

Page 1 CITY OF CORAL GABLES LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY (LPA)/ PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT CORAL GABLES CITY HALL 405 BILTMORE WAY, COMMISSION CHAMBERS CORAL GABLES, FLORIDA WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 2018, COMMENCING AT 6:02 P.M. Board Members Present: Eibi Aizenstat, Chairperson Rhonda A. Anderson Maria Velez Robert Behar City Staff and Consultants: Ramon Trias, Planning Director Miriam Ramos, City Attorney Jennifer Garcia, City Planner Arceli Redila, Principal Planner Jill Menendez, Administrative Assistant, Board Secretary ALSO PARTICIPATING: Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk, DPZ CoDesign	Page 2 1 THEREUPON: 2 (The following proceedings were held.) 3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Good evening to all of 4 the members in the audience tonight. I'd like 5 to welcome everybody. 6 This is just a presentation, so I'm going 7 to dispense with the usual reading. At this 8 time, I'd like to call the meeting to order. 9 The time is 6:02. 10 Jill, if you could do a roll call, please. 11 THE SECRETARY: Rhonda Anderson? 12 MS. ANDERSON: Present. 13 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar? 14 MR. BEHAR: Here. 15 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell? 16 Maria Menendez? 17 Maria Velez? 18 MS. VELEZ: Here. 19 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat? 20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Here. 21 Let's go ahead and take a look at the 22 minutes for approval. 23 MS. VELEZ: I'll move. 24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So moved. 25 MR. BEHAR: Second.
Page 3 1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Second. 2 Any discussion? 3 MS. ANDERSON: No. 4 MS. VELEZ: No. 5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: No? Call the roll, 6 please. 7 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar? 8 MR. BEHAR: Yes. 9 THE SECRETARY: Maria Velez? 10 MS. VELEZ: Yes. 11 THE SECRETARY: Rhonda Anderson? 12 MS. ANDERSON: Yes. 13 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat? 14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I would like to 15 abstain because I was not here for that 16 meeting. My question is, what happens? 17 Yes, I'm fine with it. 18 MS. GARCIA: They need five more minutes. 19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. 20 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, we have one item 21 today only and that item is a presentation from 22 the consultant to discuss the Zoning Code 23 process. So as soon as Liz is ready -- and my 24 goal for this meeting is for Liz to be able to 25 explain what has taken place so far and lay out	Page 4 1 the future steps and get your input in how much 2 involvement the Board wants to have and when, 3 and get some of idea of the time. 4 So, Liz, whenever you're ready. 5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you. 6 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: Good evening. 7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Welcome. 8 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: Thank you. 9 So I've just been told that the slide 10 advancer is missing, so my counterpart in the 11 machine room will be assuming that. She knows 12 when to push the next slide. 13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. Can I ask you, 14 just before we start, just for the record -- 15 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: Yes. 16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: -- please state your 17 name and address. 18 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: Elizabeth 19 Plater-Zyberk, representing DPZ CoDesign. 20 There are usually three of us who show -- three 21 or four of us who show up at the meetings with 22 the City Staff, so there's a larger team that's 23 working with this. And Judith Bell is with me 24 tonight working the computer. 25 So what we're intending to do this evening

Page 5 1 may be a little bit redundant for some of you. 2 It's an update of the work that's been done on 3 this project, the updating of the Zoning Code, 4 which has been through a series of meetings 5 already with Staff and a Staff Committee and a 6 Steering Committee. 7 So I think they can hear me. 8 MS. GARCIA: He's working on it. Give him 9 a few minutes. 10 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: At any rate, I will 11 continue to give you some general ideas about 12 where we've been and, I think, where -- we're 13 looking forward to hearing from this Board 14 about our next steps. 15 So this is coming to the end of the 16 assessment and analysis phase of the project, 17 which then has a phase of proposing changes, 18 and then a phase of implementation. This is 19 all on the slides, and when we get to that 20 part, I'll skip through it quickly, but, 21 essentially, we understood that there are two 22 components. 23 So this is just the title slide, telling 24 you where we are and what we're doing. 25 Let's see here. Okay. So here I am	Page 6 1 explaining the schedule to you. We're coming 2 to the end of the first phase, which was 3 analyzing the document and getting as much 4 input as possible on how it could be better. 5 Next. 6 This is where we've been. Reading from the 7 bottom up, we started in the Spring, and you 8 can see we've had a series of Steering and 9 Staff Committee meetings, which bring us to 10 this Board meeting. We had a Board Workshop 11 earlier in September. 12 Next. 13 So the preliminary assessment -- you know, 14 I'm used to having a computer here in front of 15 me to read this, but essentially what we heard 16 from those Committees and others were that 17 the -- thank you. You're moving the screen for 18 me. 19 MR. BEHAR: Can you get the screen to work 20 for her? 21 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, it's not working -- 22 MR. BEHAR: It would be much easier. 23 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: I'll keep going. 24 That the organization of the Code presents 25 some problems, that it could be easier --
Page 7 1 people wish it could be easier to use. A 2 number of -- so that's really about the 3 structure of the Code -- and then a number of 4 content issues, included some of the Site 5 Specific regulations, a couple of the 6 categories, MF2, MFSA, Mixed-Use categories, 7 the interaction of density, height and FAR 8 needed clarification. In some cases, they 9 seemed contradictory. 10 Thank you for moving that around. 11 There's been a lot of discussion about 12 possibly reducing -- parking reductions and 13 considering relief for small site 14 development -- thank you -- that means sites 15 below 20,000 square feet. So this is a series 16 of repeating themes that keeps coming up in 17 meetings. 18 Next slide, please. 19 So we began by, of course, looking at the 20 Code very thoroughly and we thought that the 21 first thing that needed to be cleared, we would 22 take the first part of that list, to clarify 23 the structure. I should point out, however, 24 that in that first list, we didn't see 25 single-family residence, because that's been	Page 8 1 worked on, in various ways, including a 2 committee which addressed changes to the 3 single-family home part of the Code, and so at 4 this point, we haven't addressed it. It hasn't 5 been part of the discussions, in large part. 6 So what we have in front of you here is a 7 list of proposed changes to the Table of 8 Contents, essentially, the structure of the 9 document. And where it is now, with eight 10 articles, we're suggesting sixteen, by pulling 11 certain things out of the existing eight to be 12 standalone articles, and I will go into this a 13 little bit more, so you can understand what 14 some of those moves are, but you'll see 15 Historic Preservation, Art in Public Places, 16 Parking, Signs, the things that are typically 17 separate chapters in Zoning Codes, and largely 18 now are all lumped into Article 5, under 19 Development Standards, we're suggesting should 20 have their own place. 21 If you look at the appendices, we also 22 found that things like the University Campus 23 District, which is a document that describes 24 the campus, was embedded somewhere else in the 25 Code, and, really, it's a separate item. It

Page 9 1 can be a standalone. It's a large Site 2 Specific, in other words. 3 At any point, if you have any questions, 4 please stop me. 5 Next. 6 So just to go into it a little bit more, 7 the general provisions will remain largely 8 intact, or, let's say, largely together. The 9 decision-making and administrative processes, 10 administrative bodies will become part of a 11 process chapter that describes the processes of 12 approvals. Development Review, likewise, 13 although it's a separate article now, would 14 become part of the process, and then other 15 things that are in Development Review would 16 have their own articles. 17 Notices, which have become more critical or 18 more intense and -- a more intense kind of 19 activity for the City, will have its own place, 20 Historic Preservation, Art in Public Places. 21 Next. 22 The Zoning Districts, of course, will be 23 focused on in the Zoning Districts article, 24 largely, and that's where some of the critical 25 content is, that you saw in the first list,	Page 10 1 might require some changes. So we haven't 2 addressed the content of this yet, but we know 3 that it's likely to be remaining together. 4 And, then, here you can see where two of 5 the items that were in Article 4 are going to 6 the appendix. 7 Let's keep going. 8 Article 5, which is currently the kind of 9 catch-all article that has many, many things, 10 many divisions in it, you can see our 11 suggestions about dividing this into a number 12 of different places; Uses might cover some of 13 the accessory uses, essentially, the Use based 14 issues; Awnings and Canopies, going back and 15 forth, that could be part of the Architecture 16 Chapter. Once we've delved into the text of 17 the Code, some of these things would become 18 more obvious. 19 Let's see if there's anything in particular 20 here. Landscape might have its own article, 21 and, of course, Parking would have its own 22 article. So it would be very obvious where to 23 go to look for things. This is about making it 24 easier to use. 25 Next.
Page 11 1 Continuing, these are the other parts of 2 the Division. You can see it keeps going, 3 Division 15, 16 and so on, and each one of 4 these is being separated out into that part of 5 the Code that deals with Uses, into that part 6 of the Code that deals with form, and so on. 7 Next. 8 Nonconformities, now to be called Lawfully 9 Existing, and we're pointing out that this is 10 Uses, Lots, Structures and Signs, because all 11 four of those can be outside of existing 12 regulations. The violations would go into 13 process, and definitions would be definitions. 14 Next. 15 So this is just to show the complexity of 16 it, but also to show that we can track the 17 moves, so that we don't leave anything behind 18 and it doesn't get lost. 19 Next. 20 And so, for instance, here's one that we've 21 taken a run at, in terms of re-organizing. The 22 Zoning District, formally Article 4, would have 23 the specific form limits or descriptions 24 under -- in this sequence of categories, the 25 residential, the single-family, which we're	Page 12 1 saying would remain largely the same, the 2 multi-families, which we're being asked to look 3 at a little bit more thoroughly, in terms of 4 content, and the Overlay Districts and then the 5 non-residential districts, and this is where 6 the discussion about Mixed-Use comes in, the 7 multiple overlays. When you see some of the 8 maps that we've made, you'll understand why 9 we're talking about content in those terms. 10 Next. 11 So now, speaking to that, you will see that 12 there are a number of often conflicting 13 overlaying regulations that are part of the 14 confusion. So it's not just the structure of 15 the Code and it's hard to find things, but 16 there are things that actually are 17 contradictory. 18 Next. 19 And we went through each area of the City 20 that has uses other than single-family 21 residential, and we did these plans, with the 22 help of the Staff. They were -- these didn't 23 really exist in this way, before we did them, 24 but what you see is the current Zoning Map on 25 the left, the Future Land Use Map, which is

Page 13 1 related to the Comprehensive Plan to the right 2 of that. 3 Beyond that, the Mixed-Use, another 4 category called the Mixed-Use -- this is 5 Downtown, the KLN Craft section, the Mixed-Use 6 district, which is really mostly into North 7 Ponce, but it comes into Downtown a little bit, 8 the Downtown District, which is really Miracle 9 Mile, the Site Specific regulations, which are 10 essentially a height regulation, and then the 11 Conservation Overlay District, which also comes 12 down into this area a little bit. There's no 13 line that says everything is one thing to the 14 outside of the line, and they also overlap the 15 boundaries. So that adds to the confusion. 16 And what you see at the end is a blank map 17 for proposal, because our suggestion is that, 18 if you want to, you could address these 19 contradictions -- it may be not be easy -- and 20 come up with, instead of a series of overlays, 21 maybe a couple or several Zoning Districts that 22 actually have lines between them, so you can 23 tell which one your property would be regulated 24 by. 25 Next.	Page 14 1 The Douglas Section, similarly, has the 2 same panoply of Zoning, Future Land Use, 3 Overlays, such as you see, Site Specifics. 4 Next. 5 The Flagler Section has very little 6 contradictions or multiplicity, because it's 7 mostly single-family. 8 Next. 9 The area to the north -- we focused on 10 anything that had commercial or other than 11 residential uses. The boundary of the City, 12 along Eighth Street, essentially has one kind 13 of Zoning, and one could discuss changes in 14 that, but it's not as complex as the others. 15 Next. 16 The Biltmore Section, which is small but 17 pretty complicated, because there's a lot of 18 history here and has similar overlays of 19 contradiction. 20 Next. 21 The industrial section, the Merrick Park 22 area, which likewise has a series of overlays. 23 Next. 24 The Riviera Section, which is really just 25 the frontage of Dixie Highway.
Page 15 1 Next. 2 And then the area that extends down into 3 the boundary with South Miami. 4 So Ramon Trias has shown us one property in 5 this area, for instance, that has two or three 6 different Zoning categories within the 7 property, that's been aggregated, plus Overlays 8 and Site Specifics, which makes the 9 interpretation of it next to impossible. 10 Next. 11 So I think one of the -- well, at the end, 12 I'll have a series of questions for you. So 13 that's one thing, is there a mandate or a 14 request or a desire to try to straighten some 15 of those Overlays and contradictions out? 16 Then, of course, we've heard a lot about 17 the Mediterranean bonus and we thought it might 18 be useful to clarify that. That deals with 19 three kinds of density, low, medium and high; 20 height, density and FAR, and then several 21 levels of application of the bonuses. 22 Next. 23 There's, first, a pre-requisite -- I'm sure 24 you all know this, but perhaps others watching 25 do not -- in which a number of	Page 16 1 pre-requisites -- there are fourteen listed 2 here -- are required to even be considered for 3 the benefit of the Mediterranean Style Design 4 Standards, no blank walls, architectural 5 elements at the top of the buildings, minimum 6 landscaped open area requirements, providing 7 street lighting and so on. These are the kinds 8 of very basic urban quality aspects. 9 Next. 10 The Level Two qualifications, which achieve 11 an additional floor in Multi-Family and 12 Commercial, and a point to FAR bonus, would 13 require the application of a number of these 14 architectural elements, arcades or loggias, 15 building stepbacks, lighting of the landscape, 16 paver treatments and so on. Again, I'm not 17 reading them all, but there's a dozen of them. 18 For residential uses in Multi-Family, six 19 of these twelve items must be present. In 20 Non-Residential Uses, the Commercial and 21 Industrial Districts, eight must be present, 22 and also for Mixed-Use, for the MXD. 23 Next. 24 Level 2 qualifications, which in low to 25 medium density allow one floor additional and a

Page 17 1 .3 FAR bonus in high density, two floors are 2 allowed and a .3 FAR bonus, and, in this case, 3 the inclusion of design elements and 4 architectural styles from the following, 5 referring to the historical buildings, the 6 eight historical buildings of the City are 7 required. 8 Next. 9 So with this kind of kit of parts -- of 10 regulating parts, we asked the City if there 11 was information on recently built buildings, to 12 understand what general patterns may be 13 emerging from something that seems very complex 14 and maybe sometimes chaotic, and so we took a 15 look at these case studies, again, with the 16 City's assistance, because they have very good 17 records. 18 Next. 19 And so I'll just go through them very 20 quickly. Some of them are built and some are 21 not. The Mediterranean Village, of course, not 22 yet, and has an FAR of 3.59 and a building 23 height of 200. This is probably -- this is not 24 the most extreme. 25 Next.	Page 18 1 I would say, not extreme, but the most 2 dense. 3 And in each case, we took a look, also, at 4 what are some of the regulatory documents that 5 may have produced them, and so you know, if 6 you've seen this project, that it has a kind of 7 form based Code or design guideline of its own. 8 Next. 9 Gables Gateway, on the north side of Ponce, 10 at Le Jeune, has an FAR of 2.9 and a building 11 height of 100 feet, 10 stories. 12 Next. 13 MR. TRIAS: That was designed by one of our 14 members. 15 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: Yes. He knows it well. 16 Next. 17 This is the view from Le Jeune Road 18 coming -- looking south. 19 Next. 20 Across the railroad -- across Ponce and the 21 railroad, the property currently rising very 22 quickly, FAR of 3.48, height of 180 feet or 14 23 stories. 24 Next. 25 Some of the illustrations for the project
Page 19 1 and the drawings used in the approvals. 2 Next. 3 2020 Salzedo, which is considered part of 4 the Downtown area, has a 4.375 FAR, with TDRs, 5 Transfer of Development Rights, 180 feet. 6 Next. 7 This is the building seen from two angles. 8 Next. 9 Some of the elements illustrated from the 10 historic buildings that were used in the 11 approvals for this building. 12 Next. 13 The Palace at Andalucia, 3.5 FAR, 101 feet 14 in height. 15 Next. 16 Interestingly enough, it's in the exact 17 center of the slide. The parking garage is on 18 the south side of the street, and the building 19 on the north side has an entirely inhabited 20 program. 21 Next. 22 Here you can see them looking east, parking 23 to the right, building on the left. 24 Next. 25 And as you could see, that was The Palace.	Page 20 1 Some of the drawings used in its approvals. 2 Next. 3 And then two side by side that are 4 interesting, because they have different uses. 5 We didn't have all of the information about 6 these, 1300 and 1200 Ponce, one an office 7 building and one a residential building. 8 Next. 9 And here you see them side by side, the 10 residential building on the left -- the 11 balconies give it away -- and the office 12 building on the right. And what you see is one 13 of the step backs that are part of the Code; in 14 the case on the left, above the first floor, in 15 the case on the right, above the fourth floor. 16 Next. 17 They stepped down to the residential, to 18 the North Ponce area behind them, with varying 19 degrees of success. 20 Next. 21 And I think this is the last one. The 22 Aloft, which -- next -- is seven stories. This 23 is the view from Le Jeune Road. It has the 24 arcade and a number of other requirements. 25 Next.

Page 21 1 This is the side street view. 2 Next. 3 And then the final thing that I have to 4 show you is the most recent analysis we did. 5 We were asked to look at the open space 6 requirements. 7 Next. 8 And so this is new since the Workshop of 9 the Planning Board earlier -- several weeks 10 ago. So these are the different Zonings, and 11 the way -- and the open space requirement, as 12 it is distributed currently through the 13 Zoning -- through the Zoning requirements, and, 14 essentially, there's a lot of different details 15 here, but it usually gets -- it's done through 16 the setbacks and through the edges of the 17 property. 18 So, in some ways, it could be considered an 19 inadequate attention to open space. I don't 20 know if that's where the concern is coming 21 from, but it's clear, if you just -- if you 22 scrutinize this diagram, that it's different 23 per Zoning District or location or something 24 else that gets written into a specific type, 25 and that it's not uniform relative to its urban	Page 22 1 location. So from one building to the next, 2 the way the frontage of the building meets the 3 street, in terms of arcade, landscape, whether 4 there can be trees or not, varies. 5 So one of the first things one considers in 6 urban design and place-making and trying to 7 bring some kind of identity or character to a 8 place is that you try to make the public 9 spaces, in particular the streets, have some 10 kind of uniform envelope, which isn't 11 necessarily a style issue as much as how the 12 building meets the street and what the 13 landscape might be doing. 14 So I think these could be scrutinized more 15 closely, looking at the document, but I'm going 16 to show you some examples and what these speak 17 to. 18 Next. 19 So this is probably a five-foot setback, 20 which has that piece of hedge in it, between 21 the City's sidewalk -- in other words, the 22 right-of-way ends at the end of the sidewalk. 23 That little curb for the planter is probably in 24 the private property. And then there's a small 25 amount of planting, which is brought into some
Page 23 1 question when it's put under an awning. You 2 know, yes, you can have sprinklers and here 3 there's plenty of sun, so we're not worried 4 about that, but there's a kind of contradiction 5 in terms here. 6 Next. 7 Similarly, in this case -- I'm not calling 8 out where these are. I don't know. We picked 9 some random examples -- again, some of the 10 green is between the building base, the black 11 base, and the sidewalk, and some of it is 12 running under the building. It's actually 13 under the arcade -- 14 MS. ANDERSON: It's on Le Jeune Road. 15 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: This is on Le Jeune 16 Road -- which seems, also, a little bit odd. 17 And then there's only a little bit of space, so 18 the palms are beginning to lean out, especially 19 since the awning is impinging on them. 20 Next. 21 This one might be considered a little bit 22 better, because there's an arcade without 23 plants in it, and there's space in the sidewalk 24 to put the palms as a kind of street tree, but, 25 on the other hand, we know that the retail has	Page 24 1 a problem with being that far from the street, 2 deep in the arcade, and without being out at 3 the street level -- without being close to the 4 street. 5 And something that's a little bit harder to 6 see, at the bottom, is the floor level 7 remaining constant while the sidewalk is 8 dipping down a little bit, because we do have 9 some topography in our City, and how that's 10 handled architecturally. It seems like an 11 afterthought. 12 Next. 13 Here's more of the kind of awning and 14 planting under the building intersection. What 15 you do see, in this case, is that sizeable 16 trees are possible if you use the parking lane 17 for planters. So it's an irregular 18 streetscape, because you're not using the whole 19 length of it. 20 Next. 21 And, you know, one might say that the trees 22 and the arcade are somewhat redundant. In this 23 case, putting the landscaped piece right in 24 front of the building doesn't seem to make 25 sense. If you're going to walk out, you should

Page 25	Page 26
1 be able to walk out. 2 Next. 3 The long length of landscape on the right, 4 which doesn't allow the pedestrian to cross. 5 It looks like a barrier. And, of course, it's 6 different from one street side to the other. 7 Next. 8 Again, the trees getting space with the 9 parking lane, but, in this case, it looks like 10 the sidewalk outside of the building envelope 11 was wide enough for planning trees, so maybe 12 you could have done that in a straight line and 13 not have to have used the parking up for the 14 tree. 15 MR. BEHAR: That goes back, where the Code 16 requires that you do the bump-outs. 17 MR. TRIAS: Right. Right. 18 MS. ANDERSON: Pedestrian space -- 19 MR. TRIAS: I believe that you were the 20 architect on this one, too, right? 21 MR. BEHAR: I don't know, but -- 22 MR. TRIAS: But that is a requirement of 23 the Code. So those are the contradictions or 24 -- yeah -- 25 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: I'm just pointing out,	1 without saying that any -- that there are 2 issues here that are worthy of some discussion. 3 MR. TRIAS: I think this is the better 4 image of the ones I've seen. If somebody were 5 to show me all of those pictures about Coral 6 Gables, I would say, "Oh, my God, what a 7 terrible place," in terms of design. So we 8 need to -- I mean, I think that's the point 9 that Liz is trying to make. I mean, a lot of 10 the things that we have in the Code right now 11 are really not encouraging quality. It's just 12 a checklist, basically. 13 MR. BEHAR: You're right, and that's 14 something we need to look at, because in 15 addition to that, that you have to do that, the 16 development has to pay for the loss of the 17 parking space -- 18 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: Right. 19 MR. BEHAR: -- which makes absolutely no 20 sense, you know. Yes, you're right, this is 21 one that I did, and we -- you mentioned about 22 the sidewalk being even with the arcade, which, 23 in this case, it does -- 24 MR. TRIAS: Yes. Yes. 25 MR. BEHAR: -- because, you know, you're
Page 27	Page 28
1 not going to put a landscaped area that becomes 2 unusable. 3 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: Right. Yeah. 4 MS. ANDERSON: Well, I like the bump-outs 5 because it gets the trees further away from the 6 building. They're not smashed against the 7 building. 8 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: Well, in some of the 9 prior cases I showed you, you absolutely needed 10 them. So this is an example of where you might 11 not have, but -- 12 MS. ANDERSON: Well, here, you know -- 13 again, we're trying to encourage pedestrian 14 traffic, and if we're going to be eliminating 15 bump-outs in order to try to provide more 16 parking, but making this a cement jungle, 17 you're not going to encourage pedestrians to 18 want to walk, because it's so hot, so sunny. 19 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: Remember, though, that 20 in this particular case -- I'm sorry, Robert, I 21 didn't know this was yours. I didn't want to 22 be -- 23 MR. BEHAR: Too critical. 24 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: No, I mean, it's just a 25 kind of example. All of the others had	1 virtually a tiny sidewalk, you know, the 2 five-foot or seven-foot sidewalk. 3 MS. ANDERSON: And I hate those. All the 4 way up and down Le Jeune Road, it's terrible. 5 MR. TRIAS: I want to give credit to 6 Robert. I mean, all of your -- the clear space 7 in your arcades, it's always -- 8 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: Yeah. 9 MR. BEHAR: And I don't know if I have a 10 self-imposed setback or not, okay. Maybe, on 11 this, and I've got to go back, if we had set 12 the building back a little bit extra to give a 13 wider sidewalk, because of a five-foot setback, 14 sometimes it doesn't work. 15 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: Yeah. Right. 16 MR. TRIAS: Right. 17 But, I mean, if you measure the width of 18 the arcade, you will see that it's wider. If 19 you measure the sidewalk, the same thing. 20 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: So I think where I'm 21 going with this is that whatever concern there 22 is about open space and how it is experienced 23 in the City, on the City streets and throughout 24 the Downtown, it needs more than saying it 25 should be ten percent or some percent of your

Page 29 1 site, because it's always going to be pushed to 2 the outside in some way, that's not under the 3 larger control of an urban design, but it's 4 determined site by site. 5 And some of you may remember, years ago, 6 when at the University we did the BID plan. We 7 made some suggestions for two of the streets 8 that were very specific to the street, 9 understanding what the right-of-way was, how 10 much sidewalk was left, whether you could take 11 any space out of parking or traffic lanes, and 12 that sort of street by street approach. I 13 think, would benefit the City, if you really 14 want to deal with open space, beyond haggling 15 over what percent of one site it should be. 16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: One question for you. 17 A couple of slides back, you showed some 18 landscaping that didn't allow pedestrians to 19 cross. That one that's in place there. 20 I wonder if that was done on purpose -- I 21 don't know -- so there is no jaywalking or you 22 could cross at the crosswalks, because you're 23 in Downtown Coral Gables, where people go out 24 for lunch from the offices and so forth. 25 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: Yeah.	Page 30 1 MS. ANDERSON: From a safety standpoint -- 2 MR. BEHAR: I don't think this was done 3 with that intention, because I remember being 4 on the Board of Architects when this project 5 came in, and I think it was done for the 6 reasons to meet the landscape, you know -- 7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Requirements or 8 percentage? 9 MR. BEHAR: Yeah. 10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Even if it's on the 11 right-of-way, it meets the landscape 12 requirements for the project? 13 MR. BEHAR: Well, remember -- yes, 14 basically. 15 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: Well, you may have 16 approved it for one or two projects. I don't 17 know about this one. 18 MS. VELEZ: We had a project in the last 19 meeting, and I asked that same question. When 20 we were looking at the percentages, I said, 21 "But all of the landscaping is in the 22 right-of-way," and, yes, it does count, which 23 doesn't make a lot of sense to me, because it 24 allows the building to be way too close. 25 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: So, at any rate, you're
Page 31 1 doing it building by building, instead of 2 street by street. And so if you had a plan 3 ahead of time for that street, then the 4 architects could try to -- at least try to 5 conform with it. 6 MR. TRIAS: If you look at the street, you 7 don't see crosswalks anywhere. 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Correct. 9 MR. TRIAS: So how is that pedestrian? And 10 those are the issues that we need to 11 coordinate. 12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I think, in that 13 street, if you continue forward, there is a 14 crosswalk by the Graziano's and there is a 15 crosswalk that goes towards -- 16 MR. BEHAR: But this is not Graziano's. 17 This is the -- 18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: That's the Fritz and 19 Franz. 20 MR. BEHAR: The Frits and Franz. 21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So at the end of it is 22 the Graziano's Market. 23 MR. BEHAR: All of the way to the end. 24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: That's where I think 25 there is a crosswalk.	Page 32 1 MR. BEHAR: All of the way to the end, 2 yeah. 3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: And I think there's a 4 crosswalk by the Denny's, forward. 5 MR. TRIAS: Right. Right. If you keep 6 going, yes. 7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Nothing in between. 8 MS. ANDERSON: But that's the whole block 9 over. 10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yeah. 11 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. 12 MS. ANDERSON: Yeah, it really should have 13 a crosswalk there. 14 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: But, you know, this is 15 a good example of, we don't have a lot of 16 public spaces that are not linear in our 17 gridded city. That's a kind of American 18 character. But here's a space that's 19 triangular and could be developed, in an urban 20 design fashion, in such a way that it would 21 make the place. It's not just defined by the 22 curbs. 23 MR. TRIAS: And I think that one of the 24 points that Liz is bringing up is that if you 25 simply say a 15 percent open space, you end up

Page 33 1 with, yeah, some space over there. That, 2 indeed, if we have a more sophisticated way to 3 deal with space, then we can talk about 4 crosswalks, we can talk about urban design and 5 so on. You know, I think that's a good 6 approach. 7 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: But I should remind us 8 all that we're talking about the Zoning Code, 9 which is a different instrument than an Urban 10 Design Plan. 11 MR. TRIAS: No, but the thing is that our 12 Zoning Code is special, because it has the 13 Board of Architects and it requires a very 14 significant design review. So if we understand 15 it like that, then we have better tools, I 16 think. 17 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: I'm just pointing out 18 that that percentage may not be the only way to 19 get a better open space result. 20 Enough said. Let's move on. 21 I think that was -- oh, and, then, of 22 course, there, the cross-block walkways, which 23 could be probably better developed. That's a 24 part of the content of the Code. I'm not 25 sure -- we haven't looked at that, but clearly	Page 34 1 there are -- the blocks are long and the 2 walkways are useful. This is one of them. 3 Next. 4 This is probably your most -- your best and 5 most intentional one, that runs through the 6 building from Miracle Mile to the other side. 7 MS. ANDERSON: Right. 8 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: Next. 9 So this is, I believe, the last slide, in 10 which we ask for your input, your comments on 11 the re-organization of the document, any 12 comments you might have on the form and 13 capacity rules. I think, with regard to FAR, 14 it's pretty clear, except in FM2, I believe. 15 This is the one that has a kind of sliding 16 scale of the taller you get, the lower the FAR 17 gets, and it's a complex kind of picture. I 18 wonder whether that could be simplified or made 19 less complex, or, let's say, more predictable. 20 The height, there seemed to be these kind 21 of height thresholds, which seem to be working, 22 as you could see from the buildings that we 23 showed. So there seems to be a pattern there. 24 However, the height limit on it of the less 25 than 20,000 might be something that could be
Page 35 1 reviewed. 2 The step backs, are those doing what we 3 want them to do? 4 The idea that you get Mixed-Use out of 5 Commercial and that you have to rezone to 6 Commercial to get it, in certain parts of the 7 City, why couldn't it all be Mixed-Use and not 8 worry about having an underlay and an overlay? 9 The small lots, I just mentioned. Is that 10 worth re-considering? What about parking for 11 the small lots. Everybody is pointing out most 12 of them are built out, at least to one or two 13 stories already, and they don't have parking, 14 so would it be that big of an impact on the 15 City to not require parking for the smaller 16 lots? 17 And then your recommendations with regard 18 to the organization of the document and the 19 content issues I've brought up, as well as the 20 degree of public participation, beyond now, 21 that you think we might need -- the City might 22 need to engage. 23 So three things, document structure and 24 organization, content, the content issues, and 25 public engagement.	Page 36 1 Thank you. 2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I'd like to take a 3 moment to recognize Commissioner Pat Keon, that 4 has joined us. 5 Thank you. Welcome. 6 Any questions? I would actually like to 7 first get some input from the architects on the 8 Board, which would be Robert. Julio, 9 unfortunately, is not here with us. 10 But if it's okay with the Board Members, I 11 would like for him to start. 12 MR. BEHAR: Thank you. 13 No, I think -- and I've been on the 14 Steering Committee, so I've been involved, and 15 I think the intent of what Liz is doing is 16 correct. One is, we need to simplify our Code, 17 okay, because it's very -- I don't want to say, 18 difficult, but it's very confusing at times. 19 So I think that process is going in the right 20 direction, and I think that was -- whatever 21 task that was, I think it's getting there. 22 What follows, I think, is going to be very 23 critical, it's how we're going to -- how we're 24 going to sort out, you know -- an example, you 25 know, and I'll pull it out of your slide

Page 37 1 presentation, the Mediterranean bonuses, how 2 we're going to be able to simplify something 3 that is not -- by the time it gets to the 4 Commissioners for final approval, it's an 5 easier process, was not up to interpretation by 6 somebody, you know. I think those are what are 7 concerning to me, how we're going to get there. 8 There's a lot of work to be done, that 9 you're going to have to do, in order to get -- 10 because when we leave it up to the Board of 11 Architects, in some cases, it's a discrepancy, 12 who is going to favor one project versus the 13 other, and that, to me, is, I think, the 14 biggest problem that I see -- or the biggest 15 challenge that you have to be able to clearly 16 make changes to the current Code to allow for 17 that. 18 I think that what you put on the screen 19 right now, I think, is correct. I think, you 20 know, for example, parking, we know that the 21 tendency today is to try to reduce parking, not 22 only because it's going to reduce the mass of 23 the building, it's that we're using cars less 24 and less, and I think it's going to benefit not 25 only the smalls lot, it's going to benefit the	Page 38 1 big lots. 2 One of the projects that you showed, which 3 is the project we did in the Gables -- Gateway 4 Gables Ponce Project, that project had 348 5 units, but yet it had over 900 parking spaces. 6 You know, we don't need to. We need to look at 7 that, because that's something that is going to 8 benefit the City, you know, now and in the 9 future. 10 MR. TRIAS: And, Mr. Behar, if you had that 11 project going through the process today, you 12 could used the shared parking, for example. 13 MR. BEHAR: But, Ramon, the shared parking, 14 yes, you're correct, but what you're allowed to 15 reduce -- the only benefit today, really, on 16 that project, is that the requirement for the 17 one bedroom unit -- 18 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, we reduced that, too. 19 MR. BEHAR: It went from 1.5 to one, but I 20 think we have an opportunity to even look at 21 more, and I think that's what I expect, for you 22 to come back to us, Liz, and say, you know, our 23 recommendation would be "X," you know. I think 24 that's an opportunity, because that's going to 25 reduce a lot of the projects you showed,
Page 39 1 including my projects. You know, you could see 2 that your pedestals are very massive. I think 3 that would help us eliminate some of that 4 massiveness of those projects. 5 I think, when you, you know, maybe have 6 some smaller lot, you have a little bit of, you 7 know, more benefit. I think that could be 8 good, you know, in a lot of areas of the City, 9 especially the Ponce corridor. I think that's 10 where we're going to see, for the next twenty 11 years, more development coming in that area, 12 because it's really conducive to do that. 13 I think, again, one of my concerns and I 14 still -- and I've been proposing this for a 15 long time, I think we need to look at not 16 following the eight examples that are set in 17 the Code, but I think we've got to find a way 18 to incentivize projects for quality, good 19 response to the urban fabric, to everything 20 that is there, not just because, if they have a 21 copula, well, why, you know, they get more 22 beneficial -- more benefits than others. 23 And I think that today, in some of our 24 Commissioners, and, you know, Commissioner Keon 25 will attest to that, you know, we want to look	Page 40 1 at better projects, you know, quality projects. 2 That's the goal, the intent of what we want to 3 do today, and I think what I would look from 4 you -- and I think everything you're doing so 5 far is going in the direction -- I think that, 6 how are we able to achieve that, in an easier 7 manner than what we have today. 8 MR. TRIAS: And I think -- Mr. Behar, I 9 think that you're probably the most experienced 10 architect on those types of projects -- 11 MR. BEHAR: Thank you. 12 MR. TRIAS: And you are, and I think that 13 your experience could be very beneficial. If 14 we can have a meeting with Liz, for example, 15 that would be one of my suggestions, to have a 16 meeting specifically on your issues and trying 17 to see if we can come up with the technical 18 solutions. And keep in mind that Zoning is a 19 limited tool. Zoning is not going to solve all 20 of our problems, but I think that your 21 expertise -- and that could be one of the 22 follow-up ideas that I may suggest, is that we 23 could set up some meetings with the consultant, 24 of some individuals who have some particular 25 issues, and then follow-up and then come back a

Page 41 1 couple of months later to another meeting here. 2 I mean, I think, at some point, we need 3 to -- I would like to get your view on how do 4 you see your role in the process, because at 5 the end, you will have to recommend approval or 6 not to the Commission of the changes. 7 The way I see the changes, I agree with 8 Mr. Behar, I see the re-organization and 9 re-labeling, which is what Liz presented, and 10 that, to me, that's a very clear, black and 11 white, issue. It's very good, very helpful. 12 It doesn't simplify the Code. It clarifies the 13 Code. I mean, it doesn't change any of the 14 content. And we can do that, and then the rest 15 of it is the actual changes. 16 MR. BEHAR: But just that process will, you 17 know, clarify fifty percent of the problems 18 that we have today with the Code. 19 MR. TRIAS: If we only do that, we've done 20 something significant. 21 MR. BEHAR: I agree, because, you know, it 22 really -- and I think Liz and Staff have done 23 so far, from what I've seen, a very good job 24 getting to that point, which I'm very happy, 25 very pleased to see that. And, you know, like	Page 42 1 I said before, is how do we get, you know, a 2 little bit further. 3 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: So one of the 4 questions, I think, that's come up in some of 5 the meetings, may have been a Staff Committee 6 suggestion, that we actually separate these two 7 issues and first do the re-organization, and 8 not even address the content issues, until 9 everybody is comfortable with that, and then do 10 the content. 11 So I don't know where we'd come out on that 12 yet. 13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Were members of the 14 community and residents on any of those 15 committees or any of those meetings that you've 16 had or was it strictly Staff? 17 MR. TRIAS: No. We had several Committees, 18 and, yes, we had members. It's just that it 19 wasn't an open meeting. It was invited. So we 20 had some professionals. We also have the 21 Steering Committee. We have members of 22 different Boards. So we had a fairly good 23 sample of people who would be interested. 24 Now, as you can see, Zoning is not exactly 25 the most exciting topic, so we don't have that
Page 43 1 many, but we need to figure out a way to get 2 appropriate input. 3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I recall, the last 4 time we went through the Zoning Code Re-write, 5 Robert, you were on the Board -- 6 MR. BEHAR: Yes. 7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: -- I was on the Board. 8 I think even Commissioner Keon -- were you on 9 the Board with us? This is when, if I'm not 10 mistaken, Charlie was doing the Zoning Code 11 Re-write, and we spent hours and hours going 12 through, line item per line item, through the 13 process, putting one or two additional meetings 14 per month, just on the Zoning Code Re-write, 15 and we did have input from the community that 16 came and sat in the audience. 17 We had Zoning attorneys, we had architects 18 and we had residents of the community that 19 actually put in very valuable input and helped 20 us make a determination as to how we wanted to 21 proceed, and, to me, that's very valuable. 22 I'm not saying we've got to spend hundreds 23 and hundreds of hours, but it's very valuable 24 to coordinate it in such a way so you get input 25 from the community and professionals to guide	Page 44 1 us and help us, because the way Robert has told 2 us that there are certain facets, when he does 3 a building, that he has issues, I think there's 4 other members of the community that would like 5 to speak out and recognize that, also. 6 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. And I think, Liz, you 7 may want to show the list of meetings that 8 we've had so far, so you get a clear idea. 9 Robert was a member of one of the Committees. 10 We had attorneys. We had a lot of people who 11 have -- 12 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: Judith, could we have 13 the second slide in the series? 14 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. I think the second slide 15 gave you a timeline. And, really, it's up to 16 you. It's a question of how much -- if you 17 want to spend three meetings every month, until 18 midnight, we can do that, but I would prefer a 19 more efficient process. So it's up to you. 20 It's up to you, whatever you think is the best 21 way to provide input. 22 I think the consultant has been very 23 helpful. I mean, you've meet with plenty of 24 people. 25 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: Maybe one back. The

Page 45 1 one that lists the meetings. 2 That. Thank you. 3 MR. TRIAS: That one. 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I just think it's 5 critical to get input from people, and if -- 6 and I would leave that up to Staff -- 7 MR. TRIAS: Okay. 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: -- as to how to drive 9 that, but in this process, we have to get 10 people to come and give input. So there's got 11 to be a mechanism. 12 MS. ANDERSON: Yeah. We do have an 13 upcoming Town Hall Meeting. But one of the 14 recurring themes that I hear from most 15 residents is the tininess of these sidewalks, 16 especially when you're dealing with large areas 17 that people want to use to walk in front of. 18 If we're going to encourage people to come into 19 the buildings, to walk in front of the 20 buildings, we need something more than a 21 five-foot sidewalk, and depending on the 22 street, if you're taking about Le Jeune Road, 23 you need to even provide a little protection 24 there from splashback from vehicles and trucks. 25 A prime example of where that wasn't done	Page 46 1 is in front of the Aloft Hotel, and as a 2 result, now we have some sort of planters out 3 there, that the building put in after the fact, 4 because they're looking for more of a buffer 5 from Le Jeune Road. 6 A better design could have been made when 7 that building -- the pad of it could be further 8 back, maybe doing a land swamp to enrich our 9 pedestrians in -- 10 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: Well, if the arcades 11 are connected, you would be developing that 12 protected walkable system. 13 MS. ANDERSON: Yeah, but it's not. You're 14 forced out towards the street at the corner -- 15 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: Yes, currently. 16 MS. ANDERSON: -- and as it was originally 17 designed, there wasn't even enough accessible 18 space to get a wheelchair or a baby carriage 19 down. 20 With regard to the parking issue, I think 21 that varies depending on where you're at. If 22 you're next to the rail, your parking needs are 23 going to be less than if you're further down 24 into the Ponce area. If you're right on Ponce, 25 it might be less. If it's a Mixed-Use
Page 47 1 building, you know, you might have that 2 swap-off where the residents use the parking in 3 some hours and the businesses in others, but in 4 some of our more recent projects in the North 5 Gables, you have parking ratios that don't make 6 sense. 7 You already have a parking problem there 8 existing from buildings such as the historic 9 buildings, that don't have sufficient parking 10 for any cars, and if you have less than a one 11 to one ratio, it's not going to work, because 12 many one bedrooms are filled with two people. 13 And as far as the trees, I made some 14 comments about the bump-outs. We do need the 15 trees. We do need the shade. You're not going 16 to have the feel in the Downtown that you 17 normally would. 18 If you go to Washington, DC, if you go to 19 some of these northern cities, their climate 20 has kind of forced them to have large sidewalks 21 in order to push the snow, but during the 22 summertime, it is bustling. If you go through 23 Chicago, it is bustling, because you have space 24 for people to move and not be shoulder to 25 shoulder on these sidewalks like we have here.	Page 48 1 So those are my comments on those two. I 2 have lots of other comments, as we move on to 3 other issues here, such as open spaces, there's 4 green space. We need to provide more areas, 5 interior-wise, like it used to exist, like in 6 the old Florida National Bank, as it was. You 7 could go inside the arcades. 8 Even if you look at the San Sebastian 9 building itself, it's changed dramatically over 10 time, and to use that as an example of 11 Mediterranean design now, when it's been 12 altered so significantly and lost a large 13 degree of its character, I think is improper, 14 and we end up with this modern interpretation 15 of Mediterranean, which really is not what I 16 think the founders had planned on. 17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you. 18 Maria. 19 MS. VELEZ: Following what Rhonda was 20 saying, I'm concerned also with the setbacks. 21 I don't like the narrow sidewalks. I think, if 22 we focus on the pictures that you showed, for 23 instance, the wider sidewalks, with the 24 setback, allows for the plantings in the area 25 and allow for the trees to grow tall.

Page 49 1 I'm concerned with the bumps outs, because 2 I like them, they're nice, but at our last 3 meeting, we had a project in the North Ponce 4 area, and I'm concerned with how much or how 5 little parking the building was providing for 6 the tenants, and the concern there would be 7 that those people, who lived in that building, 8 would need to park on the street, which is 9 already full, because of all of the older 10 buildings that have no parking whatsoever. So 11 when we begin to do the bump-out, we take away 12 what little there is. 13 So it's a conflicting situation, because we 14 want the green, we want the trees, but we also 15 do need to understand that there are people who 16 will continue to drive and that they need to 17 drive, because they don't have adequate access 18 to transportation. 19 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: So if I could use that 20 as an example. You've spoken about the parking 21 and the open space in several different 22 locations, and each one of them is different 23 enough, that having one Zoning rule for whether 24 you do a certain kind of setback and whether 25 it's open space or not, really cannot deal with	Page 50 1 that, because it's different in each case. 2 MS. VELEZ: Agreed, a hundred percent. 3 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: So that's a point at 4 which our work on the content of the Zoning 5 Code will at least feel like it falls short, 6 because that probably should be done first in 7 an Urban Design Plan, that lays it out, rather 8 than by Zoning category. 9 MR. TRIAS: But I would suggest that most 10 of that problem is one Zoning category, which 11 is MF2, which is already one of the issues that 12 you're tackling. 13 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: Yeah. 14 MR. TRIAS: For example, the parking, the 15 parking issue that you have expressed concern, 16 that really relates to the North Ponce area, 17 which has MF2, so that there could be a 18 different ratio, for example. I mean, those 19 are the solutions that, I think, upon further 20 study, the consultant can give us ideas for 21 best practices. 22 MR. BEHAR: And those are more limited 23 areas. When you look at more the Commercial, 24 the Mixed-Use, the CBD, you know, we don't have 25 that problem there. You know, in some areas,
Page 51 1 you do. And I agree, in some areas, some 2 projects come in with very little parking, and 3 those are, you know, up to this Board and the 4 Commission, maybe, not to accept the proposed 5 reduction, as they're doing it. 6 But in overall, I think that, you know, the 7 requirements for Coral Gables are far 8 greater -- and I think Liz will attest to 9 that -- than most municipalities throughout the 10 country. You know, we maybe have to look 11 forward and say, okay, that was good for a 12 1950s, you know, requirements, but today, you 13 know, the requirements have changed. 14 MR. TRIAS: It's 1964. 1964 is the actual 15 date. 16 MR. BEHAR: 1964? Okay. I wasn't around. 17 But we've got to look at it, you know, like 18 the rest of the country is looking at it. 19 Something must be going on, that we need to 20 look at, as well. We cannot sit back and say, 21 "Okay, you know, our founders, you know, did 22 something back then," but, you know, I think 23 we've got to be more openminded and look at 24 what is happening in the whole country, and the 25 whole world, for that matter, you know.	Page 52 1 MR. TRIAS: And what I would say to you is, 2 I would remind you that the founders of the 3 City did not have parking requirements. It was 4 in 1964 when that was established. And the 5 last time we reviewed it has been recently, but 6 there's room to certainly come up with a more 7 nuanced approach, I think. 8 MS. VELEZ: But the City has grown 9 tremendously, probably, since the last time it 10 was looked at, and our population and the 11 density has tripled. 12 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: It might be interesting 13 on this topic to take a look at how much of the 14 parking that exists is used. 15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: How will we see the 16 changes? Are you going to do a strike out, a 17 red line? What format are you going to use? 18 Or how are you going to provide that to us? 19 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: Well, you know, I 20 think, if what we did first was just move the 21 divisions and articles around in the way we've 22 proposed, we might produce that -- and no 23 content changes, at some point you would have 24 to go back in and when it refers from one 25 division to another, you would have to revise

Page 53 1 those references, but I think we would -- our 2 preference would be to hand you that revised 3 document -- 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. Yeah. 5 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: -- not having done 6 anything to MF2 or the parking requirement or 7 the open space requirement, just this is all 8 where it's all going to be, how does this feel, 9 what are the issues, what problems does that 10 raise, and iron that out, and then come back 11 and deal with the actual content of it. 12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: But we'll be able to 13 see a document where the changes are physically 14 made? 15 MR. BEHAR: Not in the organization portion 16 of it, because I think that what you're doing 17 is just going to -- 18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Just not on the first 19 phase. 20 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: No, we have a draft in 21 our office, which we haven't even read yet, of 22 moving everything around, and so we would take 23 a look -- 24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yeah. 25 MR. TRIAS: And then you've got to	Page 54 1 strikethrough underline of any changes. So I 2 think we have to be very transparent and clear 3 on them. 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes. That's where I'm 5 going, actually. 6 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: Yeah. 7 MR. TRIAS: I think that my suggestion was 8 to separate the re-arrangement and re-labeling, 9 because, to me, that's a very clear project, 10 but it's more complex than it appears, because 11 everything is going to be re-numbered. All of 12 a sudden, we need to make sure that it is 13 internally consistent and so on, but if you're 14 comfortable with that, meaning we have better 15 labels and better chapters, that's something 16 you can vote on, and, then, later on, we can 17 take, either as a whole, all of the changes, or 18 in pieces, depending on your comfort level. 19 MR. BEHAR: So what you're asking from us 20 today, you know, is for us to vote on the 21 format that is being proposed? 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Not even a vote. It's 23 just a recommendation. 24 MR. TRIAS: No, we're just talking about 25 recommendations. So if you agree with that,
Page 55 1 then the consultant will come back with the 2 actual re-arranged and re-labeled Code. 3 MS. VELEZ: The organization part, I think, 4 is major, and you've done a really good job of 5 putting things where they should be. I like 6 it. I think it's going to be more user 7 friendly. 8 I also like the idea that the Chairman had 9 of getting a lot of input from people who 10 actually will use this. I'm not using it on a 11 daily basis, but people who will use it on a 12 daily basis, and that's when we would have 13 additional input from other people. 14 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: Well, and I think we 15 have a good group in the Steering Committee and 16 the Staff Committee -- 17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: But outside. I'd 18 really like to get people -- 19 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: Yes. 20 MR. TRIAS: I want to assure you, we don't 21 have a list of the people, but you would 22 recognize most of them, in the sense that they 23 tend to be the professionals -- and Robert can 24 explain, because he's been to some of the 25 meetings -- the attorneys, the architects. All	Page 56 1 of the people who use the Code all of the time, 2 have already been part of the meetings. 3 We also had specific meetings with the BID, 4 for example, a special meeting to deal with 5 their issues. We also had a special meeting 6 about Mixed-Use issues. We've had some 7 specialized meetings, and the issue, at the end 8 of the day, is, how much of the general public, 9 and what will be your preference, in terms of 10 having that kind of input. 11 I mean, those are the specialized input. I 12 think the consultant has been extremely helpful 13 in working with as many people as possible. 14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: And what I recall from 15 last time, there were a lot of Site Specific 16 issues, Site Specific Standards -- 17 MR. BEHAR: That needs to come back. 18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: That needs to come 19 back, and I assume that, on those, you're going 20 to work with the City Attorney's Office, very 21 closely on that. 22 MR. TRIAS: Yes. 23 MS. RAMOS: Most certainly, because the 24 last time we made changes to the Site 25 Specifics --

Page 57 1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I recall that. 2 MS. RAMOS: -- the floodgates opened, so we 3 have to look at that. 4 MR. TRIAS: I would even describe that as a 5 third step. I mean, I would even separate 6 that. 7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Correct. It's just 8 that I didn't see that in there, and that's 9 why -- 10 MR. TRIAS: It's there. 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Oh, it is? 12 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: No, it is. It's part 13 of the content, what we call the content. It's 14 along with MF2, and, you know, the other kind 15 of actual regulatory issues. 16 So, you know, I think everybody thinks -- 17 no one, in the course of the many meetings that 18 we've already had, has said, "Just start over." 19 I think people understand that this is a 20 document, which has evolved over time and it 21 has a tremendous amount of the history of 22 concern about quality of construction and the 23 character of the City in it. 24 So we wouldn't even dream of trying to do 25 the kind of re-write we did for the City of	Page 58 1 Miami, because that really did require starting 2 over, and it did not have the history of -- it 3 didn't have the attention that you have to form 4 and design and landscape and the historical 5 style of the City, its character. 6 So all of those things are very carefully 7 written into the Code, and that's why we're 8 saying, that will all move with it. It's 9 moving laterally. We're not suggesting that -- 10 maybe later, when we get to the content, people 11 will tell us there's certain aspects of those 12 that need to change, but you're concerned about 13 things like excavation or docks or whatever 14 issues have their own place, that come from 15 dealing with things and trying to prevent bad 16 things from happening. 17 So I think we're just saying, all of that 18 stays, and, in particularly, probably the most 19 concern, in terms of pedantry, comes from 20 single-family residential owners, and that's 21 been -- you've been working on that. 22 MR. TRIAS: Right. 23 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: That stays. Pieces of 24 that may find a new location in the book -- 25 MR. TRIAS: I mean, I think that the Board
Page 59 1 and the Commission worked really hard on 2 fine-tuning, just fine-tuning, the 3 single-family. That's the way I see the rest 4 of the Code, just fine-tuning and rearranging. 5 MR. BEHAR: You know, we're working with 6 something that at least was done, unlike, you 7 know, the City of Miami. You've got something 8 to work with, that needed clarification. You 9 did not start from scratch, you know. 10 And, again, and going back, I think this 11 process is going in the right direction. I'm 12 in support of it. You know, as we go further 13 down the line -- and, for example, one of the 14 exhibits that you showed, you know, the current 15 Zoning Map, the Future Land Use, I think we 16 need to look at it, because you're going to 17 find -- and what I would recommend to you, as 18 you come back to us, is, you know, you're 19 going to see pockets that are not consistent. 20 How do we make clear those areas, that, you 21 know, in one block you have -- 22 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: Yeah. Well, there are 23 some -- if you wanted to make that into one 24 map, which it could be, instead of six, you 25 would have some hard decisions, in some cases,	Page 60 1 and I think we're ready to deal with that with 2 you, you know, bring you options, but I think 3 that you don't want to get into that until the 4 format is -- 5 MR. BEHAR: The format is the fundamental 6 issue that we had, and I think we're getting 7 close to the Finish line. 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: The idea is there. 9 MR. BEHAR: Yeah. I'm saying -- you know, 10 and I don't think it's necessarily good to do 11 one map. I think, maybe, you know, the six 12 maps may be okay, but I think that, in each of 13 those areas, it needs to be cleaned up a little 14 bit. 15 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: Well, by six maps, I 16 meant, in one area, because they have 17 contradictory FARs and heights and things. 18 MR. BEHAR: Exactly. Okay. 19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: It needs to be user 20 friendly more so than the Code is today. You 21 know, that's one of the big complaints that I 22 have heard about the Zoning Code. 23 MR. BEHAR: I'm in favor of making the 24 recommendation that the consultant continues 25 the way we're going, and bring it back to us

Page 61 1 whenever that takes place, with the 2 organization as being proposed. 3 MR. TRIAS: Okay. I'm sure we can work 4 that pretty soon. I mean, we'll have to 5 discuss the timing, but I think that, in terms 6 of concept, it's already well-designed and it's 7 a matter of getting it ready for you. 8 MR. BEHAR: You know, to follow-up on Maria 9 and Eibi's suggestion, I know I've been to, I 10 think it's two or three meetings, and I'm 11 familiar with it, maybe we need to do a 12 courtesy meeting to the community and to the 13 residents and to the other professionals, just 14 to make sure that we cannot -- nobody comes 15 back and says -- 16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: "We didn't know about 17 this." 18 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, we can have a Town Hall 19 style meeting, that is advertised, and we send 20 letters to people and so on. 21 MS. ANDERSON: And if people can also see 22 the red line version versus, you know, the 23 product -- 24 MR. TRIAS: That will be later. I think we 25 need to have a meeting for just general ideas.	Page 62 1 MR. BEHAR: Information meeting. 2 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, because we don't have the 3 red line version yet. 4 MS. ANDERSON: Well, I understand, but what 5 are you going to show them at that meeting? If 6 you just tell them, "We're playing with the 7 Code," they're going to get concerned. 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I think it's more to 9 get additional input at this stage that we're 10 at. 11 MR. TRIAS: Right. 12 MS. ANDERSON: A wish list? 13 MR. BEHAR: I don't think a wish list is -- 14 because I think that if you put to out to do a 15 wish list, we're going to be here for the next 16 five years doing this. 17 MS. ANDERSON: No, I understand, but -- 18 that's what I'm saying, we need a defined -- 19 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: What you want to do is 20 preclude people saying, "We didn't know you 21 shouldn't be doing this. So you shouldn't be 22 doing it, because we didn't know." 23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes. Thank you. 24 And I think, as we get further along in the 25 process and the red line version comes out, we
Page 63 1 will proceed accordingly with that. 2 MS. ANDERSON: Right. 3 When do you foresee the red line version 4 being available? 5 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: Okay. So I'm getting 6 nervous about calling it a red line version, 7 because I think it probably would be the new 8 text, which has no content changes, and maybe 9 the diagram that shows you where everything 10 went. 11 MS. ANDERSON: Okay. 12 MR. BEHAR: So, if I understand you 13 correctly, there are no changes in the text 14 language. The only change is where it's 15 placed? 16 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: That's what we would be 17 trying to do, except for the reference to where 18 it's going. You know, when it say, as in -- 19 MR. TRIAS: Every article is to be 20 renumbered. So there are many references and 21 so -- 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I understand. But 23 there's no text change? 24 MR. TRIAS: There's no content change. 25 There will be some text changes, that talk	Page 64 1 about references and so on. 2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Understood. 3 MR. TRIAS: But no content. 4 MR. BEHAR: Now, if that is as simple as 5 that, I don't know -- 6 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, as simple as that. 7 There's no tricks here. It's just very 8 straight-forward, very transparent, you know. 9 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: So it may be rough in 10 language, because it's just moved completely. 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Right. But then your 12 idea works. 13 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: Then we can address it, 14 but I think actually showing the fact that it's 15 moved intact is probably important. 16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Because the last time 17 we sat here and did these, what we call the 18 Zoning Code Re-write, it was item per item, 19 line by line, page by page, that we went 20 through it that pertained to -- 21 MR. BEHAR: And, Eibi, that may come later, 22 when there's actual content changes. Right now 23 we're not doing that, from what I understand. 24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I understand. 25 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: And the old Code

Page 65 1 remains intact, and that's what you're using 2 while we're doing all of this. 3 MR. TRIAS: Right. Right. 4 MS. ANDERSON: I did have a couple of more 5 comments. You had a question, that was written 6 in on the PowerPoint, under Division 3.10, 7 Transfer of Development Rights, and you said, 8 "Verify that it stays here rather than moved to 9 Article 8, Historic Preservation." 10 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: Yeah. That one, in 11 particular, I think we understand stays with 12 the process and doesn't go with Historic 13 Preservation. 14 MS. ANDERSON: Right, because we're also 15 talking about green space, when we were talking 16 about TDRs. 17 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: Yeah. We had a few 18 other questions we have to go through, like 19 there's a DRI Chapter and there's no more DRIs. 20 MR. TRIAS: Right. That's not ready for 21 you to take action. When you get it -- 22 MS. ANDERSON: Oh, okay. I thought it was 23 my question. 24 MR. TRIAS: Right. 25 MS. ANDERSON: Okay.	Page 66 1 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: You know, I think if we 2 do things like cross out the article on DRIs, 3 that would move or be pushed to the end and 4 literally crossed out, because there are a few 5 things like that that just don't apply anymore. 6 We do know that. 7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Any other comments at 8 this stage? 9 MS. ANDERSON: Not at this stage, no. 10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Maria? 11 MS. VELEZ: No. 12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Ramon, do you need 13 anything further from us? 14 MR. TRIAS: No. Thank you very much. And 15 I think we'll bring you back -- Liz, do you 16 have any idea of the time frame, just roughly, 17 for the re-arrange? 18 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: How often do you have 19 meetings? 20 MR. TRIAS: Once a month. 21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Every day. 22 MR. TRIAS: Certainly we can follow the 23 Chairman's idea of three meetings every 24 month -- 25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Well, no. What I was
Page 67 1 saying is, that's what transpired -- 2 MR. BEHAR: But we did that. For every 3 week, we had a meeting that we went to. I'm 4 not doing that. 5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Until midnight. 6 MR. BEHAR: I will resign from the Board. 7 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, what I would say 8 is that, because of that very, very good work 9 you did, now we only have to do about ten 10 percent of the work, because it's really 11 rearranging and then changing some details. 12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Well, it was really 13 Staff, the Commission. It was a unified 14 project. I think it was a culmination of 15 everybody working hard and putting the time in. 16 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: You know, I think the 17 timing question is, do we bring that document 18 to you first and then it goes to that -- 19 whatever the Town Hall meeting is after that? 20 MR. TRIAS: My thinking is, we can probably 21 have a Town Hall meeting relatively soon, and, 22 for example, a January meeting for the 23 re-arranged Code will be to me -- 24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: The Town Hall meeting, 25 though, you know, you have the holidays coming	Page 68 1 up. I would be mindful of those dates, to be 2 able to get as much input as you can. 3 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: So we could take this 4 presentation that we did today to a Town Hall 5 meeting, or if we want to do the book, that 6 would probably push it close to the holidays 7 and you may want to push it into the New Year. 8 MR. TRIAS: I think you should take this 9 presentation and try to simply allow for 10 comment, and think in terms of maybe January or 11 February for the first time that it comes back 12 to you, in terms of re-organization. 13 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: As a book. 14 MR. TRIAS: And then think about another 15 three or four months of basically discussion to 16 come up with the changes. I mean, that's the 17 way I would see it. And if you need more time, 18 you need more time. 19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So you would schedule 20 a Town Hall meeting what month, probably? 21 MR. TRIAS: As soon as we can. I mean, I 22 would try to do it before the holidays, 23 obviously. So I would try to schedule it soon, 24 and see the level of interest that we have from 25 the community. We may have thousands of people

Page 69 1 show up, and then we may need to have another 2 meeting, or not. Or it could be like tonight's 3 meeting. We'll see. 4 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: So mid November or 5 early November. 6 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, that would be my 7 recommendation at this point, if you feel 8 comfortable with that timing, with the hope of 9 coming back after the holidays with something 10 for you to take action. 11 And I think, at that point, is when you 12 will see more interest, when you start taking 13 action. 14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Correct. 15 And where would those Town Hall meetings 16 take place? 17 MR. TRIAS: Well, we had a meeting last 18 night at the Youth Center, and that seems a 19 good venue. 20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. It's a very 21 good venue. 22 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. 23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. I was just 24 thinking, not the engineering building or so 25 forth. The Youth Center is good.	Page 70 1 Okay. Any other comments? 2 MR. BEHAR: No. 3 MS. ANDERSON: None. 4 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: So this presentation 5 would be good for the Town Hall? 6 MS. VELEZ: It's a start, and a way to get 7 people thinking and to start listening to 8 what's out there. 9 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: Thank you very much. 10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Any other comments? 11 No? 12 I'd like to thank you very much for coming, 13 Commissioner. Thank you for joining us 14 tonight. 15 I guess we're adjourned. 16 MR. TRIAS: Thank you very much. 17 MS. VELEZ: Thank you. Thank you, Liz. 18 (Thereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 19 7:20 p.m.) 20 21 22 23 24 25
Page 71 1 C E R T I F I C A T E 2 3 S T A T E O F F L O R I D A : 4 S S . 5 C O U N T Y O F M I A M I - D A D E : 6 7 8 9 I, NIEVES SANCHEZ, Court Reporter, and a Notary 10 Public for the State of Florida at Large, do hereby 11 certify that I was authorized to and did 12 stenographically report the foregoing proceedings and 13 that the transcript is a true and complete record of my 14 stenographic notes. 15 16 DATED this 26th day of October, 2018. 17 18 19 S I G N A T U R E O N F I L E 20 _____ 21 NIEVES SANCHEZ 22 23 24 25	