfortable telling a friend, change your design. And sometimes I've seen that designs come to the board -- to the architectural board that they're already so advanced and so poor, you would have to redesign them. So, at a certain level, if we have some big projects to have some review panels with some anonymity with people that are -- have a background in traditional architecture, that have studied classical architecture, that have a track record. That's my first suggestion. And the second suggestion would be, if you're giving a bonus and you're giving density and intensity, you should get a wonderful project, a beautiful project that you walk by and you are in awe and you're inspired by it. Well, why can't we require that designers have some track record? If they're going to give to developers -- I have developed and I'm telling you what I'm sure -- maybe -- I think -- I'm pretty positive that if you were giving me a lot of density, a lot of intensity, and I could do bigger projects, that you would tell me, you have to have an architect who has a track record in traditional architecture and does not give us (COMMENTS IN SPANISH NOT TRANSLATED) Pollo Tropical, somebody who really knows. And I think, as a developer, if you want to be able to get that much more out of it, and probably you're going to -- go design (INAUDIBLE) thoughtful. The designer, a classical architect takes into consideration the context, which is one of the things that I have seen we have failed, context. So many times, I had to stand in front of Planning, not because I wanted to, but because I feel responsibility because the project is coming close to my house where I go, "Oh my god." That project is in front of a historic property and it's totally out of context. Once it's built, we can't go back. So, my two suggestions would be some sort of review panel, and the second one, requirements of some sort -- I'm not an architect, but some sort of requirements of a track record in Mediterranean Revival or traditional architecture. Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you.

(APPLAUSE)

City Clerk Urquia: Next speaker is Mr. Alexander Adams.

Alexander Historical Resources Director Adams: Hello. I'll be pretty quick. I don't -- I know we're late, and I don't want to be verbose here. One point I want to make, I think we do need to stick directly to just the Mediterranean architecture and the Mediterranean bonus. You know, I think all the residents here and the ones that I hear from, they like Coral Gables being Mediterranean. You can do modern, but you don't get the bonus. We get a bonus because it's a particular item that the residents want to see. So, we don't want to change the name of the bonus. We don't even want to talk about other things. This is really about Mediterranean bonus and buildings that get a bonus to do something great, and they mentioned that. On the other hand, yes, there's a huge issue with parking. We heard several places, you know, and how it creates a pedestal and all. Why is the Biltmore beautiful? Because it doesn't have parking, you know, it really doesn't. It's off on the sides. If it had a pedestal and it had to put all the parking in the middle -- in the building, it would look totally different. If we're not going to allow the height, you know, in proportion -- proportions, I think, are the big thing missing right now also. You know, if we're not going to allow height, then maybe we have to do an incentive for the parking to go underground, and that's expensive in Miami. And as far as I was involved -- and I represent myself -- I've lived in downtown. I've had a house right next to downtown. I've always been right here in the downtown area over 10 years and seen it grow. And the reason the Agave project looks different, it was originally designed with two floors underground. And those two floors that came above ground to go from a five-story garage to seven, is just night and day. I mean, it's -- you know, you went from proportions of just over a third of the building to almost half is parking, right? And so, it sounds small, but it's huge, two floors all the way around that thing. So, how we do proportions is a big one. And even small items -- you look at the Douglas Entrance a long time

ago, but it's a botch job, right? I mean, you have horizontal windows, no (INAUDIBLE), like it doesn't pass any rule of traditional Mediterranean, or any of the examples there. So, I do think there are some things that we can look at. They can be tweaked. I like the idea even that maybe there should be more than two categories, maybe you get, you know, more bumps for things. And I will say, on the opposite side, don't just throw a cupola on the top of the thing. That's also just as bad. You know, I mean, we don't always have to have a cupola, and we don't -- you know, it can be an expression vertically, but there's other types of expressions and things, you know. So, I think that's where your kind of parameters and box, and yes, you get boxed in, FPL vaults and everything else. But I think if you had to narrow it down, this is a bonus. Keep it with Mediterranean traditional and all. And we need to really key in on proportions and the forms, whether you need a form-based code, whether you need 3Ds, whatever it is. And that would be my...

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you.

City Clerk Urquia: Next speaker is Mr. Enrique Bernal.

Enrique Bernal: Good afternoon. And thank you for taking the time to keep this city the way it was. I just have a very simple question. The Chairman read a document that -- and spoke about compatibility with the neighborhood. And then we heard today that you have many checkboxes for granting of the Mediterranean bonus. I'd like to ask is one of those boxes "neighborhood compatibility"? And if so, what weight is it given relative to all the other 17 whatever things?

Chairperson Pardo: Actually, that's not in the boxes. It's in the other section under design standards, which are for all projects.

Board Member Pratt: And the BOA is very adamant about -- or that's something...

Chairperson Pardo: The context.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, the context, more so or -- well, for all projects, but even more so for -- especially for single-family residences and for how it fits within the neighborhood. In other words, it's not an incentive. It's a requirement.

Unidentified Speaker: Yeah.

Mr. Bernal: Okay.

Unidentified Speaker: (INAUDIBLE) the base...

Board Member Pratt: And a lot of projects are rejected by the Board of Architects because they don't comply with context or they're designed within the contextual character of...

Mr. Bernal: Okay, well, that was my question. Thank you very much.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you.

City Clerk Urquia: The next speaker is on Zoom, and it's going to be Ms. Maria Cruz.

Maria Cruz: Good afternoon. First of all, let me thank all of you for giving us your time and your efforts in trying to make our city the City Beautiful that we moved to. I heard something today that made me happy, and I think is an excellent idea for the projects to go first to the Board of Architects for a preliminary look to make sure that if it's something that is not going to work, that they can hear it before they spend millions of dollars doing plans and whatever, and then not be able to tell them, "No, too bad," because they've already spent time and money. But I must tell you that some of us have been listening to the people, to the residents, to the taxpayers. And most of us see -- most of us have concerns about bonuses and incentives. Most of us really do not believe that we should be giving any bonuses or any incentives. Most of us, I think, believe that

we moved to Coral Gables because we liked the way Coral Gables looked. And instead of giving bonuses and incentives, maybe we should take away if they do not build the way that Coral Gables -- that Merrick conceived Coral Gables. I'm going to tell you that my big issue is when someone buys a property, somebody buys something that they want to build in Coral Gables. They should look at what they can build. They should pay attention to what's possible to be built and not expect any variances, any waivers, any bonuses. What they buy is what they can build. The problem is they -- my perception, and I've been here since 1976. My perception is that they find an inexpensive, a cheap land, a lot, an old house that needs to be torn down and can go for very little, and maybe two or three houses, one next to the other, they buy it for very little money, very little, you know, in quotes. And then they figure out that they cannot make enough money if they have to follow the rules. So, then they have to come and cry and beg because they're not going to be able to make enough money. And we -- "we" meaning the employees, the staff, sometimes the elected officials -- feel bad because they've bought this property and they cannot build what they plan to build. Well, they should not plan to build something that doesn't fit in the land that they bought. It's a simple issue. They need to buy enough land or the property in the location where they can build what they want, or they shouldn't buy it. There's no discussion about it. I am sure that most of us that live in, you know, homes, most of us that live in residential areas, if we were to go to the City and say, "Well, you know, now that I have seven more kids, I need to add another story to my house," they may not be very agreeable to it because my -- the little lot where they want to build it is not big enough for that kind of building. Well, that has to apply to the developers also. The message should be do not buy in Coral Gables unless you're sure that what you're buying lends itself to what you want to build. End of the story, no more discussion. And there should be a gatekeeper. Before the process starts, there should be somebody that when they come in first and say, "I'm buying this property," or "I bought this property and I would like to do such and such," that they can look at them in their face, and say, "I hate to tell you, don't buy it, because you will not be able to build that," instead of trying to come up with ways to help them build what they want to build, even though they shouldn't. And that's my thought for the day. And once again, I thank you all for giving us your time, your expertise. And please remember that the residents, the

taxpayers, are here to stay. The developers come, build, take their money and run away. Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you.

City Clerk Urquia: The next speaker is Mr. Jackson "Rip" Holmes.

Jackson "Rip" Holmes: Greetings. Nice to see our distinguished panelists. I feel -- I got to start out with the larger picture. My perception is that Citizens United has allowed developer money to control elections in Coral Gables. And that as a result, we no longer have a government of the people because the developer money -- as an example, there's -- a developer can give an unlimited amount of money to a PAC. And people that have run and won, or run and almost won, have told me it really is now impossible to win a seat on the City Commission and be able to appoint members like yourselves to this panel without developer support. So, it taints -- I mean, I hate to say this, but you don't have infinite time, so I'm going to get right to the point. I think that we don't have a government of the people. We have a government of developers. And I think, from what I've seen today, I've been disappointed. I don't even think -- Mr. Bermello, you and I know each other, and so you're going to forgive me even if I may make you mad right now, so I ask you forgiveness and -- upfront. I thought that Mayor...

Unidentified Speaker: (INAUDIBLE).

Mr. Holmes: Thank you. Mayor Lago was going to be on board with this. He seemed to think that there was -- that we're giving away too much Mediterranean bonuses. Living in the world of reality, I thought, you know, with that direction. But now, you, Mr. Bermello, are challenging the very premise of some of the things that Mr. Pardo pointed out. You're saying that there is no tainting of the process. I hate to say this, but I believe Mr. Pardo and not you. But what's most upsetting to me is that it suggests that maybe Mayor Lago is not really on board with trying to control this thing. Now, focusing narrowly then on the Mediterranean bonus, over the years I've

talked with developers, I've learned that, in the proper context, a Mediterranean bonus is worthwhile. As I've already said, I think that we've lost that context completely. We should have a moratorium on Mediterranean bonuses and only allow them for special circumstances because all of development is out of control. But I'm worried now, Mr. Bermello, that maybe you're not really -- maybe Mr. Lago's not on board, maybe you're not on board, and are we going to get anything out of this? I think that in terms of the narrow focus of this committee, we need to really seriously pare back. Let's say that on a -- if there's a hundred percent being given out now, let's say it needs to be cut back to -- at least back to 25 percent of the present in terms of what is allowed for a Mediterranean bonus because we're getting buildings that really don't look Mediterranean. We've lost the focus. We've lost the purpose. I think there is a legitimate purpose. It's been blown out. I could go on, but I will add another larger picture remark. With all of this runaway development enabled by Citizens United, we're no longer really a suburb. Anyone that thinks about moving here to Coral Gables to get some kind of place where their children can grow up safe from urbanization and the crime that comes with urbanization is not really getting good information. And no doubt I'll get myself in trouble for this, but I'm going to get away -- this will be my last comment. For Mayor Lago to say, "Oh, we're doing such a great job. People want to move here," that's really not an honest statement. People want to move here because they're still living in the past. The present is that there's runaway development in Coral Gables. It's a runaway train. It's not really a suburb anymore. Look at the Wawa project. It's not even safe for children. And let's try and get our story straight. Thank you very much.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you. Mr. Clerk.

City Clerk Urquia: So, the last -- he was the last speaker, but we did receive a comment through the chat. It's from Mr. Cesar Mergoza (phonetic). And he said, "Question: The Mediterranean bonus seems to be misnamed. It seems the objectives are design, classic Coral Gables, as well as open space and compatible neighborhood design. Keep buildings to five stories or fewer and to avoid encroachment through small setbacks. Can we use this opportunity with the blue-ribbon committee to adjust the document to incorporate the incentives that seem to have unanimous

agreement?" He further added, "Also, what is the timing to get the final recommendation from the committee? I believe residents will like a thoughtful, yet speedy resolution to this prior to year-end, preferably."

Chairperson Pardo: Is that it, Mr. Clerk?

City Clerk Urquia: That it is, sir.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you. Alright. So, based on that, as a segue into that, I would suggest to the committee that we meet on a weekly basis for, including this meeting, a total of four meetings. In other words, to try to see if we could wrap this up in such a way -- what we'd like to do, I would think, is make sure that we take the direction specifically as stated by Mr. Behar earlier about looking specifically at the bonuses, narrowing it down to those elements or bonuses that are elements that are relevant, and it would be us individually coming up with our own, all seven members, then analyzing those at the next meeting to see, you know, which are worthy, et cetera, whether there should be still a level one and a level two or only one level, to understand specifically of how the historical context would come into play, and then go in that direction. Mr. Behar.

Board Member Behar: No, I agree with that. And I think that's the way we need to proceed because a lot of the comments that were made, unfortunately, we don't have...

Chairperson Pardo: The power.

Board Member Behar: The ability to do any changes.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Behar: I mean, that's the reality. And whether I agree with that -- and there's a lot of things that I am agreeing with all the residents and the comments, we cannot do. We cannot do

anything about it. So, let's concentrate on what we can and let's try to improve that. And I think that taking those five -- or two bonus -- those two incentive levels and making the most out of that is going to be the most beneficial to this process.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, fair enough.

Unidentified Speaker: That's what we're charged to do.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. Now, one more thing.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chair, I agree a hundred percent.

Chairperson Pardo: Yes, sir.

Board Member Bermello: I just still believe that we should all be provided the entire section, and that we all review the entire section, and that we comment on the entire section, and then we have a process by which we can each redline and consolidate. And it seems to me that, at the end of this process, there should be a version that shows what the findings of this group are to the Commission, and that it be posted in a way that every resident in the City can review, can opine, can comment, can come back and tell us we missed X, Y and Z, or we agree with you, or you did a great job. Or like one of the ladies apparently thinks, we're not doing a good job, or whatever the case may be, so that there's full involvement by the citizenry in what is being done. And there may be some things that we can't change, but I think there's certainly a message that we can send. And maybe there may -- and there could be a difference. In other words, there are some things that, as a panel, we may not be able to modify. But I think -- it seems to me that what I -- I hear -- at least from a number of the citizens -- is that -- and what they've heard from, I think, all of us, is that they have heard their own voices, and that they're counting on us as this panel to convey that message. So, I -- and some of these things may have to do -- beyond just the bonuses. But if

we can have a -- and I like the idea of meeting every week for the next four weeks, and let's see that we get it done.

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE) to get it done.

Board Member Bermello: And work hard to get it done.

Chairperson Pardo: I agree. Same day, same time.

City Clerk Urquia: I was going to confirm. So, is it going to be for the next three weeks or the next four weeks?

Unidentified Speaker: Three weeks.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, the next three would make it a total of four.

Unidentified Speaker: Four.

Chairperson Pardo: But if you recall, the City Attorney can say, we've got a lot of pressure from the Commission saying, you know, see how we could -- what we could do in 30 days. In other words, the 30 days starting today, so that would make it four weeks. If we don't set a timeline, we won't accomplish...

Board Member Pratt: We won't finish.

Chairperson Pardo: So, we're going to do that, I think. I know at least the rest of the members, not me, but the rest of the members are pretty smart. I figured that they could come up with something pretty quick on that. And I want to also say one more thing. I've had Mr. Adams sitting here. Mr. Adams has a particular charge that I am going to indulge myself as Chairman. Mr.

Adams, I would like to have something in writing from you to all the board members, okay. And what I want to have from you is how existing, historically important -- not necessarily -- I said carefully, I said historically important, not necessarily designated. Because there are many buildings out there, such as the San Sebastian Hotel -- or San Sebastian Apartments. Most residents in the City of Coral Gables assume that is a designated historical building. It is not, just so you know. But it is historically significant, and since 1986, that particular building has been used as an example for the Mediterranean ordinance. Mr. Adams, can you approach?

Historical Resources Director Adams: Just for clarification, a designation report is being prepared. It just has not been completed and submitted to the board yet.

Chairperson Pardo: Correct.

Historical Resources Director Adams: And if you're asking for me to provide information on buildings which may not necessarily be designated but are historically significant...

Chairperson Pardo: Well, what I'm saying is, not -- I'm not asking you -- don't -- as I always say, don't put your liver in a quiver, okay.

Historical Resources Director Adams: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: Let's put this in the proper context.

Historical Resources Director Adams: Sure.

Chairperson Pardo: It's the impact of development, new development, on historically significant projects. In other words, how does it impact them?

Historical Resources Director Adams: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: Visually, massing, all these different things.

Historical Resources Director Adams: Sure.

Chairperson Pardo: I think that's very important that we at least understand and take a look at. I know for a fact -- and there are municipalities, there are counties, in fact, throughout the United States, that are -- that have certain requirements to make sure that they don't lose the fabric component of those buildings. And sometimes there are distance requirements, you know, how - - that's just another one of those design constructs, I think, which has been very silent, in my opinion. Having been a trustee of the Dade Heritage Trust, having worked on historical buildings, I would tell you that that is one of our greatest resources. And that's why I would just like to have your expertise as an opinion, just so we understand, whether we use it or we don't use it, but at least we acknowledge the importance of those historic buildings.

Historical Resources Director Adams: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright.

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Salman, you were going to say something?

Board Member Salman: We've heard a lot of commentary from the public, and I think that we are all in agreement that we see something that needs to be addressed, and that it doesn't necessarily completely exist within the Mediterranean bonus. I think we're all aware of that. I don't think there's anything limiting us with regards to our personal opinions and what we do outside of this committee to make those other changes (INAUDIBLE). Because there are certainly issues with regards to design, which is becoming apparent and becoming apparent to everyone that are not necessarily within the character of the City, and that's what I think the public is objecting to. I think that's what we as professionals are beginning to object to. And this is only one component.

We have our limits with regards to our charge here, which is specifically with regards to how the Mediterranean bonuses are calculated and applied. And -- but we are members of this community, and we have the ability to address other issues outside of this. And we should take this opportunity to do so.

Chairperson Pardo: Very good.

Board Member Pratt: And if I could just add one thing too. Actually, to the extent that -- with reference to historic is that one of the things that does have a big play in the Med bonus and in the overall massing of the building is when TDRs or transfer of development rights are given to -- which are a -- an incen -- well, not an incentive, but it's a benefit that is given by the City Commission -- or permitted by the City Commission. But when -- you know, a lot of the projects that I think the residents and people use as the reference for complaining about are projects that have received TDRs, and they're much larger. You know, it allows the project to go up to a 4.375, and so -- but the flipside of that coin is the project is larger, but the use of the TDRs is preserving the historic character and going -- and making it possible for historic buildings to be preserved that create also the character of Coral Gables. So, without the use of the TDRs, or without the ability of the owner of a historic property to sell the TDRs to a developer to utilize in a larger project, they're not going to have the money or the ability to maintain historic properties and preserve. So, you know, one of the things about development is that, you know, there's multiple sides to it. It's not just that everything is, you know, too big. It's too out of -- you know, it's out of scale. There are things, elements that are going into it that make other parts of the context of the neighborhood or the urban character. It's preserving those historic buildings. So, you know, I -- a lot of times, I -- you know, laypeople don't understand that balance that is working to -- you know, new development that is also preserving older buildings. So, you know, I think it's something to keep in mind. But that's something that is very difficult speaking from the Board of Architects point of view to try and find that balance in new projects that come to the board for review that are using TDRs, because it does create a much larger envelope on the site than what's usually, you know, allowed.

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Adams, do you have a TDR accountability -- let's say, available TDRs that exist out there. Are we talking about a lot of TDRs? For the public, TDRs are transfer development rights that are assigned based on the FAR that is not used by normally smaller buildings which are historical. And once they qualify, those TDRs can be sold to be able to preserve those historic buildings, and then they're used in new development. What happens is then that the FAR in the new development then goes up exponentially, and therefore...

Board Member Pratt: But it gets capped at -- it is -- you can't make it go forever. It's capped at 4.375.

Chairperson Pardo: Right, it's capped at 4.375, but the whole point is that, right now, even with the bonuses, the two levels of Mediterranean bonus that exist today is 3.5; at 3.3, and another .2, that's 3.5.

Board Member Pratt: It's an additional 25...

Board Member Bermello: Depends on...

Board Member Pratt: Percent.

Board Member Bermello: The district.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. And depending on the district, it's a complicated formula, but the whole optic of the TDRs, which have been used now for many years, all over the United States, is to be able to transfer development rights in order to preserve historic buildings.

Board Member Bermello: You know, it's like everything else we're saying is there's no other good option for common sense. A TDR applied in the correct location the entire community can

applaud. A TDR applied in the wrong location, and it's horrible. You'll never be able to live off that wrong decision. So, TDRs themselves...

Historical Resources Director Adams: TDRs...

Board Member Bermello: Are not a problem. It's how it's managed and applied.

Historical Resources Director Adams: TDRs...

Board Member Bermello: Where's the receiving site.

Unidentified Speaker: Where's the receiving site.

Board Member Bermello: You put a receiving property that is right at the edge of a single-family neighborhood, and it's going to be impossible to not impact a single-family neighborhood.

Historical Resources Director Adams: TDRs are for specific, specific areas. You can't just transfer them anywhere in the City. They are for specific areas.

Board Member Bermello: With the exception of one...

Board Member Pratt: It has to be within the CBD.

Board Member Bermello: With the exception of one property, where the City arrived at an agreement with one particular property, where because of the courts, that TDR can go anywhere.

Board Member Behar: Well, that's limited...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Those are already exhausted.

Board Member Bermello: But it's, you know...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Those TDRs have already been exhausted. Those no longer exist.

Board Member Bermello: Unidentified Speaker: But for a long time, that was still there. And so, still the issue of common sense and where it's applied has to be -- you know, it's a lot of what we've been talking about, you know. And so, it's not just like saying height is bad or TDRs; it's how it's applied.

Historical Resources Director Adams: And I also think even though the sale of TDRs effectively helps to protect the historic site because you're selling development rights...

Board Member Bermello: Absolutely.

Historical Resources Director Adams: Off the site, so you're reducing the amount that potentially could be built there, therefore, effectively reducing the development value of the site. It doesn't necessarily prevent someone from building something on the adjacent lot. So, while you may have protected the historic building, the context of the building could potentially still be destroyed.

Board Member Bermello: And if you designate the CBD, for example -- obviously, the case -- but if you were to expand that into, let's say, areas of the North Gables, or in areas that, you know, where the boundary is a single-family home, that can have a significant impact. In the middle of the Central Business District, nobody will -- it won't be an issue. It's the right thing to do because you're saving a historic property. You're allowing them the ability to maintain that property, which now, after what happened in Surfside, every condo association is now thinking about, you know, their reserves and maintenance. And TDRs allow you to do just that.

Chairperson Pardo: And one of the reasons -- exactly what Willy was saying is that over time, and the reason we're sitting here today is over time, we started off one way, the original Med bonuses were only in the CBD, period. The TDRs were only in a certain section, period. Over time, it's moved out. So, it would be nice, I think, for this committee to understand from a TDR standpoint, you know, where they are. Because at the end of the day, they could also be added to the Med bonuses, and that's how you get to the over 4 FAR.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I would still want to just chime in, I'm sorry. But the scope of TDRs just is so far outside of...

Chairperson Pardo: Alright.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: The Mediterranean bonus that I don't see how it provides anything else to the discussion.

Chairperson Pardo: We'll strike that.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: But as far as the impact of historic buildings, you know, on the bonuses, you know, where the bonuses are, et cetera, it would be nice to know what other people in the country do when it comes to massing, et cetera, and you know, how they impact or don't impact historical buildings.

Historical Resources Director Adams: And one thing -- you know, I've been listening to what you've been saying. And one thing that's been at the back of my mind is, my department doesn't really deal with the Mediterranean bonus because it's generally for new, large construction, generally, not in historic areas. But my way of looking at things from a historic perspective, based on a lot of the things that were said today, a lot of the things we look for in buildings are honesty

and integrity and authenticity and proportion. And a lot of that seems to be missing sometimes because these details seem to be an afterthought. And you know, most people can tell, like the lady said earlier, how come these buildings don't look as good as the older buildings. Obviously, it comes down to training and understanding what you're doing. But certainly, from my point of view, I tend to look at not just Mediterranean Revival buildings, but all new architecture. I tend to look at as, in 50 years' time, is this the sort of building that we would be trying to designate and preserve? And I think that's an important consideration in new design. You know, as a good design and in 50 years' time, is this the sort of thing that we would be looking to preserve? So, that's certainly my take on newer construction, and I certainly think that's something that's worth keeping at the back of your mind. You know, is this a new design that, in 50 years' time, we would be proud to or would be eligible to designate? And I think that's important as well.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Adams. Mr. Attorney, one last question. And that is, at the next meeting, you know, if the board -- it was a consensus of listening to the public. You know, I think that the next meeting is probably going to be a nitty-gritty workshop, which is open to the public. But do we have the ability of maybe -- you know, if time does not allow for us to, you know, hear public comment at that time, is there a possibility of having the public send us, or through the Clerk, I guess, send all the committee members, you know, whatever comments they have? I think it would be much more...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: The public can always provide comments and send in comments. And at every single meeting, it's up to the Chair, if they would like to allow public comments. So, if the time allows for it, it's always at the discretion of the Chair and of the board, if they want to have public comment. But they can always submit it to the Clerk, and we can provide it to you. That's, once again, strictly up to you.

Chairperson Pardo: I just think that everything was pretty much said today from all of us on both sides of the dais today. And I think, you know, it'd be wise to utilize as much of the time possible to cut to the chase.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Okay. Was there a discussion --? I apologize. I stepped out for two minutes. Has there been any discussion on any sort of a breakdown of parts of the Code for each individual representative?

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Nothing? Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: Very good.

Board Member Salman: It's not a big section.

Board Member Bermello: Will you be sending a Word...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I will provide a Word version of the -- of 5-200 to all the board members.

Board Member Bermello: Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: You're going to have to expand it. Look at the size of the printing.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: If you do have any questions or comments in regard to the document, I only ask that you do not reply all. You can send questions to staff, just not amongst yourselves.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Unidentified Speaker: Thank you.

Unidentified Speaker: Fair enough.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. Is there --? Thank you, board members. Is there any other comment from the committee?

Board Member Salman: I make a motion to adjourn.

Board Member Bermello: I second.

Board Member Pratt: So -- second it.

Unidentified Speaker: Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright. Mr. Clerk?

City Clerk Urquia: All in favor?

The Board Members (Collectively): Aye.

City Clerk Urquia: Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you very much.

Board Member Bermello: Thank you.

Board Member Behar: Thank you.