

1 MS. SUAREZ: The next item is Item 8, an
 2 Ordinance of the City Commission of Coral
 3 Gables, Florida providing for text amendments
 4 to the City of Coral Gables Official Zoning
 5 Code, by amending Article 4, "Zoning
 6 Districts," Section 4-201, "Mixed Use
 7 District;" Article 5, "Development Standards,"
 8 Section 5-604, "Coral Gables Mediterranean
 9 Style Design Standards," and Section 5-1105,
 10 "Landscape Requirements;" and Article 8,
 11 "Definitions," to increase the requirements for
 12 landscaped open space and clarify what
 13 constitutes open space; providing for a
 14 repealer provision, providing for a
 15 severability clause, codification, and
 16 providing for an effective date.

17 MS. MENENDEZ: Thank you.

18 MR. TRIAS: May I have the PowerPoint,
 19 please?

20 Madam Vice Chair, this has been a request
 21 of the City Commission. There's some concern
 22 that some of the requirements that we have for
 23 open space don't result in the high quality
 24 open space. That is the view of some people.

25 And there are two issues related to this

1 designations that we have. We were just
 2 discussing Commercial Limited. That is one of
 3 the designations. We also have Commercial. We
 4 also have Mixed-Use Districts. And we have
 5 residential, MF2, the apartment areas and so
 6 on.

7 And here what we're proposing is some
 8 slight increase in the percentage. Now, what I
 9 would recommend, based on some conversation
 10 I've had with some of the Members, is that we
 11 probably need to look at this a little bit more
 12 closely, in terms of the effect that it has on
 13 development, and given the fact that the City
 14 Commission is not going to meet until the end
 15 of August, we still have an additional meeting
 16 in August, potentially, if you choose to go
 17 that way, in which we could review this a
 18 little bit further, if you choose to do that.

19 So that is the idea. The request is that
 20 we believe that the Code will be enhanced by
 21 having ground level be more clear and more
 22 explicit. I think that's very important. And,
 23 secondly, that there's an opportunity to
 24 improve some of the percentages that are
 25 requested or required in the different Zoning

1 request. One is the amount of open space, the
 2 percentage that is required, and the other one
 3 is the location. And I would like to describe
 4 them separately, and I think it's probably
 5 easier to think of them as two separate
 6 requests.

7 Right now open space is allowed to happen
 8 at the ground level, but also in the upper
 9 stories, for example, at a pool deck, if you do
 10 a garden there and so on. What happens is that
 11 that is really not the intent of open space for
 12 the creation of high quality pedestrian areas.
 13 It really has to be at the ground level.

14 So one aspect of this request is that we
 15 have made some amendments to the text -- it's
 16 probably easier to look at the two displays
 17 that I have -- some amendments to the text,
 18 that add the word "ground level" multiple times
 19 and define some key provisions, such as the
 20 paseo, as something that has to be open to the
 21 sky. So those, I think, are very clear, very
 22 straight-forward, very applicable things.

23 The next aspect of this is the change, in
 24 terms of the percentages, and this chart right
 25 here illustrates the different Zoning

1 designations. So that is the issue.

2 It's complex, it's very significant, and it
 3 really matters in terms of the quality of life
 4 of the community and the overall appearance of
 5 the City. This is one of those things that
 6 truly can have a big impact.

7 MR. AIZENSTAT: And if I may --

8 MS. MENENDEZ: Sure.

9 MR. AIZENSTAT: -- this would only apply to
 10 the Mixed-Use District?

11 MR. TRIAS: No. It actually applies to
 12 Commercial, Commercial Limited and Mixed-Use,
 13 yes, and also the MF2. Yeah.

14 MS. BALIDO-HART: So where are we getting
 15 these percentages from? And is there any
 16 concern with the numbers?

17 MR. BEHAR: Very good question.

18 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. And I -- thank you very
 19 much for the question, because that is exactly
 20 the aspect of the request that is -- I believe
 21 requires a little bit more thinking. The
 22 existing percentages are here on the top, and
 23 the proposed are the ones that are highlighted
 24 in green.

25 So, as you can see, there's a little bit of

1 a difference, and the difference is towards
 2 more percentage, but the reality is that --
 3 what I like to tell people who ask about these
 4 things is that the City of Coral Gables has
 5 probably the best design and review process
 6 anywhere, and that is through the Board of
 7 Architects. No other City has seven
 8 professional architects review absolutely
 9 everything that goes on for aesthetics.
 10 So what happens is that we do have a great
 11 process to make sure that projects are designed
 12 at the highest level, and that process, I
 13 believe, is as important as the requirements
 14 that we have. So, from my perspective, I think
 15 that we need to respect the Board of
 16 Architects, we need to respect the Staff that
 17 we have that reviews all of these projects, and
 18 allow for some flexibility, because I think
 19 that cities that tend to look at things in
 20 terms of percentages are not as high quality as
 21 Coral Gables.
 22 Coral Gables is way beyond. So it's a
 23 simple way of looking at things, because we do
 24 have that process. So, anyway, that's my
 25 answer.

1 MS. BALIDO-HART: Right. And the reason I
 2 asked the question is that perhaps something
 3 for consideration could be a range instead of a
 4 limited number, a range, but I'll look forward
 5 to further discussion of this and further
 6 understanding.
 7 The ultimate goal of this is really to have
 8 greater green space, right, to increase the
 9 green space?
 10 MR. TRIAS: At the ground level.
 11 MS. BALIDO-HART: At the ground level.
 12 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 13 MS. BALIDO-HART: And it's all in the
 14 execution, right? So what might be right for
 15 one property may not be right for another?
 16 MR. TRIAS: Right.
 17 MS. BALIDO-HART: So that's why the range
 18 concerns me, because I don't know -- I can't
 19 visualize what that number would mean across
 20 the board.
 21 MR. TRIAS: And I don't think anybody can.
 22 If you ask me right now, what does that mean
 23 exactly, in terms of a project, I cannot give
 24 you an answer, and the reason is that we have
 25 such a serious process of review, that takes

1 into account the proportions of the building,
 2 the arcade, the location of different things --
 3 MS. BALIDO-HART: Right.
 4 MR. TRIAS: -- that is so much more
 5 important, in my view, than, well, it's eight
 6 percent, nine percent, ten percent.
 7 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.
 8 MS. VELEZ: I see that the Commercial,
 9 Commercial Limited, with the Mediterranean
 10 Bonus has no change at all, other than removing
 11 the elevated areas.
 12 MR. TRIAS: And that has to do with the
 13 fact that when you do the Med Bonus, other
 14 things apply, and that's what I'm saying about
 15 the Code. The Code is very complex. It's one
 16 of the most complex Codes we have.
 17 When you see Commercial -- like, for
 18 example, the project we just saw is Commercial,
 19 but because it's going for the Mediterranean
 20 Bonus, then it doesn't have to follow some of
 21 the setback requirements. All of a sudden, the
 22 issue of open space becomes, well, we have an
 23 arcade, and then the architect, for example, in
 24 that case, designed a landscaped area in front
 25 of the arcade. Why? Well, because it's on

1 US-1, there's a lot of traffic, it's the right
 2 design solution, and that was done through the
 3 current process.
 4 Now, if instead of looking at it as a
 5 design problem, we only look at it in terms of
 6 a mathematical equation, are we going to get
 7 the same quality? Maybe not, and that's the
 8 issue that I'd like to emphasize.
 9 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes, sir.
 10 MR. GRABIEL: My concern is that everybody
 11 is for open space, but I want to qualify it,
 12 open space, so that it becomes significant open
 13 space. This morning, I was walking the back
 14 street of the Colonnade Hotel, and the way that
 15 building solved their landscaping requirements,
 16 and we've talk about this before, is putting
 17 planters between columns, which kills the use
 18 of an arcade, because nobody jumps over the
 19 planter to get into the arcades. So either you
 20 walk on the sidewalk or you walk on the arcade,
 21 but there's no flow between one and the other,
 22 and, yes, the building complied with the
 23 landscaping requirements at the time at ground
 24 level, but it urbanistically is a disaster.
 25 So how do we protect the landscape and how

1 do we qualify it in such a way that the
2 landscape becomes a significant benefit to the
3 City and the residents and visitors?

4 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, we added some language
5 that talks about that specifically, but it's
6 not enough.

7 MR. GRABIEL: Okay.

8 MR. TRIAS: What does the job is the
9 process, the process that we have through the
10 Board of Architects, and I think -- you know,
11 again, I think that's the key. The key is that
12 we have that process, other people don't, other
13 cities don't.

14 Yes.

15 MR. BELLIN: It seems like we're discussing
16 this situation before we hear from the public,
17 and I would like to hear from them before it
18 gets to us.

19 MS. MENENDEZ: Sure. Well, because he's
20 still doing his presentation, but you're right,
21 we probably should have waited for our comments
22 until after the public spoke, and I probably
23 should have asked Jill if there's anyone that
24 wanted to speak to this issue.

25 THE SECRETARY: Yes. We have three.

1 Zoning District which does not see the level of
2 sort of development activity that you think
3 would be appropriate in re-development activity
4 in certain areas, and you wonder if that is
5 part of the complicating factor in
6 re-developing those sites.

7 Landscaped open space in the ground floor
8 is, generally a good idea, you can't say that
9 it's a bad idea, but you don't want it -- you
10 want it to only enhance projects and be able to
11 enable projects to happen that are going to
12 overall improve the City and its neighborhoods.

13 The second point is the fact that this
14 change, whenever it comes, will be a change
15 that's going to be taking place while other
16 projects are going through the Development
17 Review approval process. So I think it's very
18 important. I think it's fair. I think it's
19 protective of people's, you know, vested
20 interests and due process here, that this
21 ordinance include, as similar ordinances have
22 included in the past, some sort of
23 grandfathering provision, whereby if you're
24 already at a certain point in the development
25 approval process, such as the project perhaps

1 Mario Garcia-Serra.

2 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Good evening, Madam
3 Chair, Members of the Board, Mario
4 Garcia-Serra, with offices at 600 Brickell
5 Avenue, not representing any particular client
6 on this matter, just here of interest, of
7 course, since I'm involved quite often in real
8 estate development projects here in the City.

9 I have two points that I would like to
10 make. Number One is a point that I believe has
11 already been made, I wasn't here for the whole
12 discussion, but the idea that perhaps something
13 a little bit more sophisticated than just
14 straight formulas is what's appropriate to
15 govern and make sure that we have the right
16 amount of landscaped open space on the ground
17 floor of a project.

18 You know, when you look at the list right
19 now, and it goes anywhere probably from about
20 ten percent to twenty-five percent, when you're
21 getting up to twenty-five percent, that's
22 already a pretty significant number, is that
23 complicating design of good projects?

24 You'll note that the twenty-five percent,
25 in part, is in the MF-2 district, which is a

1 that came before us, whether that be
2 preliminary Board of Architects approval
3 perhaps, that that project -- those projects
4 still be subjected to the rules in place when
5 they started being developed and proposed.

6 MS. MENENDEZ: I think that would be more
7 at the Commission level.

8 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Okay.

9 MS. MENENDEZ: I'm not sure that -- I mean,
10 you could probably get like our comments on it,
11 but I think that's more at the Commission
12 level.

13 MR. LEEN: Madam Chair, could I add
14 something to that?

15 MS. MENENDEZ: Of course.

16 MR. LEEN: We have a current policy that --
17 which the Commission has endorsed and adopted,
18 that we look at the final Board of Architects
19 review, the second one, not the preliminary,
20 and that's where, in a sense -- it's not truly
21 vested rights, because the Commission can
22 change it, but that's where the Commission is
23 recognizing your rights to vest, in the sense
24 that we're not going to change the Code at that
25 point as to you. That can change, though.

1 What the Resolution says is that the
2 Commission can pick a different date, if it
3 wishes, and I'm sure that they would love the
4 recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Board
5 as to that.

6 I also had one point I just wanted to make
7 regarding open space. The way that the
8 proposed Ordinance is written, and I know Mayor
9 Valdes-Fauli has raised this point, and also
10 Commissioner Lago, that they want open space to
11 be right on the ground floor. They don't want
12 to step up or step down. And, you know, that's
13 very important for you to know and think about
14 in making your recommendation.

15 I just wanted to make one point, though.
16 There's still the legal aspect to that, which
17 is that -- I've given opinions in the past,
18 that the Board of Architects, for aesthetic
19 purposes, can have some leeway to deviate from
20 that, if they're imposing a condition of
21 approval. Likewise, for the ADA, sometimes
22 things will come up where there may need to be
23 a ramp or some sort of deviation from the norm,
24 in order to address those sorts of concerns,
25 and I just want to be clear that that still

1 exists, all of those sorts of interpretations
2 exist, but the general idea of this proposed
3 Ordinance would be that it would be at ground
4 floor, but there could be -- Staff is going to
5 have a little bit of leeway, the Commission and
6 you will have leeway when you do Conditional
7 Use reviews, when you impose a condition of
8 approval. The Board of Architects will have
9 some leeway, as well.

10 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. Thank you.

11 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: On that point, Craig, I
12 remember also when -- I think it was the Impact
13 Fee Ordinance, which was the last Ordinance
14 approved by the City Commission that had a sort
15 of grandfathering language, aside from final
16 Board of Architects approval, it also included
17 any project that was --

18 MR. LEEN: Subject to a development agreement.

19 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: -- subject to a
20 development agreement approved at a public
21 hearing.

22 MR. LEEN: Yes.

23 MR. BEHAR: But the problem with the final
24 Board of Architects, that could be months down
25 the line and the project would have already

1 commenced the process and it may take four or
2 five months before a project comes for the
3 final Board of Architects.

4 MR. LEEN: True.

5 MR. BEHAR: So that may, you know --

6 MR. LEEN: So there may be a reason to have
7 a different point. It could be the application
8 date, it could be the first Board of
9 Architects, and that could be recommended to
10 the Commission.

11 MR. BEHAR: Because, you know, going
12 through the process in the City is a lengthy
13 process. So not that we want to delay the
14 project, but, you know, we have to consider an
15 alternate date, not final Board of Architects.

16 MR. LEEN: It is within your authority to
17 recommend that.

18 MR. BELLIN: Craig --

19 MR. LEEN: Yes.

20 MR. BELLIN: -- it's always been, as far as
21 I know, preliminary Board of Architects,
22 because that's when you're given the right to
23 start construction documents, once you get the
24 preliminary Board of Architects, and you can't
25 have a guy, you know, waiting to get to the

1 final Board and have this problem, because then
2 you can, you know, throw the plans away.

3 MR. LEEN: But I believe the Commission
4 chose the second Board of Architects, right,
5 the final?

6 MR. TRIAS: I think so. Yes, and that's a
7 policy choice. They could chose one or the
8 other, and if you want to recommend the
9 preliminary, that's perfectly fine, and that's
10 an appropriate role for the Planning and
11 Zoning --

12 MR. BEHAR: But Marshall makes a good
13 point. You know, if we want to see good
14 development happen in Coral Gables, a developer
15 is not going to take the chance and go through
16 the whole -- spend the money in the whole
17 construction document, wait six months for that
18 to happen, and then come back later and say,
19 "Oh, I can't get it approved."

20 MS. MENENDEZ: But what happens in the
21 cases where the preliminary approval of the
22 Board is issued, but then the plans change?
23 I've seen that happen. Then the developer, all
24 of a sudden, decides to change the plans. Are
25 they grandfathered in because of the

1 preliminary date or does it change?
 2 MR. BEHAR: No, if it's a minor change that
 3 is because of, you know, some minor
 4 modification, it should not change. If a
 5 developer comes back with a brand new project,
 6 completely different, well, that's a different
 7 case.
 8 MS. MENENDEZ: Right. But to me,
 9 preliminary just means that it's still
 10 evolving. I mean, I've seen so many
 11 developments come through -- when I used to be
 12 with Coral Gables, so many development comes
 13 through and then they change after the
 14 preliminary and then they come in for another
 15 preliminary, you know.
 16 MR. BELLIN: But that's when the process
 17 starts again. There's a preliminary. You
 18 change the project. You go for another
 19 preliminary.
 20 MS. MENENDEZ: Or they come in for the
 21 first review with some changes. I mean, it's
 22 just -- I think a final is more -- I mean --
 23 MR. LEEN: Well, and the reason we chose
 24 the final was because -- my recollection is,
 25 when you get that final approval, you have

1 eighteen months that that's good for, then, at
 2 that point. So, you know, 1-110 --
 3 MS. MENENDEZ: That makes sense to me.
 4 MR. LEEN: -- of the Zoning Code had a real
 5 time period where that was valid. So it seemed
 6 like if you were going to go to all of the
 7 trouble to get the final BOA approval, that it
 8 would be a hardship, at that point, to then
 9 apply a whole new law to you, where you would
 10 have to change everything that you've done.
 11 Whereas, a preliminary, there seemed to be
 12 more -- I'm just telling you the thinking. You
 13 know, you can disagree with it, certainly, but
 14 the thinking was that there was more leeway
 15 after preliminary BOA. You haven't even gotten
 16 Zoning approval yet. There could be changes to
 17 the Zoning Code or something like that.
 18 And a lot of times, when people go, after
 19 preliminary BOA, to Zoning, they get some
 20 feedback, they change it, they go back to the
 21 BOA. So the thinking was that that was
 22 somewhat premature, but for something like
 23 this, if you think that that's the date it
 24 should be, the opinion that my office gave and
 25 the Resolution passed by the Commission allows

1 for them to pick preliminary BOA as the
 2 grandfathering date. So you can recommend
 3 that.
 4 MR. BEHAR: Well, my opinion, something
 5 like this, it would be more appropriate at
 6 preliminary, because when you have, for
 7 example, a Site Plan that complies with the
 8 requirements today, this would change -- this
 9 will alter that plan completely. So for us to
 10 go through that whole process and get it drawn
 11 all of the way to a hundred percent and submit
 12 it, and then you've got to come back and change
 13 it --
 14 MS. MENENDEZ: But at what point do you
 15 submit after the preliminary approval? What's
 16 the lag time?
 17 MR. BEHAR: Like Marshall said, the
 18 preliminary approval gives you the confidence
 19 to go forward and continue the process, the
 20 drawings for the project. You don't submit --
 21 you know, on a major project, you don't submit
 22 the drawings within the first, you know, ninety
 23 to a hundred twenty days.
 24 MS. MENENDEZ: But when you go to the Board
 25 of Architects after preliminary approval, are

1 you submitting construction documents? Are you
 2 submitting so much detail that, you know, it's
 3 fixed?
 4 MR. BEHAR: No.
 5 MS. MENENDEZ: I mean, I think that you
 6 just submit the aesthetics, the architectural
 7 drawings.
 8 MR. BEHAR: But then you go forward, you
 9 move forward with the construction documents.
 10 MR. TRIAS: Madam Chair.
 11 MR. BEHAR: And you get your final Board of
 12 Architects at the completion of those drawings.
 13 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.
 14 MR. BEHAR: And then, during that time
 15 could lapse, you know, six months, whatever.
 16 And then, if I've got to come back at that
 17 point and say, "Oops, you've got to apply --"
 18 MS. MENENDEZ: Right. I understand. I
 19 understand.
 20 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: If I may, just one more
 21 relevant point on that point exactly. The
 22 Ordinance which Craig and I are remembering,
 23 that had a grandfather provision most recently,
 24 was the Ordinance amending the new impact fees.
 25 When you're creating the new impact fees,

1 you're not affecting design. In other words,
2 when they adopted that Ordinance, your plan was
3 still good. You're going to have to pay more
4 in impact fees now than what you did
5 previously, but your plan is still good.

6 This Ordinance, on the other hand, if
7 adopted --

8 MENENDEZ: Affects it. I understand.
9 Okay.

10 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: -- would potentially
11 render plans useless.

12 MR. BELLIN: I just want to make clear
13 that, you know, we've gone through the process
14 many times, and it's got to be preliminary
15 Board of Architects, because once the
16 preliminary Board of Architects is approved,
17 then that starts the process of construction
18 documents, structural, mechanical, plumbing,
19 electrical and architectural, and you don't go
20 back to the Board of Architects for final until
21 you have got all of the documents in place.

22 So you can't then go for final approval and
23 have them say, "Listen, fellows, you don't have
24 enough landscape." So the effect essentially
25 means you can throw the drawings away.

1 MS. MENENDEZ: I see. Okay. Got it.

2 MR. LEEN: Thank you. Thank you, Madam
3 Chair.

4 MS. MENENDEZ: Good points.
5 Do we have any other comments?

6 Mari, do you -- no?

7 Oh, public speakers. Sorry.

8 MR. PAPER: Good evening. Henry Paper,
9 Alliance Starlight Companies. I know most of
10 you; not the new members. So congratulations.
11 It's a pleasure to meet you.

12 By way of a historical perspective, we
13 own --

14 MR. AIZENSTAT: Sir, would you state your
15 address, for the record?

16 MR. PAPER: 340 Minorca Avenue -- I forgot
17 that -- in Coral Gables.

18 By way of perspective, the Board should
19 know that we either own outright or control the
20 development of about 200,000 square feet of
21 land in the North Gables, North Ponce corridor.
22 We've been there since the early 2000s. We've
23 been involved with the Rezoning and the Overlay
24 efforts for the last three years. We're very,
25 very much aware of the peculiarities of the

1 effort over here.

2 The proposed Landscaping Ordinance that
3 we're discussing tonight, in our view, is not
4 workable. Presently, if we were to develop a
5 piece of property in the MF-2 zone, and we used
6 the existing setback standards, development
7 standards, we would be required to allocate
8 about ten percent green space ground level.
9 However, I want you all to know that we are
10 very much in favor of enhancing green space in
11 North Ponce. We think it's consistent with the
12 overall attitudes in the City, and it's also
13 consistent with the intent of the
14 re-development effort in the North Ponce
15 corridor.

16 But as Ramon said, and I don't always agree
17 with Ramon, but when I do, it's a pleasure, I
18 think you're going to have to tweak the numbers
19 a bit. I don't believe that you can
20 successfully develop a property in the MF-2
21 zone requiring 25 percent green space, whether
22 it is green-green or open green or -- we all
23 know what we're talking about. I don't think
24 you can do that successfully and build a
25 building at 25 percent.

1 I think it's got to be something less than
2 25 percent. Maybe it's a bit more than the
3 current requirement of 10 percent ground floor,
4 and maybe you make up the 25 percent in other
5 areas of the building, maybe you have planters,
6 maybe the amenities areas are addressed, maybe
7 you have green walls. There's a lot of
8 facilities that you can reach in a development
9 world and get to the point that you want to
10 get, but I think all of the comments we had
11 tonight are very well-placed and are very good,
12 and the Board should take them under
13 consideration in addressing this, taking
14 particular care not to throw the baby out with
15 the bath water.

16 We spent a lot of time getting this Infill
17 regulation approved and passed. It was almost
18 unanimously supported from its inception, from
19 the Charrettes we had three summers ago, all of
20 the way through the Planning Board, to the
21 Commission. There was not one -- incidentally,
22 not one negative comment from the community,
23 not one person came out to oppose it. And as I
24 recall, and the Board can correct me, as I
25 recall, there was only one who showed up in all

1 of the hearings, and that was to ask that their
 2 property was included in the Overlay. It was
 3 the lady who was on the north side of Calabria
 4 that came in.
 5 So, once again, I don't want to take too
 6 much time, I would like you to take into
 7 consideration the comments that were made by
 8 Ramon, and by Mario, and the other people who
 9 have been up here tonight, and take special
 10 care on what you do in the ground level,
 11 because as you increase the requirement at
 12 ground level, you're impacting the parking
 13 requirements, impacting the building envelope
 14 requirements and you're really eviscerating the
 15 total intent of what this Infill regulation was
 16 meant to be.
 17 Thank you very much.
 18 MR. AIZENSTAT: Thank you.
 19 MR. PAPER: Oh, one other thing, too.
 20 You might find that there are parcels that
 21 can accommodate more on the ground floor. This
 22 can't be one size fits all, as Jolie mentioned
 23 earlier. It cannot be one size fits all;
 24 however, you might find sites that can
 25 accommodate greater percentages of green space,

1 I'm confident, at the end of the day, you're
 2 going to come out with the right solution.
 3 Thank you very much.
 4 THE SECRETARY: Jorge Navarro.
 5 MR. NAVARRO: Good evening, Board Members.
 6 For the record, Jorge Navarro, office at 333
 7 Southeast 2nd Avenue. I'd like to welcome the
 8 new Board Members. I'm looking forward to
 9 working with all of you.
 10 I think there's been a lot of good comments
 11 echoed tonight. As your Director said, I think
 12 this is an important issue for the City. We're
 13 generally supportive of providing a greater
 14 quantity and a greater improvement to the
 15 ground floor open space, but it's something
 16 that has to be studied and it has to be looked
 17 at carefully, because by adding to the ground
 18 floor open space, you're actually impacting or
 19 you may impact the ability for a particular
 20 property to be able to re-develop and provide
 21 parking and to accomodate the building
 22 footprint.
 23 So I believe that there needs to be some
 24 allowances and some flexibility built into the
 25 Code, in case you have a particular property

1 and, maybe in order to encourage that, you
 2 might want to offer some kind of an incentive
 3 to the developer.
 4 I'll give you two quick examples and then
 5 I'll sit down. We have one site on Santillane
 6 that's 30,000 square feet. There's no way --
 7 it's 211 Santillane. It's just to the west of
 8 Ponce. There is no way we can develop that
 9 property with a 25 percent green space
 10 requirement on the ground floor. No way.
 11 Right now we're at about 11 percent, and that's
 12 maxing what we can do.
 13 But we have another site across the street,
 14 across the Women's Club. It's 912 East Ponce
 15 and 100 Calabria. It's a corner piece. There
 16 we can do much more. Maybe we give you 30 or
 17 40 percent green space. This is just
 18 hypothetically. And for an incentive, maybe
 19 you give me another 20 units an acre incentive
 20 to do that. In those cases, we'd have no
 21 problem giving the City more than 25 percent
 22 ground level.
 23 So, you know, you've got to think it
 24 through carefully, listen to Ramon, listen to
 25 the professionals, follow their guidance, and

1 that cannot meet these requirements.
 2 You know, I think this was also said, and
 3 it may have been by Jolie, but there has to be,
 4 I think, a sliding scale. I mean, it's much
 5 easier for larger properties to be able to
 6 provide additional open space than it is when
 7 you have a 10,000 square foot. By providing 15
 8 percent on a 10,000 square feet lot, you're
 9 automatically taking away 1,500 square feet
 10 from that lot, and it could affect, A, your
 11 parking pedestal or, B, your ability to provide
 12 the necessary parking requirements, and it
 13 could also impact the quality and design of the
 14 building, which is something that, as your
 15 Director said, the Board of Architects really
 16 strives to get the best design possible.
 17 Another comment that was made is that even
 18 though you may not be able to provide all of
 19 the open space at the ground level, there
 20 should be some flexibility to either provide it
 21 by either improving the abutting right-of-way,
 22 or by providing a percentage of that in the
 23 upper levels. I mean, by providing open space
 24 in the upper levels, it improves the quality of
 25 the life of the residents. So it's actually

1 not lost. It's actually given back to the
 2 residents of that project.
 3 In terms of improving the right-of-way, I
 4 know that when the MXD regulations were
 5 originally created, the idea was to promote
 6 paseos and to promote the improvement of the
 7 alleys and the public right-of-ways. So I
 8 think this is like an amenity that could be
 9 promoted as part of the open space, and to
 10 count the paseos, because you want to provide
 11 covered walkways, you want to provide improved
 12 hardscapes, lighting, landscaping elements,
 13 seating elements that could be incorporated,
 14 and this also improves connectivity and access
 15 throughout the area.
 16 The last comment that I'll make is
 17 regarding the vesting language. I think that's
 18 very, very important, as Mr. Bellin said, and I
 19 think Mr. Behar echoed, as well. By the time
 20 you go in for preliminary Board of Architects,
 21 that's the springboard, that from there you
 22 have a set of plans that you're moving forward
 23 through the process. At that point, you're
 24 doing your mechanical, your electrical, your
 25 plumbing and your structural drawings.

1 You don't go to final BOA until you submit
 2 your building permit. By that time, any kind
 3 of change to the ground floor by having to
 4 provide additional open space could change your
 5 entire drawings and it's a significant cost to
 6 the developer. So I think there should be a
 7 recommendation, whether it's preliminary Board
 8 of Architects, or some other point, that allows
 9 the developer to be comfortable and preserves
 10 their rights and allows them to expend, you
 11 know, time and resources in developing the
 12 plans and doesn't hold projects back.
 13 So these are just some recommendations that
 14 I hope you'll consider here this evening.
 15 Thank you very much.
 16 MS. MENENDEZ: Thank you.
 17 THE SECRETARY: No more speakers.
 18 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. Do we have comments?
 19 MR. BELLIN: Yeah. I'll start.
 20 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.
 21 MR. BELLIN: To give you some perspective
 22 as to really what happens when you're looking
 23 for 25 percent on the ground, if you just
 24 conform to the setbacks that are required by
 25 the Code, you provide around 12 percent green

1 area in the MF-2. 25 percent, really makes a
 2 project of 10,000 square feet undoable. You
 3 can't develop it.
 4 The Code now provides for that situation,
 5 and I don't know why we're going to change it.
 6 Certain percentage goes to the ground, then you
 7 can improve the right-of-way, and then you can
 8 use balconies, you can use amenities next to
 9 pick up the extra square footage.
 10 So I think a reasonable number, maybe we
 11 use 12, 13 percent of green on the ground, at
 12 ground level, and then we're able to use the
 13 right-of-way to give us part of the additional
 14 green that we need, and then we can use the
 15 balconies, as well.
 16 And what happens is, the balconies can be
 17 considered as green if we put planters and the
 18 planters are permanently connected to the slab,
 19 bolted to the slab, so they can't just, you
 20 know, after we get the building approved, move
 21 them.
 22 And the Code, as it stands now, makes
 23 provisions for those things. One of the --
 24 what happened was, and I'm not really quite
 25 sure why, but the ability to put green space on

1 amenity decks and balconies was stricken in
 2 this proposal, and I think what we need to do
 3 is make recommendations that that not be taken
 4 out.
 5 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. Any other comments?
 6 MR. BEHAR: I do. I have several. And,
 7 you know, I want to start by saying that I
 8 agree with everything the speakers have said,
 9 you know, with the Director, and even Marshall.
 10 I think that we're not looking at this
 11 correctly. I think that there is an
 12 opportunity to increase the open space, not
 13 green space. To me, I look at it as a
 14 combination, open and green.
 15 To give you an example, if you wanted to do
 16 a plaza, and right now, based on my
 17 understanding, a plaza would not be considered
 18 green space, but yet you could provide an open
 19 area that the public would benefit from it.
 20 The elimination of the elevated areas, I
 21 agree with Marshall, I think it's a mistake,
 22 because what we want to do by requiring some of
 23 the open space at the elevated areas, you're
 24 reducing the massing of the project. Otherwise
 25 you could -- if you eliminate it, I can do a

1 rectangle box and I don't provide any relief.
 2 I think that's a mistake. I think we should
 3 leave the elevated areas.
 4 What I also agree with is that if we
 5 increase the requirement on the ground floor,
 6 where maybe it is 12 percent, in some cases,
 7 you know, it could be a little bit more, but we
 8 should be able to count the public
 9 right-of-way, some of the ground floor, and the
 10 upper areas as part of the total. So we should
 11 not say 25 percent on the ground floor. That's
 12 not the right thing to do.
 13 When I looked at it and when I analyzed it
 14 in different lot sizes, I think in some cases
 15 the setback that is being imposed is the
 16 problem, because where is the most beneficial
 17 to have open space? It's really at the public
 18 right-of-way, at the public realm, at the
 19 street level. If I have in some cases, where,
 20 you know, I might use an MF-2, and I'm abutting
 21 an MF-2, I'm required to do a 15-foot
 22 setback -- and you can correct me if I'm wrong
 23 -- on the sides and on the rear, somewhere in
 24 the front, but where I benefit the most is on
 25 the streetfront, that's where you get the

1 relief, because if you've got two projects
 2 abutting each other, you don't get the benefit
 3 of that relief. You want to do that on the
 4 street facade.
 5 MR. TRIAS: And if you'll recall, in the
 6 North Ponce MF-2, we made that requirement, the
 7 10-foot front requirement for green
 8 specifically for that.
 9 MR. BEHAR: Right, but if you had an option
 10 to say, you know what, on the rear, instead of
 11 fifteen feet, I'll take it to five and I add
 12 those ten feet to the front, the public benefit
 13 will be greater if it's in the front of the
 14 property.
 15 MR. BELLIN: Robert, what happens is, it's
 16 not the building that causes the problem. It's
 17 the parking. The building setback in the rear
 18 and the sides is ten feet, but the parking
 19 setback is only three feet. So if you just
 20 take the perimeter of the three-foot parking
 21 requirement and the front setback, which is
 22 twenty feet, you come up with around twelve
 23 percent.
 24 MR. BEHAR: But, Marshall, if you do a
 25 pedestal building and the parking is not a

1 surface parking, then you run into that
 2 problem. Then you have to set the building
 3 back, because it's not -- that applies if it's
 4 a surface parking lot.
 5 MR. BELLIN: But in the smaller buildings,
 6 that's all you can do.
 7 MR. BEHAR: Right. But don't look at it in
 8 the smaller -- look at it as a big picture for
 9 the whole area.
 10 MR. BELLIN: But that's why it's different
 11 according to the design of the project and the
 12 scope of the project.
 13 MR. BEHAR: Okay. I think there are some
 14 good proposals that we could do. I don't have
 15 a problem increasing a little bit the open
 16 space. I don't want to call it just green
 17 space, because I'll give you an example; the
 18 project on Ponce and Le Jeune Road. There was
 19 a big plaza in the corner.
 20 Well, technically that's not green space.
 21 It's open space. And then you have to -- that
 22 percentage, you have to take into consideration
 23 such space, not just green. And I think that
 24 this is one that the Planning Director has to
 25 go back and do precise numbers, not just throw

1 numbers in the air, because it's going to hurt
 2 a lot of the projects.
 3 MS. MENENDEZ: Well, I think he already
 4 committed to coming back before -- or for our
 5 next meeting.
 6 Let me ask you, what is the definition of
 7 green space?
 8 MR. TRIAS: Well, all of that, and that's
 9 the issue -- the issue is that it's complex.
 10 MS. MENENDEZ: Do we have a definition in
 11 our Zoning Code of green space?
 12 MR. TRIAS: Open space is defined, right,
 13 open space, not green space.
 14 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. I would suggest we
 15 try to define it.
 16 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. But, for example, the
 17 point that Mr. Behar was raising of the plaza,
 18 the plaza counts 75 percent, and we were
 19 thinking maybe count only 50 percent, meaning a
 20 hardscaped paver plaza. Those are the issues
 21 that we need to get a grasp on, because some
 22 people believe that there should be more green,
 23 more lawns and trees, other people believe that
 24 the balance between the building arcade and the
 25 plaza and the green space is more important.

1 So that's the discussion, and my
2 perspective on this, my professional
3 perspective on this, is that I have never had
4 the opportunity to work with such a great City,
5 that has such a great process. I mean, this is
6 the best process I know, in terms of dealing
7 with design, by far. So to somehow assume that
8 things are not going well is wrong. Things are
9 going very well.

10 Now, we can make them better, sure, and I
11 think one of the issues is, the ground level
12 discussion, emphasize ground level. I think
13 that the upper level landscape is good, from a
14 design point of view, like Mr. Behar and Mr.
15 Bellin explained, but I think that the public
16 interest really is to create that pedestrian
17 area at the ground level. That is the most
18 effective way to help the discussion. So
19 that's the issue.

20 And the other issue is, maybe with
21 examples, maybe we can have a discussion and
22 show some examples.

23 MS. MENENDEZ: I think that's a great idea.
24 Yeah.

25 MR. TRIAS: What does this mean, versus --

1 MS. MENENDEZ: Show the existing versus the
2 proposed.

3 MS. VELEZ: That would help.

4 MS. BALIDO-HART: Yeah. The examples would
5 be very beneficial, because, again, the
6 percentages just seem like they've been pulled
7 out of thin air. And I think -- I want to make
8 sure we're clear on something. What is the
9 intent? What is the goal? Is the goal here to
10 increase more open space? Is it to increase
11 more -- to have more green space or a
12 combination thereof?

13 I just really want to make sure we
14 understand the heart behind this.

15 MR. TRIAS: The goal of the sponsor of this
16 area, which is Commissioner Lago, was to
17 increase the green areas. Now, that doesn't
18 have to be the only goal, but that was the goal
19 that he expressed.

20 MR. AIZENSTAT: How did the percentages
21 come about? How did the numbers come about?
22 How did you get those?

23 MR. TRIAS: They are some existing numbers,
24 and we increased them based on the experience
25 of looking at projects. So it's not a very

1 scientific method, but certainly it does have
2 some data.

3 MR. AIZENSTAT: Is there a way to do it on
4 a sliding scale --

5 MS. BALIDO-HART: Right.

6 MR. AIZENSTAT: -- as opposed to a direct
7 percentage that equates to every project across
8 the board?

9 MR. TRIAS: Yes. Yes, that can be done.

10 MS. BALIDO-HART: Right.

11 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. So you're going to --

12 MR. BEHAR: To answer -- one more, to
13 answer your question --

14 MS. BALIDO-HART: Yes.

15 MR. BEHAR: -- I think the intent, both, to
16 have more open space, more relief at the
17 pedestrian level, okay. Not necessarily -- I
18 don't think it goes to having green areas.
19 It's to having more relief so the buildings are
20 set back. They're not as close to --

21 MS. MENENDEZ: Massive. Break up the massing.

22 MR. BEHAR: Yes, breaking up the massing.
23 I think that's the intent of this Ordinance.

24 MS. BALIDO-HART: Right. And I think, at
25 the same time, we all agree that we want to

1 make sure that we don't create problems with
2 projects that are proposed and that we don't
3 unnecessarily create issues, and I think we all
4 recognize that each property is different. So
5 I think we need to give some consideration to
6 the fact that each property is different, and
7 we all share the same spirit, that each
8 property needs to be the best it can be.

9 So I'm just concerned, again, by the
10 rigidity of these proposed percentages and I'm
11 in favor of the sliding scale concept and
12 ranges, perhaps.

13 MR. TRIAS: Very good.

14 MS. MENENDEZ: Julio wants to speak.

15 MR. GRABIEL: A couple of comments. I
16 agree with my fellow architects. An owner,
17 developer, once he goes through the first
18 approval of the Board of Architects, he commits
19 in some cases millions and millions of dollars
20 to get a project through. It would be totally
21 unfair to have an owner spend that kind of
22 money and then, when he comes to the final
23 Board of Architects, say, "Oh, by the way, we
24 can't, you need an additional ten percent."

25 MS. MENENDEZ: So you're advocating the

1 issue of -- at the preliminary, okay.
 2 MR. GRABIEL: Preliminary. Yeah, that's
 3 one.
 4 Two, we've been fighting very much to try
 5 to get affordable housing in the City, and
 6 specifically on North Ponce. I would hate to
 7 think that some of these requirements would be
 8 impacting the possibility of developers to do
 9 that.
 10 MR. BEHAR: Absolutely.
 11 MR. GRABIEL: And I don't know the
 12 specifics. I've never developed a project
 13 there. I don't know how we would do it, but I
 14 think I would like the Staff and the City to
 15 take a look at that and see, by increasing the
 16 percentage of green, how does that impact the
 17 opportunity for development, and is it going to
 18 make it such an affordable project, that then
 19 we lose the baby with the bath water, okay.
 20 And Number Three, we have not talked about
 21 it in this body, but how about the idea of
 22 green roofs. Coral Gables has not pushed for
 23 green roofs, but it is something that if you
 24 see, all over the country, it is being adopted
 25 by major cities and minor cities, and I don't

1 know if going to green roofs as a benefit to
 2 the developer by increasing maybe the ability
 3 of them to build additional units or whatever,
 4 is something we can look at, which in addition
 5 to that we can tie it into the open green
 6 space, and I don't know -- we've never talked
 7 about it. I don't even know if you've looked
 8 at it, but I think that's something, as this
 9 body, we should be looking at.
 10 MR. TRIAS: And I think that that's a
 11 separate issue, to some extent, in the sense
 12 that the critical issue right now is the ground
 13 level pedestrian areas. There's a belief,
 14 which I agree with, that they can be better.
 15 If we find a way to do that, I think we've done
 16 something very, very valuable.
 17 In addition, we can look at the
 18 environmental benefits of green roofs and so on
 19 as an additional aspect of the discussion, but
 20 I do think, though, that there's a need to
 21 focus on the ground level areas in the front
 22 and in the areas that shape the City. I mean,
 23 that really matters.
 24 MR. BEHAR: I agree with Mr. Grabiell's
 25 second point. We don't want to create a

1 hardship, where we're going to deter potential
 2 good projects from developers coming to the
 3 North Ponce corridor area. So we've got to
 4 carefully look into those numbers.
 5 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 6 MR. BELLIN: Ramon, I think we need a
 7 starting point, and the Code is very specific
 8 about what the setbacks are. And because of
 9 those setbacks, what the Code specifies, we
 10 know what the green space is going to be to
 11 start, and that's about twelve percent.
 12 Now, if we want to get to 25 percent, I
 13 think you let the developer get to the other 13
 14 percent, whatever it is, any way that he can.
 15 If he's got green space in the right-of-way,
 16 and he can use that towards what he's lacking,
 17 that's fine. Some lots don't, some do.
 18 And then you can use the elevated, the
 19 balconies, and the roof decks.
 20 MR. TRIAS: Well, that's the way that I
 21 interpret the sliding scale that Ms.
 22 Balido-Hart proposed. Some requirement at the
 23 ground level and then some others optional
 24 areas --
 25 MR. BELLIN: But the Code gives us that

1 now. I don't know why we're changing it. It
 2 gives us that option.
 3 MR. TRIAS: As I said, I think we have one
 4 of the best Codes and certainly the best
 5 process anywhere. I don't think anybody should
 6 think that that is not true.
 7 Now, the only thing that is not clear, I
 8 think, is the ground level requirements or the
 9 thing that could be better. I do agree with
 10 that statement.
 11 Now, for me, a sliding scale would be,
 12 okay, something is required at the ground
 13 level, and then it's optional whether you do it
 14 at the ground level or somewhere else, that
 15 additional green space. For example, that
 16 would be one option. We can propose that to
 17 you next time, among other options, and see
 18 where that goes.
 19 MS. BALIDO-HART: Among ranges, as well,
 20 and, as I said, some visual illustrations would
 21 be helpful.
 22 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yeah, that would be great.
 23 MR. BEHAR: Marshall, I have a question for
 24 you. Do you, on projects -- and just a
 25 hypothetical project -- that you do have a

1 parking pedestal, because some projects will
 2 require you to do that, the setback required is
 3 greater than three feet, right?
 4 MR. BELLIN: If you have above ground
 5 parking. If you have a parking garage, yes.
 6 MR. BEHAR: Yes. Let's say that, because
 7 in this area I think the Code has allowed up to
 8 a hundred units per acre, if I'm not mistaken.
 9 MR. TRIAS: That's the latest change.
 10 MR. BELLIN: It's the Infill.
 11 MR. BEHAR: Okay. So if we do that, I
 12 would venture to say that a hundred percent of
 13 those projects will require an above ground
 14 parking structure. At that point, you have to
 15 do a garage, so your setback is going to be
 16 greater than three feet. Correct? Right?
 17 MR. BELLIN: But that's --
 18 MR. BEHAR: We agree to that. Let's
 19 just --
 20 MR. BELLIN: If it's a parking garage, the
 21 setback is the same as the building.
 22 MR. BEHAR: Okay.
 23 MR. BELLIN: Okay.
 24 MR. BEHAR: Thank you. That's the point.
 25 If the intent here is to create, in my

1 opinion, based on conversation I had with
 2 Mr. Trias and with the Commissioner, is to
 3 create a more open area that the public will
 4 benefit from, so I think that a reduction of
 5 some setback, if -- to give you an example,
 6 again, like I said before, if I reduce the rear
 7 setback by five feet, I should be able to put
 8 those five feet in the front to create more of
 9 an open space at the street level, and that's
 10 what we need to look at, I think, also,
 11 reducing -- be able to modify the setback and
 12 not say that -- you know, because, whether my
 13 colleagues agree or not, every building that
 14 has a hundred units per acre will have a
 15 parking pedestal, which is the same setback as
 16 the building.
 17 My opinion is, we should look at those
 18 buildings, because if I have those two projects
 19 abutting -- you know, back to back, I should be
 20 able to get them closer, so I could get the
 21 benefit at the street level.
 22 MS. BALIDO-HART: What's the down side to
 23 doing that?
 24 MR. BEHAR: Right now we're not allowed to
 25 do that. You're not allowed to do that. What

1 I'm proposing is that we look for an option to
 2 be able to do that, because, at the end of the
 3 day, you're going to get the benefit at the
 4 street level.
 5 MS. BALIDO-HART: What's the down side to
 6 that?
 7 MR. TRIAS: No, there's no down side. And
 8 that's allowed if you're doing a Mixed-Use
 9 building and get Mediterranean Bonus, et
 10 cetera, you do have some flexibility with
 11 setbacks already in some other aspect of the
 12 Code.
 13 MR. BEHAR: In some other aspect.
 14 MR. TRIAS: What Mr. Behar is speaking of
 15 is MF-2, a straight MF-2 project, right?
 16 MR. BEHAR: Correct.
 17 MR. TRIAS: Which doesn't have all of the
 18 benefits that some of the other projects have.
 19 MS. BALIDO-HART: Right.
 20 MR. TRIAS: So we could propose applying
 21 those same benefits perhaps to MF-2.
 22 MR. BELLIN: Robert, in an MF-2, you can go
 23 to within eight feet of the front property line
 24 for the first two stories. So you're
 25 eliminating a lot of green area.

1 MR. BEHAR: See, I don't think that's a
 2 good thing to do. I rather push a building
 3 back and get more green in the front.
 4 MR. BELLIN: Go and look at projects that
 5 have been built that way, designed that way,
 6 and I think you'll find that having -- you
 7 know, townhouse projects are perfect examples,
 8 but we've done a number of them. Go and look
 9 at them and then tell me if you think that it's
 10 reasonable or not, where you bring the living
 11 units as a buffer to the parking, and --
 12 MR. BEHAR: Okay.
 13 MS. BALIDO-HART: I mean, again, I can't
 14 visualize this without an illustration.
 15 MR. BEHAR: I think you got the message.
 16 MS. MENENDEZ: I think he's got the
 17 message, he's going to come back and the only
 18 thing I wanted to point out --
 19 MR. TRIAS: My instructions are clear.
 20 MS. MENENDEZ: -- Ramon, is, in your memo,
 21 in the last paragraph, that has nothing to do
 22 with the topic, so make sure we don't include
 23 that next time. You saw that one, too?
 24 MR. TRIAS: As you know, all of my staff
 25 has resigned, and I have a new staff person

1 right here. We have Jennifer. So she's the
 2 full department right now in terms of Planning.
 3 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. Welcome, Jennifer.
 4 MR. GRABIEL: That's your department?
 5 MS. MENENDEZ: Staff resigning might be an
 6 indication of something, Ramon. You have to be
 7 careful.
 8 MR. TRIAS: No. No. It has to do with,
 9 they have better options elsewhere. So that's
 10 what happens.
 11 MS. MENENDEZ: I doubt that. I doubt that.
 12 MR. TRIAS: But, anyway, what has happened
 13 is that this is very complicated and we're
 14 trying to get it through the process. We're at
 15 the very beginning of the process. My advice
 16 is that it's not ready. That's what I would
 17 say. And hopefully we can look at it again in
 18 August.
 19 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.
 20 MR. GRABIEL: Thank you, Ramon.
 21 MS. MENENDEZ: Let's go to the last item.
 22 MR. TRIAS: Thank you.
 23 The last item is to be presented by Public
 24 Works, Jessica Keller is here, and she has a
 25 PowerPoint, I think.

1 MS. KELLER: I'm waiting for my PowerPoint.
 2 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. Ready?
 3 MS. KELLER: I'm waiting for my PowerPoint.
 4 We can go. This is very straight-forward.
 5 Most of the elements -- my name is Jessica
 6 Keller. I'm the Assistant Public Works
 7 Director.
 8 MS. MENENDEZ: Can you read the item for
 9 the record, please, Item 9 -- do you have that
 10 with you -- on the agenda? It's Sustainability
 11 Complete Streets Policy.
 12 MS. KELLER: I don't have the agenda in
 13 front of me. I have the actual --
 14 MS. MENENDEZ: This is a Resolution of the
 15 City Commission of Coral Gables, Florida
 16 providing for a Sustainable Complete Streets
 17 Policy and directing Staff to develop
 18 implementation strategies to increase the
 19 livability of all streets, implementation
 20 strategies to increase the liability -- oh,
 21 this is duplicated here -- of all streets for
 22 all modes of travel for residents -- or for
 23 citizens of all ages and abilities in Coral
 24 Gables.
 25 I'm sorry, can you state your name again,

1 for the record?
 2 MS. KELLER: That's okay. I'm Jessica
 3 Keller. I'm the Assistant Public Works
 4 Director. I oversee transportation
 5 sustainability. As I mentioned, these are
 6 pretty straight-forward. Most of the items
 7 that are identified in the policy are captured
 8 in the Comprehensive Plan, but we want to take
 9 this a step further, particularly in light of
 10 the fact that in 2016 Smart Growth America
 11 released its annual report, that once again put
 12 our state in the top spot as the most dangerous
 13 state for pedestrians, and placed our region as
 14 the eleventh most dangerous in the country.
 15 Over 1,000 jurisdictions in the U.S. have
 16 made formal commitments to streets that are
 17 safe and convenient for everyone, no matter
 18 their age, income, race, ethnicity, physical
 19 ability or how they choose to travel, by
 20 passing Complete Streets Policy.
 21 As part of our multi-modal transportation
 22 planning process, we've developed the City's
 23 Sustainable Complete Streets Policy, and our
 24 goal is that our policy receive national
 25 recognition as one of the strongest and most

1 comprehensive that truly reflects who we are as
 2 a community.
 3 What makes this particular policy stand out
 4 is this commitment to sustainability and
 5 resiliency, Historic Preservation, storm modern
 6 management practices, accessibility and
 7 attention to aesthetics.
 8 MR. BELLIN: Maria, before he goes, don't
 9 we have to make a motion with respect to the
 10 last item?
 11 MS. MENENDEZ: No, I think - he's coming
 12 back. I'm sorry.
 13 MS. KELLER: That's okay.
 14 MR. BELLIN: I know, but don't we have to
 15 make a motion for him to bring it back or --
 16 MS. MENENDEZ: I don't think so. Do we
 17 have to make a motion to bring the previous
 18 item? I think we gave directions to Staff to
 19 come back in the future, but I don't think that
 20 requires a motion of our Board Members.
 21 MR. TRIAS: No, it doesn't. We'll schedule
 22 it for our next meeting.
 23 MS. MENENDEZ: Right. That's what I thought.
 24 MR. BELLIN: Okay.
 25 MS. KELLER: All that we're doing is, we're