

Page 1

CITY OF CORAL GABLES  
 LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY (LPA)/  
 PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING  
 VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT  
 WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 13, 2021, COMMENCING AT 6:04 P.M.

Board Members Present:  
 Eibi Aizenstat, Chairman  
 Robert Behar  
 Luis Revuelta  
 Wayne "Chip" Withers  
 Venny Torre  
 Claudia Miro

City Staff and Consultants:  
 Ramon Trias, Planning Director  
 Jill Menendez, Administrative Assistant, Board Secretary  
 Jennifer Garcia, City Planner  
 Arceli Redila, Principal Planner  
 Craig Collier, Special Counsel (via Zoom platform)  
 Peter Iglesias, City Manager  
 Miriam Soler Ramos, City Attorney  
 Warren Adams, Historical Resources &  
 Cultural Arts Director

Also Participating:

Felix Pardo  
 Willy Bermello  
 Mario Garcia-Serra, Esq., On behalf of E-1 and E-2  
 Maria De La Guardia, Architect  
 Sue Kawalerski  
 Agustin De La Guardia  
 Maria Cristina Longo  
 Tom O'Malley  
 Anne Finch  
 Carlos Singer  
 Jose Rivera-Font  
 Brett Gillis, Via Zoom

Page 2

1     **THEREUPON:**

2             **CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT:** I'd like to go ahead

3             and call the meeting to order.

4             Good evening, everybody. This Board is

5             comprised of seven members. Four Members of

6             the Board shall constitute a quorum, and the

7             affirmative vote of four members shall be

8             necessary for the adoption of any motion. If

9             only four Members of the Board are present, an

10            applicant may request and be entitled to a

11            continuance to the next regularly scheduled

12            meeting of the Board. If the matter is

13            continued due to a lack of the quorum, the

14            Chairperson or Secretary of the Board may set a

15            Special Meeting to consider such matter. In

16            the event that the four votes are not obtained,

17            an applicant may request a continuance or allow

18            the application to proceed to the City

19            Commission without a recommendation.

20            Pursuant to Resolution Number 2021-118, the

21            City of Coral Gables has returned to

22            traditional in-person meetings. Accordingly,

23            any individual wishing to provide sworn

24            testimony should be present physically in the

25            City Commission Chambers. However, the

Page 3

1            Planning & Zoning Board has established the

2            ability for the public to provide comments,

3            though non-sworn and without evidentiary value,

4            virtually. Accordingly, only individuals who

5            wish to provide public comment in this format

6            may appear and provide those comments via Zoom.

7            Lobbyist Registration and Disclosure, any

8            person who acts as a lobbyist pursuant to the

9            City of Coral Gables Ordinance Number 2006-11

10           must register with the City Clerk prior to

11           engaging in lobbying activities or

12           presentations before City Staff, Boards,

13           Committees and/or the City Commission. A copy

14           of the Ordinance is available in the Office of

15           the City Clerk. Failure to register and

16           provide proof of registration shall prohibit

17           your ability to present to the Board.

18           As Chair, I now officially call the City of

19           Coral Gables Planning & Zoning Board Meeting of

20           October 13th, 2021 to order. The time is 6:04.

21           Jill, if you'd please call the roll.

22           **THE SECRETARY:** Robert Behar?

23           **MR. BEHAR:** Present.

24           **THE SECRETARY:** Alex Bucelo?

25           Claudia Miro?

Page 4

1           **MS. MIRO:** Present.

2           **THE SECRETARY:** Luis Revuelta?

3           **MR. REVUELTA:** Present.

4           **THE SECRETARY:** Venny Torre?

5           **MR. TORRE:** Here.

6           **THE SECRETARY:** Chip Withers?

7           **MR. WITHERS:** Here.

8           **THE SECRETARY:** Eibi Aizenstat?

9           **CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT:** Here.

10           Notice Regarding Ex Parte Communication,

11           please be advised that this Board is a

12           quasi-judicial board, which requires Board

13           Members to disclose all ex parte communications

14           and site visits. An ex parte communication is

15           defined as any contact, communication,

16           conversation, correspondence, memorandum or

17           written or verbal communication that takes

18           place outside of the public hearing between a

19           member of the public and a member of the

20           quasi-judicial board regarding matters to be

21           heard by the Board. If anyone made any contact

22           with a Board Member regarding an issue before

23           the Board, the Board Member must state, on the

24           record, the existence of the ex parte

25           communication and the party who originated the

Page 5

1 communication. Also, if a Board Member  
 2 conducted a site visit specifically related to  
 3 the case before the Board, the Board Member  
 4 must also disclose such visit. In either case,  
 5 the Board Member must state, on the record,  
 6 whether the ex parte communication or site  
 7 visit will affect the Board Member's ability to  
 8 impartially consider the evidence to be  
 9 presented regarding the matter. The Board  
 10 should also state that his or her decision will  
 11 be based on substantial competent evidence and  
 12 testimony presented on the record today.

13 Does any Member of the Board have such  
 14 communication and/or site visit to disclose at  
 15 this time?

16 MR. BEHAR: No.

17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Swearing in, everyone  
 18 who speaks this evening must complete the  
 19 roster at the podium, please. I'd like to make  
 20 sure everybody has done that who will be  
 21 speaking tonight. We ask that you print  
 22 clearly, so the official records of your name  
 23 and address will be correct.

24 Now, with the exception of attorneys, all  
 25 persons physically in the City Commission

Page 7

1 e-comments for tonight's meeting?

2 THE SECRETARY: No e-comments, but received  
 3 e-mails regarding some of the projects on the  
 4 agenda.

5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. The Clerk will  
 6 be asked to read each e-comment or e-mail into  
 7 the record.

8 The first item is the approval of the  
 9 minutes of August 11, 2021. Anybody would like  
 10 to make a motion?

11 MR. TORRE: I'll make a motion.

12 MR. BEHAR: Second.

13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have a motion.  
 14 Second by Mr. Behar. Any comments?  
 15 No? Having heard none, call the roll,  
 16 please.

17 THE SECRETARY: Claudia Miro?

18 MS. MIRO: Yes.

19 THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?

20 MR. REVUELTA: Yes.

21 THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?

22 MR. TORRE: Yes.

23 THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?

24 MR. WITHERS: Yes.

25 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?

Page 6

1 chamber, who will be speaking on agenda items  
 2 before us this evening, please rise to be sworn  
 3 in and raise your right hand.

4 MR. COLLER: That would include the Staff.

5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: And Staff, please.  
 6 (Thereupon, the participants were sworn or  
 7 affirmed.)

8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you very much.  
 9 Zoom platform participants, I will ask any  
 10 person wishing to speak on tonight's agenda  
 11 items to please open your chat and send a  
 12 direct message to Jill Menendez. Please open  
 13 your chat and send a direct message to Jill  
 14 Menendez, stating you would like to speak  
 15 before the Board, and include your full name  
 16 and item that you would like to speak about.  
 17 Jill will call you when it's your turn.  
 18 Depending on the number of speakers, I ask you  
 19 to be concise, for the interest of time.

20 Phone platform participants, after Zoom  
 21 platform participants are done, I will ask  
 22 phone participants to comment on tonight's  
 23 agenda items. I also ask you to be concise,  
 24 for the interest of time.

25 Jill, the clerk -- did we receive any

Page 8

1 MR. BEHAR: Yes.

2 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat?

3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.

4 The procedure we will use tonight is as  
 5 follows, first, the identification of agenda  
 6 item by Mr. Coller. We will have then a  
 7 presentation by Staff, presentation by the  
 8 applicant or agent. I will then open it to  
 9 public comment, first in chamber, then Zoom  
 10 platform, then the phone line platform.  
 11 Afterwards, we will close the public comment,  
 12 the Board will have a discussion, and a motion,  
 13 more discussion, and a second of motion, if it  
 14 arrives, then Board's final comments and a  
 15 vote. Thank you.

16 Mr. Trias.

17 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to  
 18 request a change in the agenda. E-3, which is  
 19 the discussion of the Mediterranean standards,  
 20 should be first, and I'm also requesting that  
 21 E-4, which is the Home Office Amendment, and  
 22 E-5, which deals with some single-family  
 23 amendments, be postponed to the November 10th  
 24 meeting.

25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I am okay with it, if

Page 9

1 the rest of my fellow Board Members --

2 MR. BEHAR: Which are we postponing, again,

3 I'm sorry?

4 MR. TRIAS: The home office.

5 MR. BEHAR: Okay.

6 MR. TRIAS: And some minor amendments for

7 single-family.

8 MR. BEHAR: I'm okay with that.

9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Is there any objection

10 from any Board Members? No?

11 MR. BEHAR: Do we need a motion for --

12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I don't think so.

13 Mr. Coller, do we need a motion to shift

14 the agenda or is that at discretion?

15 I'm sorry, I was not able to understand.

16 MR. COLLER: Okay. You can do a voice vote

17 on this, if you wish. You're deferring

18 items --

19 THE SECRETARY: E-4 and E-5.

20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: The City is deferring

21 Items E-4 and E-5.

22 MR. COLLER: Oh, they're requesting

23 deferral.

24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: They're requesting

25 deferral and we are changing the agenda to

Page 11

1 "Architecture," Section 5-200, "Mediterranean

2 Standards" and providing for severability,

3 repealer, codification, and for an effective

4 date.

5 Item E-3, public hearing.

6 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, as you know, the

7 City Commission established a Blue Ribbon

8 Committee composed of some very prominent

9 architects. Some of them are here tonight,

10 Chairman Pardo, of course, Willy Bermello, and

11 Mr. Behar, who sits with you on the Board.

12 They have worked very hard trying to come up

13 with some recommendations for the Ordinance, so

14 I would request that they make a presentation,

15 explain the ideas that they have, and then

16 Staff has a brief PowerPoints of some issues

17 that we have raised.

18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

19 I was originally going to ask Mr. Behar to

20 just bring us up to speed. Mr. Pardo, as

21 Chairman, if you're here, if you don't mind

22 coming up and giving us an update and mainly a

23 background as to what went about, how you got

24 here. That would be great and much

25 appreciated.

Page 10

1 bring Mediterranean Bonus first.

2 MR. COLLER: You can do that as a motion.

3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Would anybody like to

4 make a motion?

5 MR. BEHAR: I'll make a motion.

6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Mr. Behar makes a

7 motion.

8 MS. MIRO: Second.

9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have a second. All

10 in favor?

11 (All Board Members voted aye.)

12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Anybody against?

13 Thank you.

14 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, on E-3, as you

15 know, the Commission set up a Blue Ribbon

16 Committee composed of --

17 MR. COLLER: Should I read the title in,

18 Mr. Chairman?

19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes, please.

20 MR. TRIAS: I'm sorry, yes.

21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

22 MR. COLLER: Item E-3, an Ordinance of the

23 City Commission of Coral Gables, Florida

24 providing for text amendments to the City of

25 Coral Gables Official Zoning Code, Article 5,

Page 12

1 Thank you, sir.

2 MR. PARDO: Mr. Chairman, Board Members,

3 thank you very much for the opportunity to be

4 able to speak to you about the proposed

5 changes, what we've been working on for over

6 two months now, and that is to try to modify

7 the Mediterranean Ordinance in such a way that

8 it would be more responsive to the public

9 outcry of some of the more recent projects that

10 were erected here in the City.

11 First of all, I know that Staff has a brief

12 PowerPoint presentation. Since I was here

13 addressing the Commission last night, I wanted

14 to pretty much start off with the PowerPoint

15 presentation that hasn't occurred yet. I was

16 able to get on the website and actually

17 download it and take a look at the thing. And

18 I wanted to bring up a couple of thing that are

19 very, very important. There's a Staff

20 recommendation and then there's the PowerPoint.

21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Would you mind just

22 maybe a little background as to what happened

23 at the Blue Ribbon Committee and so forth?

24 MR. PARDO: Okay. The reason that it was

25 formed --

Page 13

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Please.  
 2 MR. PARDO: -- was that there was a  
 3 Sunshine meeting back in July, and when that --  
 4 I think it was July, and when that occurred,  
 5 there were over 80 citizens, above and beyond  
 6 Staff, at the new police station, and it was  
 7 televised, and, from my understanding, there  
 8 were about 300 people on Zoom watching the  
 9 proceedings, and that was because of the  
 10 dissatisfaction specifically of some of the  
 11 developments that had gone up.  
 12 There was a clear -- there's a clear  
 13 understanding that most people were upset,  
 14 because they thought that the original intent  
 15 of the Med bonuses was not being complied with.  
 16 Staff had the opportunity and made a very nice  
 17 PowerPoint presentation to the public, and what  
 18 happened then was that they listened to  
 19 comments from the public. After Mayor Dorothy  
 20 Thomson spoke, she was the first speaker, and  
 21 she was very much involved, I spoke, and many  
 22 other citizens talked about what had happened  
 23 and what hadn't happened.  
 24 I had -- unfortunately, because of my age,  
 25 I had the unique experience of being involved

Page 15

1 room -- headway, rather, and we were able to  
 2 take a look at the original Med Bonuses  
 3 Ordinance, and then we were able to bring it to  
 4 a certain conclusion.  
 5 During that process, well into it, the  
 6 Commission had asked me to address the  
 7 Commission, at a certain point, which I did, to  
 8 give them an update of where we were. So they  
 9 knew, because the incrementation of the  
 10 moratorium was every 30 days, so we gave them  
 11 an update. They told us to proceed. We did do  
 12 that. Once we had our work pretty much done,  
 13 then we received Staff comments. The Staff  
 14 comments were received the night before a  
 15 Commission Meeting that we were supposed to  
 16 have. There wasn't enough time to be able to  
 17 look at it. And, then, that Commission Meeting  
 18 was deferred. Since then, we were able to then  
 19 address Staff's comments during regular Blue  
 20 Ribbon Committee Board Meetings and we were  
 21 able to move forward on that.  
 22 Then, once we had concluded our work, then  
 23 there were other documents that have been  
 24 provided by Staff, this time, by Legal.  
 25 There's a memorandum. There were all sorts of

Page 14

1 in -- at the very beginning, before the  
 2 Ordinance actually came into play, and that --  
 3 in that particular meeting, I explained what  
 4 the intent was and how it had transformed  
 5 itself to something other than that. Much was  
 6 talked about, a couple of buildings, two or  
 7 three buildings, that have all of the ire of  
 8 most of the citizens, so, therefore, after that  
 9 meeting that evening, there was a Commission  
 10 Meeting here in this chamber, and at that  
 11 point, the Commission went ahead and  
 12 implemented a building moratorium for projects  
 13 that were being awarded Med bonuses.  
 14 At that -- in the same Commission Meeting,  
 15 then the Blue Ribbon Committee was formed.  
 16 Each one of the Commissioners had an  
 17 appointment. I requested and the Commissioners  
 18 granted the City Architect and a representative  
 19 of the Board of Architects be included, which  
 20 provided seven members, which was great, all  
 21 being registered seasoned architects.  
 22 Therefore, after that started, we got  
 23 together, and it's not always easy to get  
 24 everyone to agree on anything, and  
 25 surprisingly, we actually made very good head

Page 16

1 things that had not been made available to all  
 2 of the Blue Ribbon Committee members, and then  
 3 I was given a copy. I reviewed those comments.  
 4 I have not sat down with the City Attorney to  
 5 discuss them yet, but we were able to air that  
 6 out at yesterday's meeting.  
 7 So, during the meeting yesterday, it gave a  
 8 very general understanding and lay of the land  
 9 of where we were at this particular point. We  
 10 did not take the red line comments that the  
 11 City Attorney's -- Assistant City Attorney Gus  
 12 Ceballos had -- kept meticulous notes and  
 13 amended the Ordinance during this entire time.  
 14 We were given these updates. We discussed the  
 15 updates and we kept going, and we pushed it to  
 16 the point that we got to exactly where we  
 17 wanted to be.  
 18 So I did not go through it line item by  
 19 line item, because although it was time certain  
 20 at five o'clock yesterday, we got out of there  
 21 by seven o'clock, and that was not going  
 22 through it line item by line item, but the  
 23 Commission wanted to move forward, to go before  
 24 -- for us to go before the Planning Board, to  
 25 be able to see and air any particular major

Page 17

1 issues from these proposed changes and then,  
 2 from there, take whatever issues the Planning  
 3 Board comes up with, and then bring them to  
 4 their attention, in a Workshop that we're going  
 5 to have with the Commission, to be able to go  
 6 in through the line item by line item. Is that  
 7 clear enough?  
 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Please. Yeah, thank  
 9 you.  
 10 MR. PARDO: So, the first thing, you know,  
 11 I want to let you know is that the Committee  
 12 was unique, because it was not a cross  
 13 reference of other professions. It was all  
 14 architects, seasoned architects. So it was  
 15 good, because these are the people that  
 16 actually use the Code, and put the things  
 17 together, and then end up with the final  
 18 products.  
 19 So I think you have in your documents, from  
 20 what I saw online, I think you have the red  
 21 line comments, you have the strike-throughs --  
 22 you have the strike-throughs of the original  
 23 verbiage, and we ended up with the final draft,  
 24 that was given to us back on the 1st of  
 25 October, from the City Attorney's Office, from

Page 19

1 building. And that started the new  
 2 Mediterranean revival in Commercial buildings  
 3 in the City. This was in answer to some other  
 4 of the designs that had gone up recently, from  
 5 the mid '60s, to about that time, glass block  
 6 buildings, concrete ritualistic architecture,  
 7 all permitted in the Commercial area.  
 8 So, one of the things that was discussed,  
 9 was that there was a requirement for bonuses,  
 10 because of the cost of construction, of doing  
 11 something that was much more elaborate than  
 12 some of the other projects that had really had  
 13 to cut back a lot, and you see that in history,  
 14 you see it in the Art Deco area in South Beach,  
 15 and that was a direct response to the economy  
 16 and certain other things.  
 17 So, moving a little faster forward, those  
 18 bonuses of additional FAR and other things were  
 19 implemented at that time to be able to off-set  
 20 the cost to be able to provide a certain style  
 21 of architecture in the Commercial areas.  
 22 So, now moving forward to some of the  
 23 discontent, there are a couple of project that  
 24 have been built on the Highway, on the Circle,  
 25 that are just either too massive, not

Page 18

1 Gus Ceballos.  
 2 And the other thing is, with me here today  
 3 is, of course, Willy Bermello, who's one of the  
 4 Committee Members, a distinguished architect,  
 5 and also Robert Behar, who sits on the Planning  
 6 Board. So we have three of the seven members  
 7 here present tonight.  
 8 Now, that being said, I'm giving you the  
 9 gist of what the changes were, and that is that  
 10 we went back and we were able to implement a  
 11 lot of the original intent, a lot of the  
 12 original intent of the original Mediterranean  
 13 Ordinance. This all started back in the mid  
 14 '80s, when we were doing a building on Ponce  
 15 and Almeria, and it ended up that we had to  
 16 tear it down, because of structural issues that  
 17 it had. It was called the Old Lock (phonetic)  
 18 Showroom. Lock Showroom is historic, and that  
 19 was basically a heart attack for a lot of  
 20 people in the community.  
 21 We were able to tear it down, come before  
 22 the Commission, and get certain dispensation to  
 23 be able to build what is today on the corner of  
 24 Ponce and Almeria, which used to be the Bank of  
 25 Coral Gables, which is today an Amtrust

Page 20

1 transitional enough, not compatible enough to  
 2 surrounding areas and neighborhoods, just  
 3 complete -- some of them completely out of  
 4 scale and don't provide certain things that  
 5 should have been provided.  
 6 So one of the things that we did is that,  
 7 in the Code today, there's Section 5-02, which  
 8 delineates in two sections, A and B, delineates  
 9 certain factors that the Board of Architects  
 10 are responsible for reviewing all designs of  
 11 all construction here in the City. These are  
 12 great tools that exist there in that section.  
 13 The funny thing is that, in the Coral Gables  
 14 Mediterranean section, there's no reference to  
 15 the 5-02 section that's been placed in there.  
 16 The other thing is that the intent -- when  
 17 you look at the markups, the intent and the  
 18 purpose of this particular section are  
 19 delineated very, very clearly and have been  
 20 brought back to the original intent.  
 21 Now, the reason I say that is, because what  
 22 happens is that, we've had a few consultants  
 23 re-write the Code for us. This is the first  
 24 time that we've got a group of just architects  
 25 re-writing the Code for you, at no charge. And

Page 21

1 the point was that, because we use it, because  
 2 we understand, and having seven of us, it's a  
 3 lot more exact than possibly, you know, a  
 4 consultant not understanding or just not  
 5 following through on the other part. So the  
 6 intent was clarified.

7 Then, very brief, and, again, that ship has  
 8 sailed, we clarified the purpose and  
 9 applicability. We also brought in a certain  
 10 process, that doesn't exist -- and by the way,  
 11 if you're keeping score, Section 5-201A is  
 12 where the clarity and purpose and ability is.  
 13 So it's broken down into two sections. One is  
 14 the style of the architecture and then the  
 15 other are the amenities, which are pedestrian  
 16 amenities, and applicability.

17 Then, on page -- Section 5-02, Page 5-02,  
 18 under Special Location Site Plans, that's where  
 19 you have Special Site Plans, such as PADs,  
 20 Planned Area Development. And by the way, our  
 21 charge was to really concentrate just on Med  
 22 bonus, not to stray from there. Legal was very  
 23 specific, and that's what we were supposed to  
 24 do. There are other issues in the Code, many  
 25 issues in the Code, but we're only going to

Page 23

1 happening, that we -- I personally interviewed  
 2 past employees that had to do with development  
 3 and also volunteers that had served on the  
 4 Board of Architects -- I mean, I sat on the  
 5 Board of Architects -- I chaired the Board of  
 6 Architects. I sat on a bunch of boards,  
 7 including this Planning Board, that I chaired,  
 8 but the point was that it was important to  
 9 understand that sometimes, by the time the  
 10 Board of Architects got a design, as I had said  
 11 several times, the souffles was already cooked.  
 12 You can't just add salt and pepper to the  
 13 souffle. You've got to do it while you're  
 14 still cooking.

15 So we came up with the concept of having a  
 16 conceptual approval. Right now, if you have a  
 17 PAD, you have to go to the DRC first. Once you  
 18 go to the DRC, you have to prepare a lot of  
 19 technical documents, because it's more -- the  
 20 DRC, and in other municipalities are called a  
 21 TAC, Technical Advisory Committee, and  
 22 basically that's what the DRC is, a Technical  
 23 Advisory Committee. They have fire, you have  
 24 building, you have Public Works, you have all  
 25 of these people. You spend a lot of money on

Page 22

1 concentrate on this tonight.

2 But on the PAD portion of it, it's very  
 3 important, because once you take properties,  
 4 like the size of a block, and you start to  
 5 accumulate, and once you hit the magic 43,560  
 6 square feet, which is one acre of land, you go  
 7 into the PAD. Now, the PAD is very specific.  
 8 What the PAD says is that, you're able now to  
 9 use your design ingenuity, but you cannot stray  
 10 from the underlying Zoning Code.

11 So if that entire block has one Zoning,  
 12 that's great, but if it has multiple Zonings,  
 13 well, you have to be careful. Now, what the  
 14 PAD does say specifically is that you're able  
 15 to take density and move it around, but there  
 16 are at least 20 different examples, where it  
 17 says that the underlying Zoning governs. Now,  
 18 there is a little bit of flexibility in there  
 19 to be able to reward good design.

20 So we addressed that in Page 5-02, which  
 21 this is the Special Location. We also added a  
 22 step that did not exist. Right now, when you  
 23 have a development, you go before the Board of  
 24 Architects for preliminary approval, and then  
 25 you go through final approval. What was

Page 24

1 the design with the architect and its  
 2 consulting engineers that have to provide all  
 3 of this technical information, and that design  
 4 is already completely inflexible by the time  
 5 the Board of Architects sees it for the first  
 6 time, which is for the preliminary review.

7 The other thing that happened, and I'm sure  
 8 Mr. Trias would disagree with me, is that many  
 9 times, during the presentation, when the Board  
 10 of Architects are reviewing plans, they were  
 11 sometimes told, no, you can't look at that,  
 12 because that's Zoning, or you can't look at  
 13 this, because it's Zoning, or you can't look at  
 14 that, because it's Zoning. Zoning is Zoning,  
 15 and Legal is right, the Zoning is on the land  
 16 and that's what it says, and, period, end of  
 17 story, but if you go to the design section of  
 18 5-02, where it tells you that you can opine on  
 19 massing, on step backs, on proportions, on all  
 20 of these different things -- there are twenty  
 21 items there -- and they're very clear, and  
 22 that's part of the pallet that the architect  
 23 has to be able to review something and say,  
 24 well, it's out of scale or not out of scale.

25 Some buildings had the step backs in the

Page 25

1 wrong proportions, et cetera, but then I was  
 2 told, by architects that have sat on the Board  
 3 of Architects recently, well, we were told we  
 4 can't do or say anything about that. Now, at  
 5 least that was the perception that they had.  
 6 So I'm not trying to cast any aspersions on any  
 7 Staff member or any Board of Architects member,  
 8 or anyone at all, except the fact that that's  
 9 an important part of how we review it. So,  
 10 therefore, this is an essential part that has  
 11 been added to the section, and I want you to  
 12 understand that there's a huge difference  
 13 between conceptual and preliminary and final,  
 14 very, very different.

15 The third thing, Page 5-02, we brought  
 16 Historical more into proper context. Now,  
 17 there were concepts that were brought in, such  
 18 as the view shed concept, that were taken out,  
 19 because it was more about compatibility. And  
 20 this has to do with buildings that are  
 21 considered historical, because they've been  
 22 designated as historical.

23 The second thing is that, originally, years  
 24 ago, a previous Commission adopted the City  
 25 Plan, in other words, the shape of the plan

Page 27

1 awarded, and it was a very specific question,  
 2 because we had -- between the seven of us, we  
 3 had a disagreement -- I can't tell you if it  
 4 was the majority, I can't tell you if it was  
 5 the minority, but there was a disagreement, and  
 6 I have to respect that. We could respectfully  
 7 disagree, but at the end of the day, I  
 8 understand, because we should be rewarding  
 9 great architecture.

10 But, in this particular case, this is  
 11 called the Coral Gables Mediterranean Bonuses,  
 12 Mediterranean Style Bonuses, so, therefore, I  
 13 asked the Commission, point blank, at that  
 14 meeting, and they unanimously said,  
 15 Mediterranean Bonuses for Mediterranean style  
 16 architecture. So that was the end of the  
 17 story. So that was incorporated on Page 565-02  
 18 and clarified that it was Coral Gables  
 19 Mediterranean Style Development Bonuses. Now,  
 20 that doesn't mean that -- there are other  
 21 styles, and many times you're talking about, in  
 22 the Commercial Districts, that shouldn't be  
 23 award winning designs that we all can agree are  
 24 magnificent. So I think that's a -- maybe  
 25 that's a thought, and a different chapter that

Page 26

1 that George Merrick, our founder, came up with,  
 2 and they adopted it and said, "This has to be  
 3 preserved." So both of these things have been  
 4 added in there, clearly, into this change, and  
 5 it's very important.

6 So one of the concerns, of course, was,  
 7 well, if you have compatibility with historic  
 8 buildings, you're going to be taking away  
 9 development rights from a developer. Not so.  
 10 The key is, sometimes that building just has to  
 11 have a better relationship with the proposed  
 12 building, and that the Board of Architects can  
 13 do, but what we did, as a safeguard is, we  
 14 threw Planning to review it, we threw Historic  
 15 to review it, and then we threw the Board of  
 16 Architects to review it. So between the three  
 17 entities, you're probably going to have a  
 18 Historic building that now has been given the  
 19 proper respect that it should have, without  
 20 taking property rights away from the developer.

21 On the bonus standards, during the meeting  
 22 for the update with the Commission, I had to  
 23 ask the Commission a specific question, and  
 24 that had to do with what the general  
 25 understanding of why the bonuses were being

Page 28

1 doesn't exist right now. So not to muddy the  
 2 waters, this is what we're talking about today,  
 3 Med Bonuses.

4 The other thing was that there was an issue  
 5 with the way that the tables had been set up  
 6 over time and there had been many revisions  
 7 over time of the Med Bonus Ordinance and many  
 8 of the components that make up the Med Bonus  
 9 Ordinance. So, one of the things is that, some  
 10 of the bonuses or some of the items in these  
 11 tables were inconsequential, some of them just  
 12 didn't belong there, not to have the importance  
 13 that had to do with the bonus or even what they  
 14 call the Standards, which is Table 1.

15 So we consolidated the tables and we ended  
 16 up with seven items per Table 2. So we have  
 17 Table 1, which is part of your -- to get the  
 18 first bonus, which is a .2 FAR and one floor of  
 19 height, then you must comply with the style and  
 20 everything that's on that Table 1. And, then,  
 21 to get to the next level, which is the  
 22 Development Level 2 or bonuses, then you get an  
 23 additional .3, and then you also get an  
 24 additional floor, and if it's a high-rise, an  
 25 additional two floors.

Page 29

1 So that being said, we consolidated Table  
 2 2, which had the pedestrian amenities, and then  
 3 we made them obligatory, but we left language  
 4 there, "as determined by the Board of  
 5 Architects," because, for example, one of the  
 6 things is underground parking. Not every  
 7 project is going to have underground parking,  
 8 but it's there, but if underground parking is  
 9 not possible or they can provide parking  
 10 without having to go underground, therefore,  
 11 the Board of Architects can determine that  
 12 that's not necessary. But what we did is,  
 13 instead of saying, you know, four out of eight  
 14 or six out of twelve, we say, you have to  
 15 comply with all of them.

16 Then the third table, which gave tremendous  
 17 amounts of -- I wouldn't call it relief, but  
 18 just basically gave all sorts of indifference  
 19 to setbacks, all of that was taken out, and we  
 20 rewrote that Table 3, which is properly called  
 21 now Other Options, and we rewrote it in such a  
 22 way that when you have, Number One, building  
 23 setback reductions, depending on the type of  
 24 lot that you have, sometimes being double  
 25 frontage lots, sometimes being lots that are

Page 31

1 public meetings about, "Well, what happens with  
 2 the massing? The massing is going to be  
 3 greater, because these are larger units."  
 4 Think about it, the largest component of  
 5 massing is parking. So if you have less units,  
 6 you have less parking. So, therefore, you have  
 7 less massing. So it's a real win-win  
 8 situation, because instead of going in, like in  
 9 the City of Miami, where they have micro units  
 10 of 400 square feet or workforce housing, as in  
 11 Miami Beach, you have less units and that  
 12 provides the ability of someone that's  
 13 downsizing in the City to hit a hole in the  
 14 market.

15 MR. TORRE: Mr. Pardo, can I interrupt you?  
 16 I'm sorry. And I'm sorry to interrupt you.  
 17 I'm thinking, you're going into the specifics  
 18 of the recommendations a little bit and so  
 19 forth. I would like to see a little bit more  
 20 discussion on a higher end first, about  
 21 understanding where this is needed, where the  
 22 faults are, the function of the Board, just so  
 23 I can get a better grasp on all of that, before  
 24 you present the proposals.

25 MR. PARDO: Your interruption was perfect

Page 30

1 very, very difficult, as long as you meet the  
 2 urban context, then they can be issued there,  
 3 but it's much tighter than it was before,  
 4 because before it was like, you could bring it  
 5 down to zero, you could do it anywhere. I've  
 6 seen buildings where the columns are into the  
 7 sidewalk. And we took out certain things that  
 8 had to do with the right-of-ways and hanging  
 9 into the right-of-ways and doing all sorts of  
 10 things that were encumbering the views for  
 11 people, because they were encroaching into the  
 12 right-of-ways.

13 Now, the second thing that was added into  
 14 Other Options was something very unique, and  
 15 that is that we added another .55-02 as long as  
 16 you had the ability of reducing density.  
 17 That's never been done before. So, in other  
 18 words, what we were doing is rewarding larger  
 19 units in these buildings, as long as you met  
 20 certain things. In other words, if you reduced  
 21 the density by one-half, we'll give you more  
 22 FAR, in order for you then to provide larger  
 23 units. So by having larger units, you have  
 24 less density.

25 Now, a question was asked during one of the

Page 32

1 timing, because I just --

2 MR. TORRE: Okay. I just haven't gotten  
 3 the whole ball of wax still in my head, where  
 4 we are, where we're having a fault.

5 MR. PARDO: And the thing is, the reason  
 6 is, the Chair asked for specifics, I gave him  
 7 the specifics. Sorry to be longwinded. But  
 8 the point is that, I got to the last table,  
 9 which is Table 3, and the rest of it has to do,  
 10 of course, with the characteristics of certain  
 11 buildings, eight buildings. We just rewrote  
 12 certain things.

13 There's just one more item that I just  
 14 remembered right now, because these are the  
 15 conceptual items that are superseding -- and we  
 16 did change word by word, which means all sorts  
 17 of things when you change words a certain  
 18 way -- and that is two items. The first one is  
 19 that one of the problems that we had with a  
 20 specific project in the City of Coral Gables,  
 21 what was approved by the Board of Architects  
 22 and what was built were completely different,  
 23 massively different, which caused all sorts of  
 24 issues. And one of the things that we wrote in  
 25 is that the City Architect will be responsible



1 to review, that project that has been awarded  
 2 Mediterranean bonuses, to make sure that it  
 3 complies with the approved plans, and, if not,  
 4 they have to go in for a revision, not  
 5 administratively, but back to the Board of  
 6 Architects for that. It's very, very  
 7 important, because there was a lot of heartburn  
 8 with a specific building in this City.

9 And the last item actually has to do with a  
 10 comment that was made yesterday, which also  
 11 Legal brought up the comment, and that has to  
 12 do with the discrepancy that has to do with  
 13 height that is in your package. You have a  
 14 memorandum -- the City Manager is in the  
 15 audience -- that was sent to the City Manager,  
 16 dated October 6th, and the Commission had that  
 17 same -- that same --

18 MR. BEHAR: Mr. Chair, if may interrupt  
 19 Mr. Pardo a second. On that particular item,  
 20 after being present in the Commission meeting  
 21 yesterday, maybe we should get an explanation  
 22 first from the City Attorney.

23 MR. PARDO: I would like to do that, and I  
 24 would like to do that as soon as I distribute  
 25 this, because one of the problems that

1 the Commission, yes, sir, very specifically.  
 2 Today is my wife's birthday, so it better be  
 3 good.

4 So, anyway, this first page, it was a one  
 5 page memorandum that was given to the Manager,  
 6 and, in there, I underlined, it says, "An  
 7 amendment of this height would be a significant  
 8 change of the adopted policy." This was done  
 9 in an Ordinance called 2014-13, which is  
 10 underlined underneath. So this is like a  
 11 partial.

12 The reason I think is important is, the  
 13 next page is the copy of the Ordinance that was  
 14 done in 2004. That's just the front page, so  
 15 you see what the reference is.

16 Then you go to the next page, and that's  
 17 the one that's not there. In other words, it's  
 18 referring to a 50-foot height there, and it's  
 19 important to understand that this applies to  
 20 certain Zonings. The other heights, the  
 21 Mid-Rise and the High-Rise, the issuance of the  
 22 bonuses, the mathematical equation, is correct,  
 23 and I said it then and I'll say it now, if you  
 24 go to the previous page, the next to the last  
 25 page, you'll see underlined -- this was the

1 occurred, and maybe to the City Attorney, was  
 2 that Staff provided one page, and I provided  
 3 the memorandum. I highlighted in color for the  
 4 Board Members, which I want to introduce, to  
 5 give it to you, and I just wanted to say a word  
 6 before the City Attorney said something. Maybe  
 7 I'm wrong in my opinion. If you can indulge  
 8 me, Mr. Behar.

9 MR. BEHAR: Sure, because I would like  
 10 Mr. Bermello to speak, that he was part of the  
 11 Committee, give him a couple of minutes to  
 12 speak, as well.

13 MR. WITHERS: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

15 Mr. Pardo, I would like to ask you a  
 16 question, for the record. You are here  
 17 speaking now on behalf and as Chairman of the  
 18 Blue Ribbon Committee and not personal, right?

19 MR. PARDO: As instructed by the  
 20 Commission, yes, sir.

21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: But my question is,  
 22 you are here right now speaking on behalf of  
 23 the Blue Ribbon Committee, as the Chairman; is  
 24 that correct?

25 MR. PARDO: Yes. Yes. As instructed by

1 part that the City Manager did not receive this  
 2 part, that the Commission did not receive, and  
 3 I don't think the City Attorney received it,  
 4 but if you read that last sentence, under B, on  
 5 the next to the last page, it says, "The  
 6 allowable floors are subject to the subject  
 7 property applicable CLUP map designation, and  
 8 the height is regulated by the Zoning Code."

9 The Zoning Code, in all of these zonings,  
 10 that are the lower tier Zonings, is 45 5-02  
 11 feet, and when you do the math you don't start  
 12 with 50 feet, you start with 45 5-02 feet.  
 13 Now, in my opinion -- in my opinion, although  
 14 this was not done by Mr. Trias, this was done  
 15 17 years ago, this has to be corrected, and it  
 16 has to be corrected for a specific reason,  
 17 because it gives the wrong impression, that  
 18 height is based on the CLUP. That is a hundred  
 19 percent wrong. It's based on the Zoning Code.

20 If this Board and the Commission wants to  
 21 change the Zoning Code from 45 5-02 feet to 50  
 22 feet, that's fine with me, as long as everybody  
 23 goes in with their eyes open. The problem that  
 24 I've seen with this incorrect interpretation is  
 25 that when you go into some of these Mixed-Use

1 Zoning areas and you add an additional 5-02  
 2 feet, that doesn't seem like it's a lot,  
 3 although it's 10 percent of 45 or just about,  
 4 is that you could put in another floor. So  
 5 instead of having, really, two floors, if you  
 6 meet the Med Bonus of Level 1, and Level 2 and  
 7 having two floors, because the Comprehensive  
 8 Land Use Plan is silent on the amount of  
 9 floors, that particular Zoning, you could sneak  
 10 another floor in there, and, really, it doesn't  
 11 hurt you, except now you're able to put more  
 12 density in there. So words mean things and  
 13 numbers mean things, too. So that's why it's  
 14 important to get this right.

15 And that concludes my presentation.

16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Just a question, so  
 17 this sheet that you gave us with the underline  
 18 and so forth was discussed at the Blue Ribbon  
 19 with all of the Committee Members?

20 MR. PARDO: This -- no.

21 MR. BEHAR: No, it wasn't. This is -- no.

22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So this is your  
 23 opinion?

24 MR. PARDO: No. No. No. No. No.

25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I'm confused, then,

1 It's all about the math, and the point is that  
 2 I've already seen other projects already come  
 3 up, where instead of going from four to six  
 4 floors, now they're going from four to seven  
 5 floors, because they're using the height and  
 6 they're starting off at 50 feet, and that  
 7 difference is 50 feet.

8 And there was some discussion yesterday  
 9 about, they said, "Mr. Pardo, you know, don't  
 10 you think, you know, the height between the  
 11 floors is -- the higher it is, the better it  
 12 is?"

13 "Oh, sure, as long as you don't stick  
 14 another floor in there. From a living  
 15 standpoint, sure, you know, nine feet,  
 16 nine-and-a-half feet, that's great, just make  
 17 sure that you don't stick another floor and  
 18 then reduce it," because now that has nothing  
 19 to do with quality of life.

20 And the same thing is that, when it came to  
 21 retail, they also asked to raise the height --  
 22 under the consultant, raise the height to 15  
 23 feet for the Commercial areas. I agree a  
 24 hundred percent with it. I don't have a  
 25 problem with that. I'm just trying to get this

1 I'm sorry.

2 MR. PARDO: So there's no mistake --

3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Please.

4 MR. PARDO: -- this memorandum was issued  
 5 recently, in this past week. The Blue Ribbon  
 6 Committee has not met yet, but because it says  
 7 clearly here that an amendment of height --  
 8 this is the Blue Ribbon Committee's work,  
 9 because we did say, fix the math, and we did  
 10 agree to make it 455-02 and then add it based  
 11 on that. That's in our final version dated  
 12 October 1st, but what this memorandum does, it  
 13 almost negates, don't change it, because the  
 14 Blue Ribbon Committee is wrong. I'm just  
 15 saying, here is --

16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So you're saying City  
 17 Staff is wrong?

18 MR. PARDO: No. I'm saying -- well, I'm  
 19 saying, clearly --

20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: It's yes or no.

21 MR. PARDO: Yes, City Staff is wrong, and I  
 22 stand by that, and I provided this information  
 23 for your consideration, because the point is  
 24 that we're not changing the heights or the  
 25 heights of the bonuses or anything like that.

1 right, because, you know what, if you don't do  
 2 bonuses, you're restricted to 45, you're not  
 3 restricted to 50 feet. So, therefore, I just  
 4 wanted -- and the reason, Mr. Chair, I brought  
 5 it up, is because this was one of the points  
 6 that was discussed yesterday and I wanted to  
 7 set the record straight, and I'll set the  
 8 record straight directly to the Commission the  
 9 next time I see them, but I just wanted to make  
 10 sure that there's no misunderstanding by the  
 11 Planning & Zoning Board, because it's important  
 12 that we get it right.

13 MR. BEHAR: I need to address that,  
 14 Mr. Chair --

15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Please.

16 MR. BEHAR: -- because I respectfully --  
 17 and Mr. Pardo said something at the very  
 18 beginning, which is very true, it was a great  
 19 committee. We disagreed substantially on a lot  
 20 of the items, and I think, you know, he will  
 21 attest that I did disagree a lot of the time.

22 I went back, because I was yesterday very  
 23 concerned with, you know, what was mentioned at  
 24 the Commission, and I believe, and I disagree  
 25 with you, that the Zoning Code is the one that

Page 41

1 guides it. I try to go back, and in a lot of  
 2 municipalities, the Comprehensive Plan is the  
 3 one that sets the height. I believe, not  
 4 Staff -- I believe that this document that says  
 5 the Zoning Code, "Regulated by the Zoning  
 6 Code," is incorrect, and that was done. That's  
 7 my opinion. That's why I wanted the City  
 8 Attorney to clear up this matter.

9 MR. PARDO: Okay.

10 MR. BEHAR: If I understood it -- and the  
 11 reason we went along, you know, a lot of the  
 12 Committee Members, is that you made a great  
 13 point, a presentation, that the 45 5-02 feet,  
 14 but when I went back -- when I go back and I  
 15 look further, I don't believe the Zoning Code  
 16 is the guiding force behind this.

17 So I want the City Attorney to clear that  
 18 up before, you know, we even look at it any  
 19 further.

20 MR. PARDO: The Comprehensive Land Use Plan  
 21 is a ceiling. It's a ceiling, from density to  
 22 everything else. You could have single-family,  
 23 where it is possible to build 200 units per  
 24 acre, but the single-family Zoning and all of  
 25 the instructions are crystal clear. That's the

Page 43

1 submit it to the State for approval, and that's  
 2 how the Comprehensive Land Use Plan was  
 3 created.

4 So what it did was, at that point, we  
 5 didn't have a ceiling, but we had Zoning in  
 6 place, and that ceiling had to do with a  
 7 calculation and an understanding of what the  
 8 infrastructure could -- the infrastructure  
 9 that's provided in the municipality could take.

10 Now, sometimes there have been issues, from  
 11 a Growth Management Act standpoint, that all of  
 12 a sudden you painted yourself into the corner,  
 13 and, then, all of a sudden, you can't develop  
 14 anymore. One of them, for example, is traffic.  
 15 So what the County did to resolve the traffic  
 16 issue many years ago, was that they said,  
 17 everything that's within the Palmetto  
 18 Expressway is exempt from Level F, traffic in  
 19 certain roads, certain arteries, Level D. You  
 20 were not supposed to be able to pull a permit  
 21 unless you had at least a Level C.

22 So the way they fixed the problem was, they  
 23 said, well, because of infrastructure and  
 24 because of mass transit, everything that's  
 25 inside the Palmetto, which runs east-west and

Page 42

1 only thing you could do. So you can go through  
 2 a change of Zoning, but you can only go up to  
 3 the ceiling. You can't go beyond the ceiling.

4 Now, if you wanted to go beyond the ceiling  
 5 and you want to change the ceiling, then you  
 6 have to change the Comprehensive Land Use Plan,  
 7 but we're guided, a hundred percent, by the  
 8 Zoning Code, when it comes to that. The Zoning  
 9 Code has to comply within, not to, but within  
 10 the ceiling of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan,  
 11 and that's the way it's done everywhere.

12 MR. BEHAR: But the Comprehensive Plan is  
 13 guided by the State level, not at a local  
 14 level, right?

15 MR. PARDO: That's correct. The reason --

16 MR. BEHAR: They're even more restrictive  
 17 than the local.

18 MR. PARDO: Right. And by the way, that  
 19 did not exist many, many years ago, because  
 20 when I was a young man, it didn't exist,  
 21 because the Growth Management Act, which is a  
 22 State Act, came into play, and it had all sorts  
 23 of things. And, here, in the City of Coral  
 24 Gables, I remember clearly, it was a foot raise  
 25 to get our information ready to be able to

Page 44

1 then north-south, going to the Bay, all of the  
 2 way to the Beach, is exempt, and that's how  
 3 sometimes the governmental agency can resolve  
 4 certain issues. But by the way, that had to be  
 5 approved by the State, and they were able to  
 6 make a very good argument for it, so we  
 7 wouldn't have to stop.

8 So I am sure that the City Attorney has  
 9 their own opinion, but I'm telling you right  
 10 now, the Comprehensive Land Use Plan is the  
 11 limit and the Zoning Code is what you have to  
 12 design by, and if you want to change the Zoning  
 13 Code, you're allowed to, within the limit, and  
 14 sometimes you want to change both, the Zoning  
 15 Code and the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, and  
 16 that's why you have Land Use attorneys.

17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

18 MR. PARDO: Thank you.

19 MR. BERMELLO: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner  
 20 Withers, Members of the Board, Willy Bermello,  
 21 address 718 Valencia Avenue. I'm one of the  
 22 Blue Ribbon Committee members. And I ask this  
 23 Board today to consider deferring this item,  
 24 for one very important reason.

25 This item is going to be Workshopped by the

Page 45

1 Commission at a time certain that I'm sure the  
 2 City Manager will inform you of, and I would  
 3 recommend that to do justice to the work of six  
 4 weeks, by five architects, the City Architect  
 5 and the Members of the Board of Architecture,  
 6 to try to do that in an hour or two, I think,  
 7 will fall short. I would recommend that this  
 8 Board join the City Commission Staff at that  
 9 time certain, where we plan to go item by item,  
 10 word by word, comma, period, punctuation marks,  
 11 style, substance, all of the above, and the  
 12 idea is that you get a consolidated amended  
 13 proposal, that you can adopt by full consent of  
 14 this Board, where you're not presented with a  
 15 red line version, and then two minority  
 16 opinions, one from the City Attorney and one  
 17 from the City Staff.

18 So there's been a lot of good work, and I  
 19 think it will do no service, neither to us, the  
 20 Board Members of that Committee, including my  
 21 colleague, Mr. Behar, City Staff or the others,  
 22 to try to cherry-pick particular items, knowing  
 23 full well that the Commission has voted to have  
 24 a full Workshop, to roll up our sleeves, invite  
 25 the public, and go item by item. I would not

Page 47

1 well, or the Committee -- there's nothing that  
 2 is being proposed that is illegal. There's  
 3 nothing where I'm coming out and saying, "Wait,  
 4 you can't do that." That's not what the memo  
 5 is.

6 The memo is highlighting changes that could  
 7 either increase our chances of being challenged  
 8 or decrease our chances of defending a  
 9 challenge, and that the big picture items are,  
 10 definitions are very important. There's at  
 11 least one or two sections that I think need to  
 12 be defined; factors like unbridled discretion  
 13 by any Board is problematic. There's well  
 14 settled case law on that. So, it's fine to  
 15 have some subjectivity, but we need to have  
 16 some factors to guide the Board and for us to  
 17 be able to defend a challenge, that those  
 18 factors were, in fact, followed.

19 And the third thing, with regard to height,  
 20 as Mr. Pardo was talking about, I don't have an  
 21 opinion about how that got there. Mr. Trias  
 22 has done significant research and can walk you  
 23 through, I think, 30 years of how we got to  
 24 where the height is. I agree with Mr. Pardo  
 25 that the Comp Plan is the ceiling and the

Page 46

1 preempt that process. What I would recommend  
 2 procedurally is to join that process and then  
 3 let it come back to you, let it come back to  
 4 you following that Workshop, so that you can  
 5 endorse something that the entire community  
 6 feels really good about, Staff, you know, Blue  
 7 Ribbon Committee, City Attorney, and that would  
 8 be my recommendation. Otherwise I think it  
 9 sends the wrong message.

10 So thank you very much for considering us,  
 11 and we're here for any questions.

12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

13 Before we go to Craig, I'd like to ask the  
 14 City Attorney if you would please come up and  
 15 speak to what Mr. Pardo has spoken about and  
 16 attested to.

17 MS. RAMOS: Good evening, Mr. Chair. Good  
 18 evening, Members of the Board. It's my  
 19 pleasure to be here with you tonight. A  
 20 clarification, what I said in my memo about the  
 21 might was, I was pointing to the Commission --  
 22 and it's an important point about my memo and I  
 23 made this clear to the Members of the  
 24 Commission in the e-mail I sent to all of you  
 25 today, and to the Members of the Board, as

Page 48

1 Zoning Code is the floor. All I'm doing is  
 2 highlighting for the Commission, because it was  
 3 on First Reading yesterday -- obviously, it  
 4 didn't pass, but it could have -- is, you are,  
 5 in fact, reducing height. So just know that  
 6 that can call a challenge.

7 That was the only point that I was making.  
 8 The history of how we got to this point, I'll  
 9 hand over to Mr. Trias.

10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

11 MR. TORRE: Mr. Chair, I'd like --

12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes, sir.

13 MR. TORRE: I want to make a point and I  
 14 have a different point of view than  
 15 Mr. Bermello, and I tried to make that point a  
 16 little bit earlier. Everybody is honing in on  
 17 these red lines and the specifics of the  
 18 changes and so forth. So this Board and this  
 19 City needs to hear, what is the problem we're  
 20 trying to fix? The first thing the Mayor asked  
 21 Mr. Trias yesterday, "Give me your  
 22 recommendation. Tell me what's going on."

23 We need to have a discussion of where is  
 24 the problem here, why did we get here, what are  
 25 we trying to get to. You're already zeroing in

1 on these red lines, and I think we haven't even  
2 discussed where the problem really sits, where  
3 do you believe the problem sits, what's wrong  
4 with the Board as a whole, and things like  
5 that. I think those general conversations by  
6 this Board need to be had, regardless of  
7 whether we vote today or review the red lines.  
8 I think we need to have a discussion of how we  
9 feel here about what is being tried to be  
10 corrected. That's my point of view on this.

11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

12 MR. TRIAS: So, Mr. Chairman, I want to  
13 thank Mr. Pardo for his passion and conviction.  
14 I know that he means what he's saying and he  
15 believes that it's correct, and I also want to  
16 thank Mr. Bermello, because my recommendation  
17 is the same as his, and we also recommend  
18 deferral, for slightly different reasons, but  
19 at the end of the day, it's the same idea.

20 I also want to thank, of course, the City  
21 Attorney, for her memo, which speaks for  
22 itself, and I think -- I have a PowerPoint.  
23 I'll go through it as quickly as I can, to give  
24 you some sense, but in my view, what I told the  
25 Committee several times, the Code is not the

1 problem. The problem is the implementation  
2 that happens, and we have to do it better.  
3 That has to do with the Board of Architects,  
4 with Staff review, with the applicants, et  
5 cetera. So that was my view.

6 My view is that the Code -- we can come up  
7 with the perfect Code in our dreams, but in  
8 reality, there's no such thing. A perfect Code  
9 does not exist. A Code is simply a tool that  
10 is used by me, by you, Mr. Behar, as an  
11 architect, by different people, to do quality.  
12 Our goals is to do quality, I think, in this  
13 City, obviously, and I think we have the tools  
14 and we're very lucky to have the people -- the  
15 people who really want to do it. So very  
16 quickly --

17 MR. WITHERS: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman.

18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes, sir.

19 MR. WITHERS: Can I introduce a motion for  
20 deferral to discuss?

21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: You would like to make  
22 a motion. Is there a second?

23 MR. WITHERS: For discussion.

24 MR. BEHAR: I'll second the motion.

25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have a motion. We

1 have a second.

2 MR. REVUELTA: Did you accept it?

3 MR. BEHAR: I second it. For discussion.

4 MR. REVUELTA: Oh, I was going to ask,  
5 shouldn't there be discussion?

6 MR. BEHAR: No, this is not for --

7 MR. WITHERS: If we get to the end of the  
8 road, and we defer --

9 MR. REVUELTA: If there's a motion for  
10 discussion --

11 MR. WITHERS: Venny eloquently spoke on  
12 where we are, at the 20,000 foot level, looking  
13 down --

14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Understood. We have a  
15 motion. We have a second. Any other  
16 discussion before I call the roll?

17 MR. TORRE: Is the roll for deferring the  
18 item?

19 MR. BEHAR: No. No. No. No.

20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: For discussion only.

21 MR. BEHAR: Discussion only.

22 MR. TORRE: Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Call the roll, please.

24 THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?

25 MR. REVUELTA: Yes, for discussion.

1 THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?

2 MR. TORRE: Yes.

3 THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?

4 MR. WITHERS: Yes.

5 THE SECRETARY; Robert Behar?

6 MR. BEHAR: Yes.

7 THE SECRETARY: Claudia Miro?

8 MS. MIRO: Yes.

9 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat?

10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.

11 MR. COLLER: So I just want to make sure I  
12 understand the motion. The motion is not to  
13 defer --

14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Correct.

15 MR. COLLER: -- the motion is to discuss  
16 whether or not you should defer?

17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.

18 MR. COLLER: Okay.

19 MR. WITHERS: That's permissible, right?

20 MR. REVUELTA: We just voted yes, so, yes.

21 MR. COLLER: It's a little unusual, but  
22 it's not --

23 MR. WITHERS: We want to do it right.

24 MR. COLLER: Usually you have a motion to  
25 defer and then there's a discussion and then

1 you have a vote.  
 2 MR. WITHERS: Well, I understand that,  
 3 but --  
 4 MR. COLLER: You did it a little bit  
 5 differently, but it's perfectly okay.  
 6 MR. WITHERS: Well, the reason is, I didn't  
 7 want to have a whole presentation from Staff,  
 8 if there is a desire that we might be deferring  
 9 this issue, is what my main concern was. So if  
 10 there is a desire to defer, then I just wanted  
 11 to kind of feel where everybody was headed on  
 12 that.  
 13 MR. COLLER: Okay. So we don't have a  
 14 deferral at this point. We just have a  
 15 discussion regarding deferral.  
 16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Mr. Withers, may I  
 17 suggest something? We have our City Manager  
 18 with us here, and perhaps he'd like to say a  
 19 few words before.  
 20 Sir, thank you for coming.  
 21 MR. IGLESIAS: Thank you, Chair. I'm happy  
 22 to be here and thank you all for the work that  
 23 you all do.  
 24 We have a presentation -- I don't think  
 25 it's going to be that long -- but I think it

1 MR. IGLESIAS: Well, I've been here seven  
 2 hours, in the last two meetings, with the  
 3 Committee --  
 4 MR. WITHERS: Okay.  
 5 MR. IGLESIAS: -- and then prior to that,  
 6 and I think we can. I think we have some  
 7 discussion, that we have some disagreement, and  
 8 I don't think there's anything wrong with that,  
 9 but the disagreements are not, I think,  
 10 monumental. The 45 5-02 to 50 feet, I think,  
 11 we can show that that was not error, that was  
 12 something that was decided by a previous  
 13 Commission, and, actually, by a previous Board,  
 14 that met for eleven months and had 32 meetings.  
 15 So that's not, to me, an error. And so I do  
 16 think that our Planning Director really has --  
 17 should present, so you can see both sides, and,  
 18 then, maybe, at that point, decide whether we  
 19 want to defer or we want to continue.  
 20 MR. WITHERS: Well, okay. I mean, that's  
 21 fine, but if everybody is going to come back to  
 22 the Planning Board -- not our Board, I mean, to  
 23 the planning table and have a Workshop and  
 24 change what we're being presented today, what  
 25 does that do to the recommendation on what

1 will bring up a number of points that we have.  
 2 We've been working with the Committee, working  
 3 with their document, and I do believe that we  
 4 would like to present our document now. I  
 5 don't think it will be that long, but it will  
 6 show some of the issues that we have with it,  
 7 as Chairman Pardo presented theirs, and I think  
 8 we can certainly work together with this  
 9 Committee to come up with something, and as Mr.  
 10 Torre said, if necessary, to make this work.  
 11 So I would appreciate us being able to present,  
 12 get our points across, and I think they are  
 13 reasonable and they are things that we should  
 14 consider.  
 15 MR. WITHERS: May I respond to that?  
 16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes, please.  
 17 MR. WITHERS: Thank you very much. And my  
 18 whole point was, I kind of felt a little bit  
 19 of, I don't want to say, dissension, but a  
 20 little bit of -- City Staff, Chairman of the  
 21 Blue Ribbon Committee, Members of the  
 22 Committee, I kind of felt that everybody wasn't  
 23 pulling in the same direction. I didn't know  
 24 if we were totally ready for this Board to hear  
 25 that.

1 we're --  
 2 MR. IGLESIAS: Well, I think you could look  
 3 at the issues -- the recommendations we have  
 4 there, there are issues by the City Attorney,  
 5 there are issues that affect Zoning, and there  
 6 are issues that affect the Comprehensive Plan,  
 7 and we plan on meeting with the Committee  
 8 before -- we talked about a November --  
 9 yesterday we talked about a November 15th  
 10 meeting, at 5-02 p.m., to really move forward  
 11 as, far as resident input.  
 12 However, it doesn't mean that we will not  
 13 be meeting with the Committee to try to  
 14 reconcile all of these issues, and I think we  
 15 can reconcile the issues. We do have to work  
 16 together, but I don't think there's anything  
 17 there that cannot be reconciled, if we work  
 18 together, the Staff and the Committee.  
 19 Now, there are issues that we feel are very  
 20 important and there are issues that affect the  
 21 Comprehensive Plan, which means that those have  
 22 to go back to Tallahassee, but I do think that  
 23 the PowerPoint presentation, I think, presents  
 24 a number of these issues clearly, and our  
 25 points clearly, and certainly those are points

1 that should be discussed. We allowed the  
 2 Committee to work on their own. We then came  
 3 back and looked at -- we had a document. We  
 4 decided to retract our document, to use their  
 5 document, and that's what we've done. Now,  
 6 does that mean that we have zero comments on  
 7 their document? Absolutely not, and I think  
 8 these issues, these legal issues, Zoning issues  
 9 and Comprehensive Plan issues, I think, should  
 10 be discussed. I think they're very clearly  
 11 presented in Mr. Trias' presentation, and I  
 12 think we would like to present, as Mr. Pardo  
 13 presented.

14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: What I would suggest  
 15 is, since we did make a motion for discussion,  
 16 let's discuss it --

17 MR. WITHERS: I'll withdraw that motion,  
 18 unless we want to discuss it. I mean, I just  
 19 didn't want to go on the record --

20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: What I would suggest  
 21 is --

22 MR. BEHAR: Let's discuss it. I think it's  
 23 a good idea.

24 MR. WITHERS: Fine. Let's do it.

25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: What I'd like to do

1 is, let's discuss it, and I do think it's the  
 2 right thing to do, to have Mr. Trias and the  
 3 City, for the record, make their presentation.

4 So we will, of course, but if we'd like to  
 5 discuss it first, then we'll have Mr. Trias  
 6 present.

7 MR. IGLESIAS: Of course. Thank you.  
 8 Thank you, Chair.

9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, sir.

10 MR. BEHAR: And I, personally, think that  
 11 once we hear Staff, I think, personally, I  
 12 would think I will be in favor of deferring,  
 13 because this has to be the whole process done  
 14 correctly. I think it would be a great day,  
 15 when we meet with the Committee, meet with the  
 16 Commission. I think it's November 15th, if I  
 17 remember correctly, and I think that would be a  
 18 very valuable day, but, I think, today, I want  
 19 the Staff to present.

20 MR. WITHERS: Perfect.

21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.

22 MS. MIRO: Mr. Chair, if I may?

23 I just wanted to say, I understand what  
 24 Mr. Withers is trying to do, and I appreciate  
 25 that. Myself, I would really be interested in

1 hearing what Staff has prepared for us today,  
 2 so that, you know, once we move through the  
 3 process of the Workshops, et cetera, I can see  
 4 how everything has come full circle, what the  
 5 City ends up negotiating or not. So, I think,  
 6 that for the sake of going through the process,  
 7 I would be really interested in seeing that  
 8 play out, and, in addition, I'm very  
 9 transparent about, I think I'm also leaning  
 10 towards deferring this item, because I would  
 11 like to see that Workshop and everything come  
 12 to fruition and see this be fleshed out a  
 13 little bit more.

14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Understood.  
 15 Mr. Revuelta.

16 MR. REVUELTA: I'm in favor of the  
 17 deferral; however, I would like to hear the  
 18 City Staff presentation, and I would be willing  
 19 to invest the time, if the rest of the Board is  
 20 willing to do that, to have some sort of  
 21 discussion about the items that have come to  
 22 light, because I think, since we're here, we  
 23 might as well invest a little bit of time to  
 24 exchange thoughts.

25 MR. TORRE: What I heard from the

1 Commission yesterday, for one, there's a speed  
 2 issue here, right? They're trying to get  
 3 through this process quickly. They wanted to  
 4 hear us discuss this item. It was a very big  
 5 deal for them to hear us discuss this item. I  
 6 heard it three times. So I think the  
 7 discussion, as full as we can give it, is  
 8 helpful to the Commission. Taking it to a  
 9 Workshop and dealing with, should this be  
 10 stricken, should that be stricken, I'm not in  
 11 favor of getting to whether that item should go  
 12 or that item should go. I don't even know if  
 13 the whole thing should go, to be honest with  
 14 you.

15 We have three large projects -- we've  
 16 heard it here -- that have caused a lot of  
 17 this, and we need to understand where that went  
 18 wrong. Was it a Board of Architects issue, was  
 19 it a Commission issue? I hear the Mayor  
 20 saying, these things are being done because  
 21 they vote six stories more than the project  
 22 allows. That's not a Board of Architects  
 23 function. That's a Commission issue. We  
 24 should be discussing whether those issues are  
 25 causing the problem or is this strictly a

1 change the Code issue, and I'm not sure this is  
2 a change the Code issue. I'm not sure the Code  
3 is broken. It is a complex Code, served us  
4 well for a long time, but this has a lot of red  
5 lines, and for us to get into the weeds of  
6 checking red line after red line, I think is  
7 the wrong place to go.

8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I would agree with you  
9 on that, going through the red lines. I think  
10 we have competent Staff and I think we have a  
11 very competent City Attorney and their Staff to  
12 actually work that out. I don't know if that's  
13 our place, and I would agree.

14 Any other comment before I ask for the  
15 presentation?

16 MR. REVUELTA: I have one last one, and I  
17 apologize for the ignorance, but the creation  
18 of the Blue Ribbon Committee, to Mr. Torre's  
19 apprehension, why was it created? What  
20 triggered the creation of the Blue Ribbon  
21 Committee to analyze the Mediterranean  
22 Ordinance and the Zoning Code? What triggered  
23 that? And I apologize for my ignorance, if  
24 that's out of line.

25 MR. TRIAS: Is that a question? I don't

1 know. That's the best answer I can give you.

2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Let's ask the City  
3 Attorney.

4 MR. REVUELTA: It's okay, but I think to --

5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Would you be able to  
6 answer that question for Mr. Revuelta?

7 MR. REVUELTA: You first have to define a  
8 problem, before you can fix it.

9 MS. RAMOS: To this undertaking?

10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: To this undertaking  
11 and the formation of the Blue Ribbon Committee.

12 MS. RAMOS: So I think that there's been  
13 discontent with some of the ways that the  
14 Ordinance has been applied. To Mr. Trias'  
15 point earlier, it may not be the regulations  
16 that are a problem, but the applications, but  
17 in either event, I think that's what happened,  
18 and so one of the Commissioners had asked for  
19 this Workshop. As Mr. Pardo explained, there  
20 was a Community Workshop, people explained  
21 their dissatisfaction with how buildings are  
22 being approved for Med Bonus, and then the  
23 Commission decided to establish a Committee to  
24 look at it.

25 MR. REVUELTA: So a Commissioner initiated

1 the request of the creation of the Blue Ribbon  
2 Committee, because of the concerns that the  
3 public had with the way that the Mediterranean  
4 Revival Bonuses --

5 MS. RAMOS: Had been applied.

6 MR. REVUELTA: -- was being applied?

7 MS. RAMOS: Yeah. That's it, in a  
8 nutshell.

9 MR. REVUELTA: And the entities in charge  
10 of reviewing and approving the Med Revival  
11 Ordinance is both, the Staff and the Board of  
12 Architects?

13 MS. RAMOS: Yes. Largely the Board of  
14 Architects.

15 MR. REVUELTA: All right. At least that's  
16 the beginning of why.

17 MS. RAMOS: And so, I think, from a  
18 philosophical standpoint, there would be a  
19 school of thought that says, the Ordinance  
20 doesn't have to be changed at all, you just  
21 have to train the Board of Architects  
22 differently, right? Some people might have  
23 that opinion. I'm not saying it's mine. I  
24 don't have an opinion on the matter. I'm just  
25 saying.

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Right.

2 MR. REVUELTA: Is there a list of specific  
3 complaints about what people, from where, do  
4 not like about the implementation of the Med  
5 Revival, and, I guess, the result -- the list  
6 of that would be, buildings that have been  
7 built, that are to the dislike of certain  
8 people that have complained to the  
9 Commissioners?

10 MS. RAMOS: Yeah, I don't think it's so  
11 much dislike, as there is, there are certain  
12 buildings -- I don't want to call them out by  
13 name -- that if you drove by them, whether  
14 you're an architect or not, you wouldn't think  
15 that they're Mediterranean. They don't look  
16 Mediterranean, but they got the bonus, and  
17 that's kind of the inception, and why that  
18 happened, and when that happened, and, you  
19 know, who knows, but --

20 MR. REVUELTA: I'd like to say something  
21 that may be controversial, but I thank Felix  
22 for -- Mr. Pardo for giving us the history, but  
23 when I've been to Europe, Med Revival,  
24 Mediterranean architecture in Italy, France and  
25 Spain, is basically one, two, three, four, 5-02



1 buildings, max. So I always wondered why the  
 2 Med Revival was not for Single-Family homes,  
 3 and there was a -- part of the Code that had  
 4 bonuses, just like many other cities do, which  
 5 allow certain things to be done by architects  
 6 and developers, if they do things in exchange,  
 7 public spaces, loggias, this and that and the  
 8 other, but that doesn't necessarily is cornered  
 9 into a style. Even the fact that the City was  
 10 developed by Merrick, who himself understood  
 11 the value of marketing, by creating a Chinese  
 12 Village, an Italian Village, a Dutch Village  
 13 and this village, and there is not a common  
 14 Mediterranean style there, but there are  
 15 different styles.

16 I've always, when I argue about metal  
 17 roofs, and Mr. Withers probably remembers  
 18 that --

19 MR. TORRE: I challenge the notion that the  
 20 buildings that are completely out of whack were  
 21 a fault because of the Board of Architects'  
 22 doing. That's my challenge, okay. There's a  
 23 few buildings, that just the bulk and size,  
 24 just, no.

25 Now, some of them, the Plaza, you may argue

1 architecturally is pleasing, this and that,  
 2 compatibility is another discussion.

3 The second session is, is the Board of  
 4 Architects adequately run to do compatibility  
 5 reviews and say, "Hey, that doesn't work," as  
 6 opposed to this Board. So they're saying that  
 7 the compatibility starts with the Board of  
 8 Architects. If doesn't work there, you should  
 9 deny it. That's a very subjective statement.

10 MS. RAMOS: It's a very subjective  
 11 statement. It could lead to issues, from a  
 12 legal standpoint.

13 Just to clarify, the rumblings about  
 14 buildings that people were upset about were not  
 15 necessarily on massing and height. It was  
 16 literally on style. This building looks  
 17 modern. It's got too much glass. But it got  
 18 Med Bonus.

19 And to answer your point, I don't know the  
 20 whole history, but I did hear Mayor Thomson's  
 21 presentation at the Workshop that started all  
 22 of this months ago, and she was around when  
 23 this first came up, and she explained all of  
 24 the reasons why the Commission, at that time,  
 25 felt that a Mediterranean Bonus was important,

1 to keep some of the integrity of the City.  
 2 That's where that started.

3 MR. REVUELTA: Well, I wanted to finish my  
 4 statement, that Florida vernacular architecture  
 5 is something that really cannot be done in the  
 6 North Gables, just because metal roofs are not  
 7 allowed, except copper, which actually is the  
 8 best conductor of heat and electricity, on the  
 9 State that has the most amount of lightning,  
 10 and it's interesting what you said, then, to  
 11 me, the biggest problem that I see, and Lord  
 12 knows that I drive from Castile to Coconut  
 13 Grove to my offices, I used to drive through  
 14 Coconut Grove Drive, which is now closed, every  
 15 morning, that the massing of that is like the  
 16 thing not to do anywhere, even in Coral Gables.  
 17 How that got done -- and I do not know if that  
 18 is the fault of the Commission or the Board of  
 19 Architects or actually an inherent issue of the  
 20 Code, but, to me, it's an issue of massing, not  
 21 an issue of style.

22 MS. RAMOS: I think a lot of people agree  
 23 with you, but I don't know that that's this  
 24 discussion, because that got there --

25 MR. REVUELTA: Probably not, but, I mean,

1 this is like we're focusing on a -- there's a  
 2 broken leg, and we're focusing on a problem on  
 3 the ear and I'm --

4 MS. RAMOS: Because this Board was  
 5 empanelled for the toe.

6 MR. REVUELTA: To this point, it seems like  
 7 -- this is not a criticism of anybody, but I  
 8 feel like we're making the point of, we're  
 9 taking Advil for a broken leg.

10 But, at any rate, I thank you for letting  
 11 me vent.

12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Any other discussion  
 13 before we ask Mr. Trias to make the  
 14 presentation for the City?

15 MR. REVUELTA: Do we need to make a motion  
 16 to --

17 MR. BEHAR: No. No.

18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Everybody okay?  
 19 Mr. Withers?

20 MR. WITHERS: Good. Let's do it.

21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: You have the floor.

22 MR. TRIAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I  
 23 hear you, and basically I share many of your  
 24 views, and I am -- one of my jobs is to give  
 25 you a recommendation, unlike the City Attorney,

1 and what happens is that, in my view, a lot of  
 2 the issues that I heard were not about the Med  
 3 Bonus, were actually about change of Land Use,  
 4 change of Zoning, other aspects of the Code.  
 5 So that's part of the complexity that we have.  
 6 But I started with this slide, that was a  
 7 summary of what the City Attorney's very, very  
 8 good memo prepared, and I want to give you the  
 9 big picture, and this is based on my  
 10 conversations with Mr. Pardo. Mr. Pardo  
 11 believes that the Ordinance, as originally  
 12 drafted in 1986 -- and I have it with me, the  
 13 one that was signed by Dorothy Thomson, who  
 14 came to that meeting, was better, and it was  
 15 better in terms of the language, and that is  
 16 what some of that language is.  
 17 When Mr. Pardo recommends to change the  
 18 word, "incentive," for, "special allowance," is  
 19 because "special allowance" was in the 1986  
 20 version.  
 21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I just want to make  
 22 one thing clear.  
 23 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.  
 24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: And I've asked the  
 25 question of Mr. Pardo repeatedly. It's not

1 preamble of that Ordinance, I think, a lot of  
 2 red lines, but don't have the effect that the  
 3 table has. So what happens is that, once you  
 4 start looking at the actual recommendations,  
 5 there are some Zoning Code issues that, I  
 6 think, are relevant, and one is that there's an  
 7 open space reduction, a reduction, instead of  
 8 making it bigger, for MF4. Then there's a  
 9 requirement that all of the standards for Table  
 10 2 need to be met. Now, one of the standards is  
 11 underground parking. Does that mean that every  
 12 building now has to have underground parking?  
 13 I don't know. I mean, and those are some of  
 14 the issues that I think are unclear.  
 15 Another issue is that the awnings are like  
 16 arcades now. I don't know if that's a good  
 17 solution for architecture. There's the setback  
 18 reductions on Table 3, and then there's the  
 19 additional FAR for .55-02 and, finally,  
 20 Mr. Pardo discussed with me and the Committee  
 21 that the 1986 manual was the best source of  
 22 ideas.  
 23 That is the only one of those topics that  
 24 deals with majoring in architecture.  
 25 MR. REVUELTA: Mr. Trias, do we have a copy

1 Mr. Pardo that's asking for that change --  
 2 MR. TRIAS: No.  
 3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: -- it's the Blue  
 4 Ribbon panel that's asking for that change, and  
 5 correct me if I'm wrong?  
 6 MR. TRIAS: I apologize. No, you're right.  
 7 What I meant is, in my conversation with him,  
 8 he explained --  
 9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: As Chair?  
 10 MR. TRIAS: As a member of the Committee.  
 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay.  
 12 MR. TRIAS: He explained it to me -- sir?  
 13 MR. REVUELTA: Is the Blue Ribbon panel  
 14 asking for a change?  
 15 MR. BEHAR: Recommending. We're  
 16 recommending.  
 17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: They're recommending.  
 18 MR. TRIAS: So I'm only saying this,  
 19 because I think it makes it more clear, at  
 20 least in my mind, but maybe it's not that  
 21 relevant, but those are some of the issues.  
 22 Some of the issues are to change some of the  
 23 words. Another issue is the change of the  
 24 actual implementation through the tables.  
 25 The words that are being changed in the

1 of that document in our packages?  
 2 MR. TRIAS: Yes -- oh, no, no, no, not at  
 3 this point, no.  
 4 MR. REVUELTA: Is there a way I can get one  
 5 right now?  
 6 MR. TRIAS: No.  
 7 MR. BEHAR: Are you okay, Mr. Trias?  
 8 MR. TRIAS: So, basically, what I'm saying  
 9 is that the issue is, that if we want to talk  
 10 about Mediterranean architecture, we probably  
 11 should talk about that, and the only aspect of  
 12 these Zoning proposals is that final line,  
 13 which is the manual.  
 14 Then there were some issues that dealt with  
 15 the Comp Plan. There's the reduction of the 25  
 16 percent density, which is in the Comp Plan. So  
 17 once you take it from the Zoning Code, you need  
 18 to revise it in the Comp Plan. The Residential  
 19 Infill Regulations will be affected by that,  
 20 also, so that would have to be revised also in  
 21 the Comp Plan.  
 22 There's the FAR increase. Again, there's  
 23 some policy about open space that probably will  
 24 have to be revised. And then we need to update  
 25 some terms, because, as I said, we no longer

Page 73

1 use, "incentives," and so on, based on the  
 2 changes. So these are some technical issues  
 3 that prevent taking everything that is included  
 4 in the proposal.

5 I don't want to go through the red line in  
 6 great detail. As you said, we can do that  
 7 later in the Workshop. But as you can see,  
 8 there are multiple problems with the changes  
 9 that deal with the internal consistency of the  
 10 Zoning Code and also the consistency with the  
 11 Comp Plan.

12 I think the biggest issue is that  
 13 compliance, that before -- the existing  
 14 compliance had to do with meeting six of the  
 15 twelve characteristics of the table, for  
 16 example, for eight of the twelve, depending on  
 17 your project. Now you have to meet all of  
 18 them. I mean, that is one of the biggest  
 19 changes that I think -- and that would appear  
 20 is consistent with the idea of having more  
 21 Mediterranean buildings, because, at the end of  
 22 the day, the question is, are the changes being  
 23 proposed going to result in buildings that are  
 24 more Mediterranean? I think that was the  
 25 question that the Commission asked. And of the

Page 75

1 Commission 17 years ago, after 32 public  
 2 meetings, and -- Chip, I'm sure you were a part  
 3 of that -- and it has not been changed for 17  
 4 years. So if you want to recommend changing  
 5 it, you can. Certainly, the Commission could  
 6 adopt a different dimension, but that would be  
 7 a change.

8 Now, I included the whole history, since  
 9 1930, of the building heights, just for  
 10 information, because if you look at, for  
 11 example, in 1987, a story was 12 feet. Then  
 12 you look at 1999, it changed to 13 and a half.  
 13 Then you look at 2004, that's when that 50-foot  
 14 base was used for bonuses. The 45 5-02 feet  
 15 remains, if you don't get a bonus, but for the  
 16 bonus -- for the application of the bonus  
 17 process, that's what was adopted. So those are  
 18 facts, and it's not something that is open for  
 19 discussion. What's open for discussion is  
 20 whether or not the policy should change, and I  
 21 believe that's what the Committee is still  
 22 debating, because I don't think there's  
 23 agreement on that.

24 And we provided the complete Ordinance.  
 25 Now, in the memo, there's only the chart, but

Page 74

1 buildings that have been criticized publicly by  
 2 multiple people, I think all of them would  
 3 qualify under the changes that are being  
 4 proposed.

5 So I don't think the Zoning Code is the  
 6 issue. I don't think it is at all. I think  
 7 it's the way that it has been applied and the  
 8 way that changes have been made through the  
 9 process, and I can go into some detail, at some  
 10 other time, about how certain things changed in  
 11 certain projects, but I will tell you that it  
 12 had nothing to do with the words of the Zoning  
 13 Code. It had to do with the way things were  
 14 applied.

15 Going through the details, again, we can do  
 16 that, if you'd like, later on, but as you can  
 17 see, there's lot of inconsistencies that create  
 18 technical challenges. Now, as far as the  
 19 building heights, and this is something that I  
 20 think is very clear, that memo that you got has  
 21 a table. That table is in the Zoning Code. It  
 22 is in the Zoning Code. Now, it's using the  
 23 dimensions that are in the Comp Plan, because  
 24 it's consistent with the Comp Plan, but it's in  
 25 our Zoning Code table that was adopted by a

Page 76

1 the whole Ordinance was provided, that's the  
 2 signed Ordinance from 2004, and it's available,  
 3 if you want to read the whole Ordinance, which  
 4 includes all of the information about the Med  
 5 Bonus, and highlighted there is the fact that  
 6 it's -- that's worth 50 and goes on in there.

7 So the concerns are multiple, and this  
 8 is -- I'm finishing my presentation here. You  
 9 know, one of the issues that -- I don't  
 10 understand very well the conceptual review,  
 11 because it happens to be only on the Special  
 12 Area Plan, so does it apply only for those  
 13 Special Area Planned projects? As written,  
 14 that's really the limit of that. Now, we've  
 15 done conceptual reviews for Board of Architects  
 16 as recently as the last meeting, when they  
 17 looked at a proposed mobility hub.

18 The Plaza, by the way, one of the projects  
 19 that has been criticized multiple times, it did  
 20 go through a conceptual review by the Board of  
 21 Architects, at multiple meetings, multiple  
 22 meetings, building by building. So I can't  
 23 imagine a more thorough process of review than  
 24 that one.

25 So all of those things -- we can do a

Page 77

1 better job, of course, and Coral Gables  
 2 deserves to have the best job, but I don't  
 3 think that the changes that are being proposed  
 4 will give you that, just like I don't think any  
 5 Zoning Code will give you that, by itself, and  
 6 I think that was part of the discussion that we  
 7 had at the Commission last night.

8 Now, there are some other concerns that I  
 9 mentioned already, but I think, for the  
 10 purposes of tonight, I probably should just  
 11 end. I'm recommending deferral, just like  
 12 Mr. Bermello. The reason is that you cannot --  
 13 or the Commission cannot adopt the changes  
 14 until the Comp Plan is amended, if they decide  
 15 to go through that policy change, but that --  
 16 in general, at the end of the day, I think that  
 17 the ideas are fine, they comply with the  
 18 general trend of things, but whether or not  
 19 they make the Code better, that's really a  
 20 question that we should be able to discuss more  
 21 thoroughly. Thank you very much.

22 MR. BEHAR: Mr. Trias, I have a question,  
 23 just for clarification, because -- and I think  
 24 this is beginning to shed some light -- the 50  
 25 foot base or maximum is only applicable if

Page 79

1 5-02 don't really have much relevance, in a  
 2 practical sense, for the City. I mean, how  
 3 many buildings do you know, recently built,  
 4 that are 45 5-02 feet?

5 MR. BEHAR: No, none. None.

6 And I want to clear something up, because  
 7 some of the projects that are a problem today,  
 8 at least two of these Board Members here, were  
 9 here for that -- one of those approvals, which  
 10 is the one on the Highway, and I happen to have  
 11 been conflicted out, because I was not in  
 12 favor, and my fellow Board Member here voted  
 13 against the project.

14 So those projects -- that one, in  
 15 particular, it went to Commission for the  
 16 approval, it was not at the Board of  
 17 Architects, that I recall, and it was not at  
 18 this Board.

19 MR. TRIAS: And required a change of Land  
 20 Use, which was really what changed the design.

21 MR. BEHAR: And I remember, I was  
 22 conflicted, because -- I was not in favor,  
 23 because they came to me to do the project, and  
 24 I said, "I cannot support, I cannot do the  
 25 project," and I was conflicted, which that's

Page 78

1 you're seeking bonuses?

2 MR. TRIAS: Yes, sir, correct.

3 MR. BEHAR: If not, the 45 5-02 feet  
 4 remains?

5 MR. TRIAS: Yes, sir.

6 MR. BEHAR: And in a case of 50 feet, it  
 7 says 5-02 stories, correct?

8 MR. TRIAS: Right. Right.

9 MR. BEHAR: And in the case of 45 5-02  
 10 feet, 5-02 stories would not be doable?

11 MR. TRIAS: Right. Right.

12 MR. BEHAR: So where is the contradiction  
 13 to be? How can we clarify? How can we make  
 14 that better, because I -- personally, I think,  
 15 and, you know, we'll do afterwards -- you know,  
 16 the modifications or the changes to the Comp  
 17 Plan, I'm not sure that's the right approach,  
 18 you know, but how do we get a clear definition  
 19 to do, because if you're asking for bonuses,  
 20 you start with the 50, if not, you're at 45,  
 21 where is that -- how do we --

22 MR. TRIAS: Well, because, generally, as  
 23 you know, from a practical point of view,  
 24 people ask for the Med Bonus Level 2, so you  
 25 end up with the 77 feet. So the 50 or the 45

Page 80

1 the best thing that happened to me. I was not  
 2 part of that, okay. But that did not happen  
 3 here. I don't believe it happened in the Board  
 4 of Architects. It happened at the Commission,  
 5 and that's what we need to look at.

6 And to answer Venny's problem, the problem  
 7 is much bigger, I agree. These red lines are  
 8 not going to be -- you know, the fundamental  
 9 problem is more significant, and how do we  
 10 solve that -- and I'm going to tell you, I  
 11 don't think a style matters any, because at the  
 12 end of the day, the public benefit could be  
 13 achieved with any style. If I'm going to do a  
 14 plaza, I must introduce step back, setback,  
 15 that has nothing to do with style, and I think  
 16 we're making -- personally, I think this is  
 17 going into that direction, which I disagree. I  
 18 think the public benefit is more important to  
 19 achieve in a different way. That's my opinion.

20 MR. TORRE: Can I continue, if you don't  
 21 mind?

22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.

23 I'd like to ask, actually, one question of  
 24 Mr. Collier. We've had a presentation by both,  
 25 the Applicant and City Staff. The flavor or

1 the sense that I get from the Board is that the  
2 Board would like to defer this, but do we need  
3 to open it up for public comment beforehand or  
4 can we continue our discussion and then have  
5 public comment later at the time?

6 MR. COLLER: I think, on this particular  
7 matter, it's up to the Board. It's a  
8 legislative recommendation. If the Board wants  
9 to defer the matter and hear it and hear other  
10 comments, since you're aware that this is going  
11 to a Workshop and feel that it would be more  
12 beneficial to see what happens after the  
13 Workshop, maybe some of these issues may be  
14 resolved, it's up to the Board. That certainly  
15 is a reasonable way to go.

16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Understood. I,  
17 myself, would be more inclined that way, but I  
18 want to make sure of the legality and the  
19 procedure. Thank you for clarifying that.

20 Yes, Venny.

21 MR. TORRE: I want to bring something up  
22 here, and make sure everybody understands this.  
23 So the ones that do not know this, the Code  
24 currently has a specific section, Section 5-02  
25 architecture, which dictates what the Board of

1 Architects' role is and what their function is.  
2 That's clearly on Section 5-02.

3 Section 5-02 is Design Review Standards,  
4 the Design Review Standard currently states  
5 that the function of the Board is to review  
6 whether the planning and siting of the various  
7 functions of the structures on site provide the  
8 following intrinsic sense of order between  
9 buildings. It's in there. It asks whether the  
10 amount of and arrangement of open space, green  
11 space, including open space or unimproved areas  
12 is appropriate for the design. It asks for  
13 proper architectural compatibility with  
14 neighboring properties and uses. It's written  
15 right there.

16 It continues, the architectural style for a  
17 given location, unless specified to the  
18 contrary, should be in harmony with the  
19 architecture of a particular neighborhood.

20 These things were there. They're there.  
21 If the Board of Architects isn't taking this  
22 and using it appropriately, that's something we  
23 should be talking about, but I believe a lot of  
24 this stuff that we're going to be looking at  
25 already exists in here. Now, it is not being

1 applied properly? Is it being missed? Is the  
2 Planning & Zoning overriding, by way of bulk  
3 and mass, approvals? Is the Commission making  
4 those changes, not the Board? Is the Board  
5 empowered enough to make those --

6 MR. TRIAS: That language has been in the  
7 Zoning Code for decades, older than the  
8 language for the Med Bonus, which is from the  
9 '80s originally, but I've seen even the  
10 language, in the 1930s Zoning Code, talks about  
11 harmony of the architecture, from the very  
12 beginning. So there's no reason why we cannot  
13 figure out a way to do it well.

14 MR. REVUELTA: I have one question. On the  
15 memorandum that Mr. Pardo handed out, it says,  
16 four stories, fifty feet. Is this what the  
17 Zoning Code reads right now? Is this table out  
18 of the Zoning Code?

19 MR. TRIAS: Yes, sir.

20 MR. REVUELTA: So, if the Zoning Code is  
21 saying fifty feet and four stories, he  
22 mentioned that an extra story was being put in  
23 there, but it seems like the Code is  
24 restricting to four stories and 50 feet, not  
25 four or 5-02 stories. And, again, I'm asking,

1 because I'm confused by this.

2 MR. TRIAS: Right. The reason why this is  
3 important is because, when you get to the 77,  
4 with Med Bonus Level 2, I believe, some  
5 applicants, sometimes, may have tried to do an  
6 extra story, but that's not what the Code says.  
7 And what happens is that we need to apply the  
8 Code properly. That's my opinion. And to make  
9 a big deal about something that is clearly in  
10 the Code is stopping us from doing a better job  
11 with the implementation.

12 MR. REVUELTA: So which parts of the Code  
13 are in black and white specifics saying 45 5-02  
14 feet?

15 MR. TRIAS: Well, not in the Med Bonus.  
16 That's in the --

17 MR. BEHAR: Zoning Code.

18 MR. REVUELTA: So if you're reading the  
19 Zoning Code and you're not applying for Med  
20 Bonuses, you get four stories, 45 5-02MR.

21 TRIAS: If you have a small parcel, yes.

22 MR. REVUELTA: If you have a small parcel?

23 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

24 MR. REVUELTA: And you're only going with  
25 the basic Zoning Code, you get four stories and

1 you get 45 5-02 feet?  
 2 MR. TRIAS: You get the 45 5-02 feet, yes.  
 3 MR. REVUELTA: If you apply the  
 4 Mediterranean Bonuses, you start at four  
 5 stories and 50 feet? This is what I'm reading  
 6 here, so that's why --  
 7 MR. TRIAS: Right. Right. The  
 8 Mediterranean Bonus is clearly showing in that  
 9 table that it says 50, and then you add one  
 10 story or you add two and so on, yes.  
 11 MR. REVUELTA: But you add one story above  
 12 four stories?  
 13 MR. TRIAS: Right. Right.  
 14 MR. BEHAR: But it's not four stories, I  
 15 believe. Isn't it 5-02MR. TRIAS: That's a  
 16 separate part of the Code. I won't go on  
 17 memory on this. I need to look at the Code.  
 18 MR. REVUELTA: And, again, I want --  
 19 MR. TRIAS: But that has nothing to do with  
 20 the issue at hand, sir.  
 21 Yeah, if you look at the 5-02 stories, it  
 22 says 5-02 stories, with 63 feet, seven stories  
 23 with 83 feet. I mean, there's a variety of --  
 24 depending on the Zoning designation, MX1, MX2,  
 25 MX3. It's in the table.

1 talk about today, "and to project conceptual  
 2 phase in order to provide direct Board of  
 3 Architects guidance at the proper -- at the  
 4 project inception. Number Four, to address  
 5 discontent of the citizens who are affected  
 6 negatively by the impact of incompatible  
 7 development," and there's a Fifth, "To return  
 8 to the original purpose of the Coral Gables  
 9 Mediterranean Architecture Regulations."  
 10 So I hear citizens discontent, I hear  
 11 compatibility, I hear lack of the Board  
 12 following these rules, and I believe I left one  
 13 out, Number Three, to put more emphasis on the  
 14 preliminary conceptual design, and maybe we can  
 15 discuss those three or four things.  
 16 5-02 is the issue of any style, right, and,  
 17 again, I hear it going back and forth, and that  
 18 is whether the bonuses should or should not  
 19 apply to any style or just simply to  
 20 Mediterranean architecture. That was a comment  
 21 I think I heard back and forth.  
 22 I think those are the ones that -- these  
 23 are the things that I think have been bouncing  
 24 around, that have larger meaning, more than  
 25 things that -- so, you know, we can talk about

1 But that is not the issue. I would --  
 2 please, let's try to keep focus. That is not  
 3 the issue that we're discussing today.  
 4 MR. TORRE: I have further comments --  
 5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes, please.  
 6 MR. TORRE: -- we can carry this meeting  
 7 forward to try and help the Commission with  
 8 what I think they're trying to get to.  
 9 I'm going to read minutes from the  
 10 meeting -- Commission Meeting where Mr. Pardo  
 11 began by stating, I think, the reasons why this  
 12 process was happening, so we can kind of hear  
 13 what those reasons were at the time.  
 14 So this is -- I'm quoting, "So the key  
 15 issues that we're addressing was the lack of  
 16 compatibility between existing neighborhoods  
 17 and new development, Number One. Number Two,  
 18 the failure to implement the existing Zoning  
 19 Code, specifically Designed Standard 5-02,  
 20 which I read, which is solely the  
 21 responsibility of the Board of Architects.  
 22 They are the design standard for all of the  
 23 projects in the City. Number Three, to provide  
 24 more emphasis on the preliminary Board of  
 25 Architects review process," which we started to

1 things specifically, but -- we can talk about  
 2 the initial review by the Architectural Board  
 3 on conceptual. Do you have anything today to  
 4 say?  
 5 MR. TRIAS: Well, the proposal, as I read  
 6 it, applies to only certain projects. We,  
 7 Staff, thought that there could be a  
 8 voluntarily process, if somebody wanted to hear  
 9 an opinion, and that's basically what happened  
 10 last week. There was a voluntary submittal,  
 11 that actually -- there was a great presentation  
 12 by our City Manager, who did a great job  
 13 explaining the mobility hub, and then there was  
 14 some good discussion. That's a fair thing to  
 15 do. There's nothing wrong with that. The  
 16 moment you make it mandatory and then you make  
 17 it only of certain projects and not others and  
 18 so on --  
 19 MR. TORRE: But here's the question, so a  
 20 project comes in and they're going to ask for  
 21 5-02 more floors. So the design is beyond what  
 22 the Zoning Code allows. So it's going to be  
 23 changed to the use -- it's going to have all  
 24 sorts of changes. Architecturally, it may be  
 25 okay in that location, or it could be say,

1 look, that design should be tweaked, you're  
 2 carrying on possibly with a decision on  
 3 architecture that still has a whole series of  
 4 problems when it gets to the Commission, in  
 5 terms of it needs 5-02 more floors to be  
 6 approved.  
 7 MR. TRIAS: That is one scenario, and the  
 8 other scenario is a recent project that we had,  
 9 that was reviewed by DRC, it came fully  
 10 designed. I mean, the developer knew what he  
 11 wanted. And it required certain changes that  
 12 were major, in terms of the Zoning Code and  
 13 even the Comp Plan, but it was fully designed.  
 14 So I don't think that, in that case, he was  
 15 looking for a conceptual review, for example.  
 16 All I'm saying is, at some point, you may  
 17 want to make it mandatory or voluntary or not.  
 18 There's nothing wrong with having a conceptual  
 19 design, and I think that, at the end of the  
 20 day, we -- you could make a recommendation for  
 21 it.  
 22 MR. BEHAR: I'm going tell you, as an  
 23 architect, I don't have major problems with  
 24 getting conceptual review. It's going to add  
 25 more time, but it could also be beneficial for

1 because it required a sewer extension of about  
 2 almost a mile.  
 3 MR. TORRE: Can we use maybe an example?  
 4 I'm thinking of an example, the Alan Morris  
 5 proposal, that we all denied. How would that  
 6 process have been different? I guess,  
 7 architecturally, they would have said, "This  
 8 building is too big"? I mean, forgetting the  
 9 fact that he was trying to get from 70 feet to  
 10 150.  
 11 MR. TRIAS: The reality is that currently  
 12 you have to go to BOA prior to the City  
 13 Commission approving the --  
 14 MR. TORRE: But let's say they made a  
 15 wedding cake. They changed the wedding cake.  
 16 They made it kind of nice, still had 130  
 17 feet --  
 18 MR. TRIAS: Which they did, and then, what,  
 19 it has to go to Commission and they still don't  
 20 have the Land Use, Zoning, et cetera.  
 21 MR. TORRE: But my point is, the Board of  
 22 Architects could guide the architecture well,  
 23 they do a good job, and they still have a  
 24 three, four, five story overbuilt.  
 25 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. Yeah. No, and the issue

1 the project. Now, my only concern is, if we go  
 2 for conceptual review to the Board of  
 3 Architects, before going to DRC, they may come  
 4 back and say, "Well, you can't do it because of  
 5 this, this and this." So what comes first, the  
 6 chicken or the egg, you know?  
 7 MR. TORRE: Wouldn't that apply to Planning  
 8 & Zoning, as well, that we may have certain  
 9 issues that --  
 10 MR. BEHAR: But, Venny, not necessarily,  
 11 because by the time it comes here, the project  
 12 may comply with all of the Zoning requirements  
 13 and may be, you know, addressing all of the  
 14 issues that will be a problem to this Board.  
 15 So I find it more of, you know, an issue, okay,  
 16 let me design a project and let me take it to  
 17 the Board of Architects for conceptual. "I  
 18 think you've done a great job. We like it. We  
 19 would approve it."  
 20 But then I would go to DRC. "Well, you  
 21 know what, you can't do it because of X, Y, and  
 22 Z. You can't."  
 23 And I will give you an example. We worked  
 24 on a project that had infrastructure problems,  
 25 and until today, the project is not built,

1 is simply -- if you want to start -- and I want  
 2 to make one point, that is the only  
 3 recommendation that actually deals with the  
 4 process, and it's actually not a bad one  
 5 necessarily, but the rest of them don't try to  
 6 improve the process, and I think that focusing  
 7 on the process is a much better use of  
 8 everybody's time.  
 9 MR. REVUELTA: So the recommendation is to  
 10 actually go to the City Commission first to get  
 11 a global change and then go back?  
 12 MR. TRIAS: No. No. To go to the Board of  
 13 Architects conceptually, without having any  
 14 approval, and then go to DRC. That is the  
 15 recommendation from the Committee.  
 16 MR. BEHAR: Is that something that you  
 17 agree with?  
 18 MR. TRIAS: I think it should be a  
 19 voluntary process. I don't agree that it is --  
 20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Is that so funds are  
 21 not spent ahead of time? Is that the reason  
 22 for it?  
 23 MR. TRIAS: That's what I heard in the  
 24 presentation.  
 25 MR. PARDO: Mr. Chairman, if I could just

1 clarify, because we wrote it. The whole thing  
2 about the conceptual approval is for any  
3 project that is asking for Med Bonuses, period.  
4 What the City did was, they voluntarily came,  
5 because it was an unusual design, and they were  
6 not asking for Med bonuses --

7 MR. TRIAS: But, sir --

8 MR. PARDO: In other words, if you come for  
9 Med Bonuses, it's mandatory to come for  
10 conceptual, to be able to get a lay of the  
11 land. There are projects right now on the  
12 boards in this City that do not meet the  
13 standards of what exists today and what's going  
14 to exist tomorrow, as far as allowing bonuses  
15 based on style.

16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you for your  
17 comment. Mr. Trias.

18 MR. TRIAS: But that's not the way it's  
19 written. I know that's what you meant, but  
20 what you have in the way -- the drafting of the  
21 Ordinance, it is only applicable to the Special  
22 Area Plan, sir. It could be -- I think it  
23 would be better the way you explained it, a  
24 much better approach.

25 But I think that the Ordinance has a lot of

1 those issues, and my opinion simply is that the  
2 more we think about the process, the better the  
3 process is going to be.

4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: From what I've heard  
5 so far, just from my thoughts, One, is to  
6 comply with all of the requirements -- before  
7 it was, let's say, four of six or whatever it  
8 was -- to me is very restrictive. I don't  
9 think, to me, that makes sense. For example,  
10 if every individual project has to do  
11 underground parking, then you're not doing  
12 any -- Mr. Pardo, it's not for discussion.  
13 It's just I'm giving an opinion. You don't  
14 have to --

15 MR. PARDO: But what I'm trying to say is,  
16 it doesn't say that.

17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I understand that.  
18 I'm just giving my observation.

19 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, it says that.  
20 And what happens is that, I know that's not  
21 what they meant. I know that's not what they  
22 meant and we can probably fix it --

23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: No, I understand that,  
24 but I'm just giving you some thoughts from what  
25 I have heard. The other item that I would look

1 at is, well, we're here right now, is it  
2 something that I would want to look at to have  
3 the same style go across the entire City or do  
4 we encourage different styles, in different  
5 ways? And I'm not saying it's one way or  
6 another, but -- go ahead, Chip.

7 MR. WITHERS: No. No. Early, early on,  
8 the idea was just elements of Mediterranean  
9 architecture.

10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Right.

11 MR. WITHERS: You know, 5-02 Biltmore Way,  
12 where the lions are, I mean, that doesn't look  
13 Mediterranean to me, but I believe it got floor  
14 and a half of a Mediterranean bonus, because it  
15 had balconies, it had shaped windows, it had an  
16 open alcove, it had some the elements of the  
17 Mediterranean Bonus.

18 So when an architect says, style, does that  
19 mean what the building looks like? Is that  
20 what you mean? Either a square of whatever --

21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: To me, it's kind of  
22 showing a blueprint of a building, let's say --  
23 typically, to me, Mediterranean may be the  
24 Biltmore Hotel. So here's the Biltmore Hotel.  
25 This is the style that we're looking for.

1 MR. WITHERS: And let's not forget, Felix  
2 or Chairman Pardo, you know, said it right  
3 early on, you know, what do we do to get GCs  
4 and developers and builders to do buildings  
5 that are friendly and compatible, and, well,  
6 that's going to cost more money, we want to  
7 look Mediterranean, but that's going to cost  
8 more money, so we gave them a bonus to do that.  
9 You know, I don't know if that's changed, from  
10 a cost perspective and from a development  
11 perspective --

12 MR. TRIAS: It has not changed.

13 MR. WITHERS: -- you know. You know, at  
14 one point, we did say that we didn't really  
15 think that you should have PADs and Overlays  
16 and any kind of Board of Adjustment rulings, if  
17 any kind of bonuses were given, you know, any  
18 Transfer of Development Rights. Why allow  
19 someone to transfer development for the  
20 Mediterranean Bonus, transfer of development  
21 rights? So I don't know, did you look at any  
22 of that --

23 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. Well, actually, you're  
24 raising a very good point. That's really the  
25 issue. The issue is, those different things



1 that interact in the Code, that was not the  
 2 task at hand, unfortunate.  
 3 MR. WITHERS: They affect the outcome.  
 4 MR. TRIAS: And in my view, that's really  
 5 what the citizens were reacting to. They were  
 6 not reacting necessarily against the Med Bonus.  
 7 They thought so, but that was really not the  
 8 issue.  
 9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Wasn't there also  
 10 bonuses given for affordable housing that was  
 11 implemented into a project? I recall sitting  
 12 on this --  
 13 I MR. TRIAS: There was a brief --  
 14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: -- on this Board some  
 15 time ago.  
 16 MR. BEHAR: But that was a very short  
 17 period.  
 18 MR. TRIAS: It was a couple of years.  
 19 MR. BEHAR: 2010.  
 20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Right, but that has  
 21 stopped?  
 22 MR. TRIAS: Yes.  
 23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: In other words, there  
 24 are no bonuses for that anymore?  
 25 MR. TRIAS: No. The only bonus program

1 everything has to be provided by somebody who's  
 2 qualified to give it to you, meaning that  
 3 they're properly certified and so on, most  
 4 likely Members of the American Code of  
 5 Certified Planners.  
 6 MR. TORRE: I just wonder, so if you're  
 7 going down Ponce, and you have pink, which is  
 8 Low Density Commercial, allows you to go, I  
 9 don't know, whatever you're allowed to go, four  
 10 or 5-02 you get a bonus, you do a really nice  
 11 building, now you're up to six floors. You're  
 12 still opposite a Residential area on Ponce.  
 13 When you go through the real process and you do  
 14 all of your bonuses and get all of your perfect  
 15 architecture, you're still six stories. So I  
 16 wonder whether some of this is just inherent in  
 17 the Plan.  
 18 MR. TRIAS: It is, and we're very lucky  
 19 that Merrick gave us a very good Plan. I think  
 20 that these kinds of issues are much more  
 21 difficult everywhere else. We're very lucky to  
 22 have that great Plan and have some very good  
 23 buildings. The issue really is not changing  
 24 the Plan. Obviously, we should be respecting  
 25 the Plan, and that's what the Code says. Or

1 that we have in the City is the Med Bonus.  
 2 MR. TORRE: Can I ask -- so we're talking  
 3 from -- compatibility, I think, is a big issue  
 4 that's been discussed and it's a big talking  
 5 point, I get it. So, as I've shown everybody  
 6 this before, the red is Commercial. You see  
 7 it. That's Downtown. You can go to the  
 8 northern part of town, MF2, all of this is  
 9 brown, because that's all Residential, 70 feet,  
 10 okay.  
 11 When you're talking about designing  
 12 something in the middle of a block where  
 13 everything is still low, but you're still  
 14 within the Zoning that's going to allow you to  
 15 go to 70, right, how do you judge compatibility  
 16 when there's nobody around, but yet the Zoning  
 17 allows you to? You see what I'm saying? How  
 18 do you handle it?  
 19 MR. TRIAS: I mean, in the technical sense,  
 20 you, as Board Members, need to get competent  
 21 with -- Craig, Mr. Attorney, what's the form,  
 22 competent and substantial evidence, yes --  
 23 competent and substantial evidence is what you  
 24 use to make a decision about compatibility, and  
 25 it's really a technical planning term, and that

1 even the Code. It's really being able to  
 2 distinguish and have the nuances, in terms of  
 3 design and so on, to do a good job.  
 4 MR. TORRE: Something that's caught my  
 5 eyes, Mr. Withers has said several times, many  
 6 times, that these folks come here asking for  
 7 30, 40 percent more, and why are we doing that?  
 8 How many times have you said that?  
 9 Okay. And the Mayor said it yesterday and  
 10 he said it several times now, the buck stops  
 11 with the Commission. So where are these things  
 12 becoming problematic, where we see these bulky,  
 13 really out of proportion properties, projects?  
 14 MR. BEHAR: There are some, and I think  
 15 that, Venny, a lot of that may come out in the  
 16 Workshop, and I think --  
 17 MR. TORRE: Do you think the Board of  
 18 Architects is going to be empowered enough and  
 19 it's going to have the meat in this to be able  
 20 to take care of it? Is that the way this is  
 21 meant to be?  
 22 MR. TRIAS: The answer is, no. I mean, the  
 23 Board of Architects does certain things, very  
 24 important things, and things that matter in  
 25 terms of development potential, but the

Page 101

1 Commission changes Land Use or not, approves a  
 2 Zoning change or not, and those are the things  
 3 that, really, in my view, affect the massing  
 4 and affect the size of projects, more than the  
 5 role of the Board of Architects.  
 6 MR. REVUELTA: Or the style. It's the  
 7 massing and the changes of Land Use that people  
 8 get the four and the five story additionally,  
 9 because then you have a change of Zoning, and  
 10 all of a sudden you have something that nobody  
 11 expected to have. And I agree, it's not the  
 12 style of architecture, sometimes the process of  
 13 changing Zoning classifications --  
 14 MR. BEHAR: It's clear, look at the project  
 15 on the Highway, which is one of the most  
 16 controversial today. Look at the style. But  
 17 it all -- it got all of the Med Bonuses, but  
 18 when you look at the project, it really doesn't  
 19 comply, for a lot of the massing, a lot of the  
 20 step backs, you know, and I think that's the  
 21 problem, is that, you know, the process is not  
 22 being executed correctly, in my opinion.  
 23 MR. TRIAS: Those two projects, Paseo and  
 24 Gables Station, because they have been public,  
 25 I'll mention them, change of Land Use, right,

Page 103

1 MS. MIRO: Yes, if I may.  
 2 Venny, I'm trying to understand, so I think  
 3 that maybe the question you're asking is, where  
 4 along the way are these massive projects  
 5 slipping through the cracks, right, and what's  
 6 the answer to that? So I haven't heard a  
 7 concrete answer. It's not the Board of  
 8 Architects or is it the Board of Architects?  
 9 Or where is it that we have to be more careful,  
 10 because obviously these projects exist, so how  
 11 is it that this is happening? And I know  
 12 that's a question that so many people have  
 13 asked, how did this come to be? So what is,  
 14 you know, our role here? How can we, as a  
 15 Board, reconcile what, you know, Mr. Torre  
 16 brought up?  
 17 Yes, it's part of the Code. The Code  
 18 allows it, but anybody who's not an architect,  
 19 just a plain resident, can see, well, this area  
 20 is brown, and if you put this, what the Code  
 21 allows, it's not compatible. So how do we  
 22 reconcile that, and where, along the process,  
 23 do we address that?  
 24 MR. TRIAS: You make recommendations to the  
 25 City Commission and the City Commission takes

Page 102

1 change of Site Specifics, a variety of changes  
 2 that were approved by the Commission, in  
 3 addition to Med Bonus.  
 4 So there's a -- the Code, people complain  
 5 that sometimes when I speak I sound  
 6 complicated, it's not me, that's just the Code.  
 7 The Code is like that. And the Code has been  
 8 like that for a very long time. And we tried  
 9 to make it a little bit simpler. Certainly, in  
 10 the last three years, with your help, we were  
 11 able to do a lot, but, you know, at the end of  
 12 the day, it's what it is.  
 13 MR. BEHAR: So had that project been 120  
 14 feet, which is what's allowed in that area,  
 15 everybody would have a different opinion of  
 16 that project. You know, that's the way I see  
 17 it, okay, because the massing would have been  
 18 significantly less, 25 5-02 percent less.  
 19 MR. TRIAS: One last comment. In my view,  
 20 the changes that are being proposed, would not  
 21 affect those projects.  
 22 MR. BEHAR: I agree. I agree. It would  
 23 affect more of the design to be more in that  
 24 style than what it does.  
 25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Ms. Miro.

Page 104

1 action on whether or not to change Land Use or  
 2 Zoning, and that is the biggest change they do.  
 3 So your role is very important in this process,  
 4 and we seem to be speaking as if the Board of  
 5 Architects is the only one, but your role is to  
 6 make that recommendation on the issues that, I  
 7 think, make the biggest impact.  
 8 MR. BEHAR: But the compatibility issue is  
 9 one of concern, because if the underlying  
 10 Zoning allows -- and you mentioned the North  
 11 Ponce corridor, and you could do -- the  
 12 underlying, you know, allows you to do "X."  
 13 Well, yeah, next to that property is a one  
 14 story building that's been there. Is it  
 15 compatible to do a six-story next to one a  
 16 story? Maybe not, but the property -- the  
 17 underlying Zoning allows it, permits them to do  
 18 it.  
 19 MR. TORRE: That's where the problem is.  
 20 MR. BEHAR: Well, but then what do you say,  
 21 no, even though you're allowed to do it, you  
 22 cannot do it?  
 23 MR. WITHERS: I think that's where this  
 24 whole bonus issue started, is that people are  
 25 given the right to do certain things and why

1 should they be given additional rights to do  
 2 more than the Code says it is. You know, you  
 3 could push the envelope, through the Med Bonus,  
 4 is I think what's causing some of the  
 5 consternation here.  
 6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So would you suggest  
 7 doing away with the Med Bonus?  
 8 MR. WITHERS: That could be discussed. I  
 9 mean, I --  
 10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I mean, that's what  
 11 I'm hearing.  
 12 MR. WITHERS: It might be sunset at some  
 13 point. I'm not saying I'm a hundred percent  
 14 for that, but -- I mean, if you're going to  
 15 require better buildings, why do you say we're  
 16 going to give you something more to do? Why  
 17 don't you just tell them, "This is what you've  
 18 got to do to build the building." I mean, I've  
 19 never understood that argument.  
 20 You know, if you want this, then say to the  
 21 builder, you've got to do this, I mean --  
 22 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Withers, you've been doing  
 23 this for how long?  
 24 MR. WITHERS: Well, too long, probably --  
 25 MR. TRIAS: So you know how it is.

1 which gave you that big setback feel, and so,  
 2 you know --  
 3 MR. BEHAR: But, you know, is it a style?  
 4 Because then you compare other buildings that  
 5 have more of the Mediterranean style that  
 6 aren't -- I want to be polite, I don't want to  
 7 say -- but it's not very good, and that's why a  
 8 lot of the residents are having the problem.  
 9 And I look at one every single day, because my  
 10 office is right in front of it, and I get to  
 11 see it every day, and when you look at the  
 12 proportions, you look at the scale, you look at  
 13 the massing, everything about it is not in the  
 14 intent of what we want to have.  
 15 MR. WITHERS: It had Mediterranean  
 16 elements, Mediterranean design.  
 17 MR. BEHAR: Very liberal.  
 18 MR. WITHERS: That was the argument.  
 19 MR. BEHAR: I think that --  
 20 MR. WITHERS: It is pushing the envelope.  
 21 MR. BEHAR: Right. I think we reached a  
 22 point where I think the deferral --  
 23 MR. TRIAS: This has been going on since  
 24 1986, as you know, exactly the same discussion.  
 25 MR. BEHAR: I think it's time for --

1 MR. WITHERS: But at the end of the day --  
 2 MR. BEHAR: Chip, I think you were in the  
 3 Commission that approved that building on the  
 4 circle, the old Regions Bank or -- what was  
 5 that bank building?  
 6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Regions Bank.  
 7 MR. BEHAR: -- Regions Bank --  
 8 MR. WITHERS: Yeah. Yeah.  
 9 MR. BEHAR: -- which to me is a very good  
 10 building, very beautiful building.  
 11 MR. WITHERS: Right. Correct.  
 12 MR. BEHAR: It gives the public benefits --  
 13 MR. WITHERS: Right.  
 14 MR. BEHAR: -- you know, where it has a  
 15 large open space in the front, it has a loggia  
 16 and covered walkway --  
 17 MR. WITHERS: Right.  
 18 MR. BEHAR: -- and it has nothing to do  
 19 with Mediterranean, but yet is a very good  
 20 building.  
 21 MR. WITHERS: Well, I mean, they bought the  
 22 parking spots upfront. That's where Uncle  
 23 Harry's Happy Town and all of those little  
 24 shops were. So, you know, you blew out another  
 25 20 feet of an arcade in front of the building,

1 MR. TORRE: But I want to make a point.  
 2 So, I'll leave you with this point, I think  
 3 that the citizens and the community have raised  
 4 the alarm. They've made their point. It's  
 5 noticed. We're paying attention. The  
 6 Commission is paying attention. I think the  
 7 job has been done. Whether this goes this way  
 8 or goes the other way, I think the benefits of  
 9 that are out, and they will continue to be --  
 10 you know this -- that we'll be paying more  
 11 attention. The Commission is going to have  
 12 more attention. I think we just need to figure  
 13 out how to make it work better, but the notice  
 14 is out. This is not working. We've got to fix  
 15 it.  
 16 MR. TRIAS: I think we have a very good  
 17 process, and I want to really thank everybody,  
 18 all of the members of the Committee, because to  
 19 be talking about these issues is very rare in  
 20 any city. I mean, we're talking about the  
 21 quality of architecture. This doesn't happen  
 22 anywhere. So we're very lucky to be doing  
 23 this. And we also have the opportunity,  
 24 because we have a very good Code, to improve it  
 25 a little bit.

1 My recommendation is, focus on the process.  
 2 MR. BEHAR: I think we do the Workshop. I  
 3 personally agree and I'm okay with a lot of the  
 4 things that we put together, that I think will  
 5 improve it, okay. There are some that, like  
 6 Mr. Pardo says, we didn't agree with and I  
 7 still disagree, but, you know, it was a process  
 8 that was done. I think the Workshop is going  
 9 to be necessary, and I think we should now  
 10 defer this until -- for that process to happen,  
 11 and I think, then, if we are concluding --  
 12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: The City, the Staff  
 13 would like to defer it. Is there a motion?  
 14 MR. BEHAR: I'll make a motion to follow  
 15 the recommendation of Staff and defer this  
 16 tonight until after the Workshop.  
 17 MR. TORRE: I'll second that.  
 18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have a second. Any  
 19 discussion?  
 20 None? Call the roll, please.  
 21 THE SECRETARY: Claudia Miro?  
 22 MS. MIRO: Yes.  
 23 THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?  
 24 MR. REVUELTA: Yes.  
 25 THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?

1 time, do you feel comfortable doing your  
 2 presentation, we will gladly go ahead and read  
 3 it in?  
 4 MR. GARCIA SERRA: Yes. 8:10 is what the  
 5 clock is showing. I believe so.  
 6 MR. BEHAR: Probably like 8:15, because I  
 7 need a two-minute break.  
 8 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: I think we have  
 9 sufficient time to do our presentation.  
 10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: You want to take a  
 11 two-minute break?  
 12 MR. BEHAR: Two-minute break.  
 13 MR. TORRE: I will be notifying the Board  
 14 that I will need to recuse myself from this  
 15 next item. I will not be able to be impartial.  
 16 I am involved with the group. Thank you.  
 17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you very much.  
 18 Thank you, Venny, for putting the time in. So  
 19 Venny will be excused. Let's go ahead and take  
 20 a two-minute recess, please.  
 21 (Short recess taken.)  
 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: All right, guys, let's  
 23 go ahead and start, so we can go ahead and give  
 24 the applicant sufficient time.  
 25 Mr. Collier, would you read Items E-1 and

1 MR. TORRE: Yes.  
 2 THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?  
 3 MR. WITHERS: Yes.  
 4 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  
 5 MR. BEHAR: Yes.  
 6 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat?  
 7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.  
 8 Thank you for the presentation, both from  
 9 the Blue Ribbon Committee and from City Staff.  
 10 I know you guys have put a lot of time into  
 11 this. Thank you.  
 12 MR. PARDO: Thank you.  
 13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Before we go ahead and  
 14 read the next item, which is E-1 and E-2 --  
 15 MR. BEHAR: Mr. Chair.  
 16 MR. PARDO: I wanted to mention that Javier  
 17 Salman, who is also in the Committee, is  
 18 present.  
 19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you. I'm sorry,  
 20 I did not see you. Welcome.  
 21 MR. BEHAR: A fellow Board Member.  
 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: A fellow Board Member.  
 23 Thank you for all of your time.  
 24 Before we read Item E-1 and E-2 into the  
 25 record, Mario, I'd like to ask you, given the

1 E-2 into the record, please.  
 2 MR. COLLIER: Yes. Let me make sure this is  
 3 on.  
 4 Item E-1, an Ordinance of the City  
 5 Commission of Coral Gables, Florida granting  
 6 approval of a Planned Area Development (PAD)  
 7 pursuant to Zoning Code Article 14, "Process,"  
 8 Section 14-206, "General Procedures for Planned  
 9 Area Development" for a proposed multi-family  
 10 project referred to as "Gables Village" on the  
 11 property legally described as Lots 1 through  
 12 22, Block 28, "Coral Gables Biltmore  
 13 Section" -- I'm not going to read the list of  
 14 all of these blocks -- Santander and 301  
 15 Segovia, Coral Gables, Florida; including  
 16 required conditions; providing for a repealer  
 17 provision, severability clause and providing  
 18 for an effective date.  
 19 You know what, maybe I should read these  
 20 in. 504, 516, 522, 530 and 536 Malaga; 503,  
 21 511, 515, 535, 529 525 and 521 Santander; and  
 22 3109 Segovia.  
 23 Item E-2, a Resolution -- I get to do it  
 24 again -- all right. A Resolution of the City  
 25 Commission of Coral Gables, Florida approving

Page 113

1 the Tentative Plat entitled "Gables Village"  
 2 pursuant to Zoning Code Article 14, Section  
 3 14-210, "Platting/Subdivision," being a re-plat  
 4 of 113.310 square feet (2.6 acres) into two  
 5 tracts of land on the property legally  
 6 described as Lots 1 through 22, Block 28,  
 7 "Coral Gables Biltmore Section" (504, 516, 522,  
 8 530, 536 Malaga; 503, 511, 515, 535, 529, 525,  
 9 521 Santander; and 3109 Segovia) Coral Gables,  
 10 Florida; including required conditions;  
 11 providing for a repealer provision,  
 12 severability clause and providing for an  
 13 effective date.  
 14 Items E-1, E-2 public hearing.  
 15 We're going to hear both items and then we  
 16 will vote on them separately.  
 17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you. Go ahead,  
 18 please.  
 19 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Good evening, Mr. Chair,  
 20 Members of the Board, my name is Mario  
 21 Garcia-Serra, with Offices at 600 Brickell  
 22 Avenue, here this evening representing the  
 23 applicant, Gables Village, LLC.  
 24 From Gables Village, LLC, today I'm joined  
 25 by Alirio Torrealba, the principal of Gables

Page 115

1 block pursuant to a Master Plan, which will  
 2 result in 48 dwelling units, which will be a  
 3 mix of duplex, apartment, and townhome units,  
 4 all designed in the Coral Gables Mediterranean  
 5 style of architecture, with the required  
 6 parking provided on the site.  
 7 This site is over one acre in size, so it  
 8 qualifies to be reviewed as a Planned Area  
 9 Development, and we are requesting Planned Area  
 10 Development review for flexibility on  
 11 transitional height, frontage and parking  
 12 setbacks, which Maria will explain further in  
 13 her presentation.  
 14 We're also proposing to re-plat the  
 15 property into three tracts, which will be  
 16 composed of a duplex tract, the townhome tract,  
 17 and an apartment tract. Much thought has been  
 18 put into the design of this project and  
 19 tremendous effort has been made to design a  
 20 project which is in keeping with the great  
 21 tradition of Coral Gables architecture, and to  
 22 also have a project that is appropriate in  
 23 scale and feel for the neighborhood.  
 24 We'll let now the plans and the images  
 25 prove that point, and I'll ask Maria now to do

Page 114

1 Village, LLC, as well as Jenny Ducret. Mr.  
 2 Torrealba's company, MG Developers, is already  
 3 a developer of considerable note here in Coral  
 4 Gables, with several number of projects already  
 5 as part of their portfolio, including Biltmore  
 6 Park, Valencia Row, Biltmore Row and Althea  
 7 Row. All of these, very well regarded  
 8 projects, many of them even awarded winning,  
 9 with regards to their design, and those  
 10 projects were actually designed by Maria de la  
 11 Guardia, our project architect on this project  
 12 also, who will be handling the architectural  
 13 presentation.  
 14 Let me start off by giving you a sort of  
 15 description of where the property is. We're  
 16 ready to start our presentation now. I'm going  
 17 to put up the first slide. There we go. The  
 18 property itself is an entire city block, 2.6  
 19 acres in size, and bounded on the north by  
 20 Malaga, on the south by Santander, on the west  
 21 by Segovia and on the east by Hernando. There  
 22 are 13 buildings on the property at present,  
 23 with a total of 52 dwelling units located on  
 24 that block.  
 25 My client is proposing to re-develop the

Page 116

1 the architectural presentation.  
 2 MS. DE LA GUARDIA: If you need, my name is  
 3 Maria De La Guardia. I'm a principal at De La  
 4 Guardia Victoria Architects and Urbanists, at  
 5 224 Valencia. I'm here with the Architectural  
 6 Director, Keegan Marshall, with home across  
 7 from Salvadore Park.  
 8 We designed this project in collaboration  
 9 with Reyes Cabarrocas Architects and with  
 10 Ernesto Fabre & Company. I want to make sure  
 11 to give them credit.  
 12 So, Gables Village stems from the  
 13 conviction that the fundamental unit of design  
 14 in architecture is not the individual building,  
 15 but the City as a whole, and to the ideal of  
 16 civic art in town building for the well-being  
 17 of individual and community alike. A critical  
 18 objective of the project is to develop a city  
 19 block in such a way that it is, at once,  
 20 responsive to the existing context and yet  
 21 arrives at an urban design that is civic in  
 22 nature, and proposes a prototype for  
 23 development in this District of the City of  
 24 Coral Gables, expressed through a sequence of  
 25 meaningful garden spaces, defined by

Page 117

1 residences. The civic dimension of the project  
 2 reads as a harmonious and balanced relationship  
 3 between the house and garden, city and  
 4 landscape.  
 5 The garden courtyards, the pedestrian  
 6 villa, and muse like driveway, are the  
 7 essential organizing feature of the project,  
 8 and as such, are interconnected as a pedestrian  
 9 sequence of open spaces. These spaces extend  
 10 beyond the properly lines and engage the public  
 11 right-of-way. Santander Avenue and Malaga  
 12 Avenue are physically and visually joined by a  
 13 sequence of courtyard and garden court.  
 14 The consequent perspective view is framed  
 15 by a two-story archway below a gable, as the  
 16 lovely arch at the Douglas Entrance, and lends  
 17 the project its namesake, Gables Village.  
 18 Although interior common open spaces have  
 19 been created within the block, the City streets  
 20 are never neglected, as all residences, with  
 21 street fronts, have their main pedestrian  
 22 entrance oriented towards them. The character  
 23 of the four different streets, Segovia Street,  
 24 Malaga Avenue, Hernando Street and Santander  
 25 Avenue is addressed by appropriate housing

Page 119

1 Malaga. And the pool house is one story.  
 2 On Santander, we're proposing lofts -- I'm  
 3 sorry, we're proposing flats. So we have 24  
 4 flats, and we're proposing 45 5-02 feet on  
 5 Santander.  
 6 Let's go back to the rooftop a minute. One  
 7 of the aspects of the project that I think is  
 8 most successful was our ability to provide more  
 9 open space than is required by Code. So the  
 10 Code, for PAD, requires 20 percent, and we're  
 11 offering 37 percent open space, and thus we've  
 12 been able to create a series of common spaces,  
 13 like we see in the garden court and in the  
 14 courtyard, which are actually connected through  
 15 a two-story archway. So you're on one street  
 16 and you actually see through the street, onto  
 17 the other side. And that happens twice in the  
 18 block.  
 19 And then we have another very interesting  
 20 pedestrian street, which we call the via, which  
 21 connects the property east-west, but all of  
 22 this open space is -- we were able to arrive at  
 23 all of this open space, because of these three  
 24 drives that we created through the property,  
 25 because these three drives allowed us to

Page 118

1 types and corresponding building heights.  
 2 So if we go to the roof plan, so each of  
 3 the four streets have different  
 4 characteristics. So Gables Village addresses  
 5 them with four different typologies with  
 6 corresponding heights. So, on Segovia, we have  
 7 two duplexes, four dwelling units, that face  
 8 Segovia, and they have a height of 30 feet,  
 9 which seems very little compared to the heights  
 10 that you were discussing on the previous item.  
 11 But on Malaga Avenue, we have 16 townhouses,  
 12 and that is in the MF3 Zoning, which allows 45  
 13 5-02 feet, but as a transition to single-family  
 14 residences across the street, we're proposing  
 15 35 5-02 feet for those townhouses.  
 16 MR. BEHAR: And you're allowed 455-02 you  
 17 said?  
 18 MS. DE LA GUARDIA: No. We are proposing  
 19 35 5-02 feet as a transition to single-family.  
 20 MF3 allows 45 5-02 and across -- but we'll talk  
 21 more about it, because I need to clarify that a  
 22 little further -- further on.  
 23 On Hernando, we have four lofts, which  
 24 we're also proposing 35 5-02 feet for the four  
 25 lofts. There's also the pool and pool house on

Page 120

1 organize the automobile and remove it from the  
 2 street and draw it into the garages and make  
 3 the automobile disappear. So, in the entire  
 4 block, we only have six curb cuts. If we're to  
 5 compare it with any other block, we will find  
 6 that there's probably like thirteen or fourteen  
 7 or fifteen curb cuts, but, here, we simply --  
 8 six curb cuts, three on each one of the  
 9 avenues. We're able to bring in the car and  
 10 organize it within the different housing  
 11 typologies.  
 12 So let's go through the images now. So  
 13 these are the duplexes, which present the  
 14 two-story scale and 30 feet, consistent with  
 15 other duplexes on Segovia.  
 16 Next.  
 17 Here we see the three-story townhouses, and  
 18 35 5-02 feet on each side of the garden court,  
 19 and so the townhouses that face the street have  
 20 their entrances on the street, and the  
 21 townhouses that face the garden court are  
 22 entered from the garden court, and we can see  
 23 how, through the archway and the gable, we're  
 24 able to connect the garden court to the  
 25 courtyard beyond as part of the system of

Page 121

1 pedestrian spaces within the block. And, here,  
 2 at the townhouse, we can see a series of  
 3 private loggias overlooking the park.  
 4 The four lofts on Santander are at a three  
 5 stories and 35 5-02 feet height, as they face  
 6 MF3. Between the lofts, we propose a pool  
 7 house and a pool, and so you see -- you see  
 8 sort of the space between the two blocks of the  
 9 lofts.  
 10 Next.  
 11 And so, on Santander, we have three stories  
 12 over the garage, and you can appreciate here  
 13 the courtyard, the arch, which connects onto  
 14 the garden court beyond, the gable and the  
 15 arch. The three-story balconies are inspired  
 16 by the Biltmore balconies, and at the base of  
 17 the building, below the three-story balconies,  
 18 we have what we have named the glorietas, and  
 19 I'll discuss that in a little more detail.  
 20 These were some of our inspirational  
 21 images. So we see the Biltmore with this  
 22 three-story balcony. We see also the archway  
 23 and bridge of the Douglas Entrance, the gable  
 24 at the Merrick House, and then, from the San  
 25 Sebastian, we learned about loggias, colonnade,

Page 123

1 pool to the right of that, behind that  
 2 appropriated wall.  
 3 Here we're seeing the townhouses, and you  
 4 can see sort of the void and the solid, the  
 5 void and the solid, the voids being these  
 6 spaces that we're creating within the block.  
 7 And here we can see the streetscape of  
 8 Santander Avenue.  
 9 As a PDA designation, the Site Plan is able  
 10 to provide a 37 percent ratio of landscape open  
 11 space, exceeding the current minimum  
 12 requirement of 20 percent. The PAD makes it  
 13 possible to not only front the residences on  
 14 the public street and civic spaces, but more  
 15 importantly, it allows for the automobile to be  
 16 segregated to the rear of the building. The  
 17 interior drives allow for a more neighborhood  
 18 friendly resolution of the automobile. Even  
 19 though 92 parking spaces are provided, not a  
 20 single garage door faces the public sidewalk or  
 21 street. Parking along the public right-of-way  
 22 is further systematized by proposing 16  
 23 on-street parking spaces, organized between the  
 24 mature street trees, to replace the existing  
 25 random and unplanned parking on the parkway.

Page 122

1 balconies, towers and how to picturesquely  
 2 compose these elements. From the Santa Barbara  
 3 Courthouse, we see the drama created by the  
 4 intersection of the arch and the gable, and  
 5 that was another inspiring moment. Coral  
 6 Gables Elementary teaches us about the beauty  
 7 of proportions and the elegance of repetition.  
 8 Let's go on to the next one. This is a  
 9 view, where we're standing in the garden court,  
 10 with the townhouse and the garden court on the  
 11 right-hand side, we have the arch on the left,  
 12 and we're looking down the via, and the via was  
 13 inspired by Via Mizner and Via Parigi in Palm  
 14 Beach.  
 15 So these are the elevations of the duplexes  
 16 on Segovia, and one thing that I think is  
 17 important to note is how we're -- the  
 18 elevations, the street elevations, are not  
 19 filled with garages, and so we -- that's  
 20 because we have been able to incorporate the  
 21 car into the block through the drives and thus  
 22 free the pedestrian experience from all of the  
 23 garages.  
 24 This is the elevation to Hernando, with the  
 25 lofts, the pool -- loggia in the middle, and

Page 124

1 The project proposes a -- so I want you to  
 2 note these two photographs, which are basically  
 3 Malaga and Santander, and so this is currently  
 4 what happens with parking around that block,  
 5 where you have the garden apartment buildings,  
 6 and then all of the parking happens in the  
 7 swale, in the right-of-way, leading to  
 8 compaction of the root system of the mature  
 9 trees.  
 10 The project proposes a 48-unit multi-family  
 11 development consisting of a variety of housing  
 12 types, the duplex, flats, lofts and townhouses,  
 13 at an accessible price point. The intention is  
 14 to incorporate universal design and wellness  
 15 principles to allow -- wellness principles to  
 16 allow aging in place and produce a healthy  
 17 cross-section of age groups in the resident  
 18 population. The range of unit types and sizes,  
 19 from two-bedroom flats to four-bedroom  
 20 townhouses, will allow for residents from  
 21 different socioeconomic groups and family  
 22 sizes, a progressive concept that Merrick  
 23 promoted.  
 24 So I wanted to discuss briefly the concept  
 25 of the glorietas. If we can go to that image.

Page 125

1 So, at the base of the flats, we are proposing  
 2 to create four small piazzas, which we have  
 3 labeled as glorietas, and Gables Village  
 4 proposes four public places, at the base of the  
 5 flats, on Santander Avenue. These four place  
 6 making spaces take inspiration from the  
 7 Glorietas of the Iberoamerican exposition of  
 8 1929 in Seville, the 48 Glorietas, representing  
 9 the different provinces, offered seating to the  
 10 tired visitor, fountains to cool the  
 11 temperature and small libraries for sharing  
 12 books on the respective provinces.

13 Gables Village offers four architect's  
 14 renditions of the Glorietas to the neighborhood  
 15 and residents as an artful place to meet  
 16 friends, swap books at the free street library,  
 17 rest while walking the dog, or simply a pause  
 18 for a moment of contemplation. Each of these  
 19 places could illustrate the history of Coral  
 20 Gables or take on a literary theme inspired by  
 21 a Coral Gables poem. They would also serve as  
 22 a setting for the Art in Public Places  
 23 component of Gables Village.

24 As Coral Gables nears its Centennial  
 25 celebration, the principles of the City

Page 127

1 entire City block, I don't know what is. And  
 2 if this project is not of sufficient quality to  
 3 be part of the future of Coral Gables, then  
 4 there is reason to be concerned, because, in my  
 5 opinion, this project is quintessentially Coral  
 6 Gables.

7 Your Staff is recommending approval with  
 8 conditions. We're in agreement with those  
 9 conditions. The Board of Architects  
 10 unanimously approved this project by a vote of  
 11 nine to zero or eight to zero, and I would ask  
 12 that you follow those recommendations and those  
 13 other approvals and also vote to recommend  
 14 approval of this project to the City  
 15 Commission.

16 I'll reserve time for rebuttal, if  
 17 necessary, and we also are available for any  
 18 questions.

19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.  
 20 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Thank you.  
 21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Mr. Trias.  
 22 MR. TRIAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
 23 I do have to give the presentation. I was  
 24 not scheduled, but I have to do it, for the  
 25 record, and I'll say a couple of things. Would

Page 126

1 Beautiful and garden City movement are just as  
 2 relevant today as when George Merrick first  
 3 conceived the City and the garden. His civic  
 4 art legacy, in the form of shaded tree lined  
 5 streets, plazas, parks, fountains, and the  
 6 celebration of the public realm as welcoming  
 7 and beautiful, forms the conceptual basis of  
 8 Gables Village, where the natural and built  
 9 environment is celebrated for the benefit of  
 10 its residents and neighbors. Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.  
 12 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Mr. Chair, Members of  
 13 the Board, we are at a point in time when the  
 14 issue of what sort of design and architecture  
 15 should be encouraged in Coral Gables, it's one  
 16 of the leading topics of public interest, as  
 17 was evidenced by the discussion you had  
 18 previously.

19 I would respectfully submit that this  
 20 project can serve as an example of how  
 21 re-development should be done in the City of  
 22 Coral Gables. If this is not in the Coral  
 23 Gables Mediterranean style of architecture, I  
 24 do not know what is. If this is not an  
 25 appropriate design through a PAD process for an

Page 128

1 you believe that this project actually reduces  
 2 density? It has less units, less units, than  
 3 what's there now. Like most cities, that's the  
 4 most important thing you will listen to in a  
 5 presentation from the Planning Director.  
 6 That's what they would tell you.

7 But in this City, we're so lucky that we  
 8 can say, you know, this is a beautiful project,  
 9 that really follows the standards of the  
 10 Mediterranean architecture.

11 So if I could have the presentation please,  
 12 real quickly.

13 You know where it is. It's the whole  
 14 block. It's Zoned duplex in the front and  
 15 townhouse in the back.

16 Two requests, PAD and Tentative Plat. Keep  
 17 in mind that they're not getting a bonus for  
 18 the Mediterranean. It's just a requirement.  
 19 You have to comply with the standards of the  
 20 architecture for the Zoning.

21 The PAD, as you well know, is the type of  
 22 instrument that allows you to design something  
 23 that is appropriate to the site, to be able to  
 24 customize the zoning and that's what the PAD  
 25 does.



Page 129

1 So there's a couple of little things that  
 2 they have dealt with, with the PAD, minor  
 3 issues that have been brought up, but I think  
 4 they have been answered properly.  
 5 A lot of public space, as required by the  
 6 PAD, a very good mix of unit types, as the PAD  
 7 aspires to do. It complies with the  
 8 requirements of the Code. It complies with the  
 9 area and so on.  
 10 And then there's the Tentative Plat.  
 11 Originally, it was two parcels, the duplex in  
 12 the blue and the townhomes and small apartments  
 13 on the end. We think it's going to work better  
 14 with three. It's just some minor changes, a  
 15 technical change, I don't think it has  
 16 relevance in the discussion.  
 17 The time line, there was a neighborhood  
 18 meeting in September, there was a Board of  
 19 Architects that went very well, today is  
 20 Planning & Zoning, and then it goes to  
 21 Commission, as a PAD always does go to  
 22 Commission, and it requires Commission  
 23 approval.  
 24 Now, letters were sent to property owners  
 25 within a thousand feet. That's the radius of

Page 131

1 in, since the representative is here tonight.  
 2 She can choose either to read it in or  
 3 summarize it. I believe all members have a  
 4 copy of this.  
 5 MR. TRIAS: There were several letters in  
 6 opposition.  
 7 MR. COLLER: And there were a couple of  
 8 other letters that do need to be read in, for  
 9 people that are not present.  
 10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes, that's what I was  
 11 going to ask. Thank you.  
 12 Jill, how many people have gone ahead and  
 13 sent e-mails or letters to you based on this  
 14 project?  
 15 THE SECRETARY: I have two other e-mails  
 16 here.  
 17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Could you read them  
 18 into the record, please?  
 19 THE SECRETARY: Sure. Sally Baumgartner.  
 20 "Mr. Trias, my name is Sally Baumgartner.  
 21 I'm the owner of 3123 through 3125 Segovia  
 22 Street, on the corner of Santander, since 1988.  
 23 I'm writing this letter, as I am unable to make  
 24 it to the Planning & Zoning meeting this  
 25 evening; however, I would like to have my

Page 130

1 the map area -- I'm sorry -- and two times we  
 2 sent letters, the property was posted twice,  
 3 website posting twice, and the newspaper  
 4 advertisement for this meeting also was done.  
 5 So Staff determines that this application  
 6 is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and  
 7 we're recommending approval with conditions  
 8 that the Applicant has agreed to do. One of  
 9 which is the three parcels for the -- or the  
 10 three tracts for the plat, and then pavers  
 11 within the parking area, in the right-of-way,  
 12 and the replacement of some of the lighting  
 13 with a more appropriate pedestrian lighting  
 14 design.  
 15 Thank you very much.  
 16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, sir.  
 17 Jill --  
 18 MR. COLLER: Mr. Chairman, just one note on  
 19 this.  
 20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes, sir.  
 21 MR. COLLER: I just want to make sure this  
 22 battery operated microphone is still alive.  
 23 And I spoke to -- the president of the Coral  
 24 Gables Neighborhood Association is present. I  
 25 don't believe it's necessary to read that one

Page 132

1 observations and objections on the record  
 2 regarding this proposed development.  
 3 While the architects are to be  
 4 congratulated on the design of the proposed  
 5 project, it can hardly be called a village.  
 6 What currently exists is a village however  
 7 dated it might be. The proposed project is  
 8 more akin to a compound. Although I'm not a  
 9 student of the Zoning Code, in reviewing the  
 10 plans of this project, I noted that the height  
 11 of the buildings across from my property on  
 12 Santander do not meet the performance standards  
 13 applicable to MF1 or single-family Zoning.  
 14 According to Section 2-104, as I read it, the  
 15 maximum height of a new structure that abuts  
 16 MF1 Zoned property is 35 5-02 feet and that  
 17 height is to be carried back for 50 feet."  
 18 There is a drawing.  
 19 And it continues, "I'm also not much of an  
 20 artist, but hopefully this diagram will  
 21 illustrate what I'm trying to say. The units  
 22 being planned for the MF1 parcels will have to  
 23 conform with the 35 5-02 and not the 45 5-02  
 24 height as proposed.  
 25 "I believe the developer might have to lose

Page 133

1 two units, but, regardless, they should be  
 2 required to maintain the performance standards  
 3 required by the Code.  
 4 "Thank you for taking the time to consider  
 5 my comments. I look forward to a mutually  
 6 acceptable outcome."  
 7 The other letter is from the Historic  
 8 Preservation Association of Coral Gables.  
 9 "Agenda Items 1 and 2 are related to Gables  
 10 Village.  
 11 "Oh behalf of the Historic Preservation  
 12 Association of Coral Gables, please accept this  
 13 letter in opposition to the Gables Village  
 14 development as currently proposed. The  
 15 Community is currently seeking historic  
 16 designation for 5-02 Santander Avenue for its  
 17 historic, cultural and architectural  
 18 significance as an intact example of a garden  
 19 apartment building in the Monterey style. The  
 20 Historic Preservation Board has not yet  
 21 reviewed the 503 Santander Avenue for historic  
 22 significance."  
 23 "The Gables Village proposal seeks to  
 24 demolish an entire city block of garden  
 25 apartments, including 5-02 Santander Avenue.

Page 135

1 Coral Gables promotes the understanding and the  
 2 importance of historic resources and their  
 3 preservations.  
 4 "Respectfully, Karelia Martinez Carbonell,  
 5 President of Historic Preservation Association  
 6 of Coral Gables."  
 7 Those are the two letters we have.  
 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you. How many  
 9 speakers do we have?  
 10 THE SECRETARY: We have eight speakers, one  
 11 via Zoom.  
 12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Let's go ahead and  
 13 call the first speaker.  
 14 THE SECRETARY: Sue Kawalerski.  
 15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. Do we need to  
 16 go ahead and read the letter, if she would not  
 17 like to speak, and enter it into the record?  
 18 MR. COLLER: It was my understanding that  
 19 they were going to make a presentation. Do  
 20 they want waive their presentation. How do you  
 21 want to handle it?  
 22 (Inaudible.)  
 23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Would you like to do  
 24 that or would you like us just to read the  
 25 letter, for the record? Thank you.

Page 134

1 Founder George Merrick included affordable  
 2 housing and garden apartments as part of the  
 3 tenets of this City, as based on the Garden  
 4 City and City Beautiful movements. Different  
 5 architecture styles, such as the Monterey, were  
 6 constructed to complement the fabric of a rich  
 7 historic built environment of the City. The  
 8 proposal seeks to demolish an established piece  
 9 of this fabric.  
 10 "As such, the Gables Village proposal does  
 11 not satisfy Section 5-201 of the Coral Gables  
 12 Mediterranean Style Design Standards, as it  
 13 does not continue to support George Merrick's  
 14 vision, consistent with the established  
 15 historic building fabric of the City.  
 16 Therefore, the proposal should not be awarded  
 17 Mediterranean bonus, if 5-02 Santander Avenue  
 18 is demolished. We ask the Planning & Zoning  
 19 Board to deny the current application for the  
 20 PAD and Mediterranean Bonus. Refinement and  
 21 study is needed as to how the significant  
 22 Monterey building, located at 503 Santander  
 23 Avenue, could be preserved, as a separate site  
 24 or incorporated into the development.  
 25 "The Historic Preservation Association of

Page 136

1 MR. COLLER: It's your choice.  
 2 MS. KAWALERSKI: Good evening. I'm Sue  
 3 Kawalerski. I live at 6830 Grecian Street.  
 4 I'm the president of the Coral Gables Neighbors  
 5 Association, with 16,000 members.  
 6 We oppose this project as proposed, and, in  
 7 summary, the letter states exactly why and it  
 8 state statutes why, but, in summary, we could  
 9 support the project, if the following three  
 10 conditions were met. Number One, a more  
 11 thoughtful transition given to the  
 12 single-family homes across the street; Number  
 13 Two, additional opening to the street green  
 14 spaces or a public community park; and Number  
 15 Three, the preservation of 5-02 Santander  
 16 Avenue as a visible reminder of the historic  
 17 fabric of the area, and that is the summary of  
 18 our report.  
 19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.  
 20 Next speaker, please.  
 21 THE SECRETARY: Agustin De La Guardia.  
 22 MR. DE LA GUARDIA: Mr. Chairman,  
 23 Commissioners, my name is Agustin De La  
 24 Guardia. I'm the brother of the architect,  
 25 Maria De La Guardia.

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: If you can state your  
 2 address, for the record.  
 3 MR. DE LA GUARDIA: 3246 Riviera Drive. I  
 4 live about three blocks away from this project.  
 5 After sitting through the last two hours or  
 6 more, I've realized that you have a double  
 7 mandate, much like the FOMC. You want to  
 8 constrain the animal spirits, but you also have  
 9 to know when to release the animal spirits. So  
 10 your job is not easy.  
 11 I think this is a lovely project. I think  
 12 it fits very well in with everything that  
 13 George Merrick envisioned for Coral Gables, and  
 14 I would urge you to approve it. Thank you.  
 15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, sir.  
 16 THE SECRETARY: Maria Longo.  
 17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Before you speak, Ms.  
 18 Campbell (sic) -- please come up -- since we're  
 19 approaching nine o'clock, if there's a motion  
 20 to extend the time, and, if so, for how long?  
 21 MR. BEHAR: I'll make a motion to extend,  
 22 and let's start with fifteen minutes, if you  
 23 think --  
 24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have a motion for  
 25 15 --

1 anything out.  
 2 When George Merrick dreamed about building  
 3 a beautiful city in the 1920s, he studied  
 4 different outstanding cities in the United  
 5 States and he sent his architects to  
 6 Mediterranean Europe to learn and study  
 7 beautiful cities and architecture. His team  
 8 was a dream team. They were very ambitious,  
 9 they had good taste, they were extraordinary  
 10 planners, they were artists and classists.  
 11 Merrick's team understood the value of  
 12 developing timeless architecture, that creates  
 13 a sense of place, in which design, style,  
 14 details, context, compatibility, scale,  
 15 proportions, fenestration, massing and the  
 16 pedestrian mattered, everything that you spoke  
 17 about in the beginning regarding Mediterranean,  
 18 the Mediterranean bonus. They even had color  
 19 specialists.  
 20 And when he -- when George Fink traveled to  
 21 Europe and came back, the company adopted the  
 22 new style of Mediterranean architecture in the  
 23 Gables, and they made it a mandate. This is  
 24 very important. They understood the value of  
 25 developing a City with a theme based on

1 MS. MIRO: I'll second it.  
 2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have a second. Any  
 3 discussion? No?  
 4 Call the roll, please.  
 5 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  
 6 MR. BEHAR: Yes.  
 7 THE SECRETARY: Maria Miro -- Claudia Miro,  
 8 I'm sorry?  
 9 MS. MIRO: Yes.  
 10 THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?  
 11 MR. REVUELTA: Yes.  
 12 THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?  
 13 MR. WITHERS: He's not here.  
 14 MS. MIRO: He left.  
 15 THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?  
 16 MR. WITHERS: Yes.  
 17 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat?  
 18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.  
 19 Please.  
 20 MS. LONGO: My name is Maria Cristina  
 21 Longo, and I own a property at 2710 Segovia. I  
 22 live at 16 Phoenetia. And I'm a real estate  
 23 investor and antique developer in the City of  
 24 Coral Gables. I'm going to read my comments,  
 25 because I want to make sure that I don't leave

1 classical principles and they focused on this  
 2 theme wholeheartedly. So I emphasize classical  
 3 principles, because the traditional  
 4 architecture that we have in Coral Gables has,  
 5 as a foundation, classical principles, and that  
 6 group of architects, in the 1920s, they learned  
 7 it, they studied it. They understood the  
 8 canons in everything related to classical  
 9 architecture.  
 10 The project presented here today, Gables  
 11 Village, it is my opinion that it's respectful  
 12 of Merrick's vision and our heritage and it  
 13 helps preserve our history, because its design  
 14 style is authentic. The word that I think we  
 15 may have missed in the discussion -- during the  
 16 discussion, I wanted to jump and say, authentic  
 17 Mediterranean -- authentic Mediterranean  
 18 architecture became Mediterranean revival, and  
 19 it was an interpretation in our climate --  
 20 based on our climate and the context of our  
 21 climate. So it evolved into Mediterranean  
 22 revival, and it took into consideration our  
 23 climate and the context here.  
 24 In my opinion, Gables Village is exemplary  
 25 in many ways. This project also has a dream

Page 141

1 team behind this vision. The developer  
 2 understands and follows the successful vision  
 3 that made our City so attractive and special.  
 4 The principal architect, De La Guardia Victoria  
 5 Architects and Urbanists, as well as other  
 6 collaborating architects in her team, are  
 7 trained in classical and traditional  
 8 architecture and urbanism, which is one of the  
 9 reasons we're not getting -- I'm sort of  
 10 getting into a tangent, but that's one of the  
 11 reasons we're not getting authentic  
 12 Mediterranean revival, because, unfortunately,  
 13 universities don't train in classical  
 14 principles anymore, and so I don't think it's  
 15 that the architects are bad architects, I think  
 16 that they lack the training and the knowledge.  
 17 This dream team has thought of every  
 18 possible detail for Gables Village architecture  
 19 and design. This project will create a sense  
 20 of place. It is timeless. It has created a  
 21 pedestrian friendly area, that incorporates  
 22 beautiful gardens, that can be enjoyed by all  
 23 surrounding neighbors. They have ingeniously  
 24 removed all cars from the swale area. I repeat  
 25 it again, the design is authentic Mediterranean

Page 143

1 a teacher, so I would only give extra credit if  
 2 the projects they gave me were extraordinary.  
 3 I would like to say this before I go, the  
 4 Mediterranean bonus, the bonus should be given  
 5 for something done extraordinary. It's extra.  
 6 Bonus is extra.  
 7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.  
 8 MS. LONGO: Thank you.  
 9 THE SECRETARY: Tom O'Malley.  
 10 MR. O'MALLEY: Hi, I'm Tom O'Malley, and I  
 11 live at 616 Jeronimo Drive, and I just have a  
 12 few comments to make here.  
 13 I believe that the request for changes or  
 14 approvals, waivers, variances, is consistent  
 15 with the two-hour long discussion that we just  
 16 had regarding what's going on with the City,  
 17 why are citizens reacting to development, and I  
 18 think we have in front of us another example of  
 19 this. How do developments become so large, how  
 20 do people think they're inconsistent with the  
 21 neighborhood or incompatible with the  
 22 neighborhood? Why are citizens reacting to  
 23 developments that appear to be out of scope?  
 24 This is a perfect example.  
 25 Now, I think the development plan is very

Page 142

1 revival architecture, with beautiful details,  
 2 fenestrations, foyers and fountains. Gables  
 3 Village is tasteful, thoughtful, harmonious and  
 4 it will increase the quality of life to the  
 5 surrounding neighbors.  
 6 This project will serve as a showcase for  
 7 other developers to follow. Now we have other  
 8 projects to follow, obviously, that were  
 9 developed by George Merrick's team, but in  
 10 recent times, we're unfortunately not getting  
 11 good ones, and that's why we have the Blue  
 12 Ribbon Committee, and that's why many friends,  
 13 including myself, after projects are approved  
 14 in the Board, you go, how did that happen, how  
 15 did that get approved?  
 16 This is not one of those. The most  
 17 incredible characteristic of this project is  
 18 that the developer did not benefit from the  
 19 Mediterranean bonus. He just got only one more  
 20 unit from that bonus. That is all. This  
 21 project is an opportunity to show other  
 22 developers what true beautiful Mediterranean  
 23 architecture looks like. Without the benefit  
 24 of the Mediterranean bonus, this project gets  
 25 from me an A plus, plus, plus, and I used to be

Page 144

1 nice, in terms of Mediterranean style, but I  
 2 believe there's some issues with Gables  
 3 Village. I think there's a height issue --  
 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: There's no  
 5 variances --  
 6 MR. BEHAR: They're not seeking for a  
 7 variance, they're not seeking for anything? Am  
 8 I confused here. You mentioned variances.  
 9 MR. O'MALLEY: Sir, I don't know the  
 10 correct words to use when people are asking for  
 11 approvals to do things. So maybe I shouldn't  
 12 have used them all, but I wanted to make  
 13 sure --  
 14 MR. BEHAR: Because that's on the record,  
 15 and you said that they're asking for variances.  
 16 I just want to make sure, I understood -- I  
 17 understood from the Staff they were not asking  
 18 for anything other than the replat.  
 19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Variances are not to  
 20 be brought before our Board.  
 21 MR. O'MALLEY: Okay. May I scratch the  
 22 word variance? But I do understand there's a  
 23 height issue for the development. I also  
 24 understand, and I would like to see the  
 25 developer provide specific information with

Page 145

1 regards to their claim they're providing 37  
 2 percent open space for this development,  
 3 because I don't think concrete driveways,  
 4 concrete walkways and pools actually qualify  
 5 for open space, and I'd also like to see a  
 6 definition from the developer with regards to  
 7 open landscape space, and to see if they're  
 8 actually compliant, and when I ask for that  
 9 kind of information, I mean, specific square  
 10 footage and locations.

11 The developer spoke about or the attorney  
 12 for the developer or somebody spoke about, in  
 13 the spirit of George Merrick, this building has  
 14 an accessible price point. Current two-bedroom  
 15 apartments in this area go for \$1,600 a month.  
 16 The bottom line or buy in lowest price point  
 17 for a development -- for a unit in this  
 18 development is over \$800,000. I'm not sure an  
 19 accessible price point of 1,600 for a  
 20 two-bedroom apartment and \$800,000 plus  
 21 purchase price is the same.

22 Also, Mr. Trias, I think, does a very good  
 23 job, but I also question the word significant.  
 24 I think, when he explained that there's a  
 25 significant difference in the density of the

Page 147

1 City fathers' had and the City Architects, and  
 2 that they're actually inspiring a lot of the  
 3 characteristics of this project -- so I think  
 4 that's very noteworthy -- as well as the  
 5 pedestrian experience in this neighborhood and  
 6 the neighboring streets, as well, what their  
 7 neighbors across will look like without cars  
 8 and driveways and parking garage doors for that  
 9 density of a block.

10 So, the vias, the open space courtyard,  
 11 gardens, assembly of the massing of the  
 12 buildings, the volumetric of it all, I think it  
 13 should be really commended to the architecture  
 14 team, how much thought and success they were  
 15 able to achieve for the community. I think the  
 16 residents will really be able to appreciate it  
 17 as they see it built. So I'm very supportive  
 18 and hope you approve it. Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.  
 20 THE SECRETARY: Carlos Singer.  
 21 MR. SINGER: Good evening. I live at 820  
 22 Castile Avenue in Coral Gables. I wanted to be  
 23 here this evening and show support for this  
 24 project. I love living in Coral Gables. I  
 25 love the style of living, the ability to be in

Page 146

1 current buildings in that area to existing, I  
 2 don't think it's significant. I think it's  
 3 moderate or mild or about the same.

4 So I think this should be given some more  
 5 thought about this project, and I think the  
 6 project should be -- there are some areas that  
 7 should be considered for not approval or  
 8 deferral at this time. Thank you very much.

9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, sir.  
 10 THE SECRETARY: Jose Rivera-Font.  
 11 Ann Finch.  
 12 MS. FINCH: Good evening. My name is Anne  
 13 Finch. I live here in Coral Gables on Castile  
 14 Avenue.

15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Would you state your  
 16 full address, please?  
 17 MS. FINCH: Sorry. 820 Castile Avenue. I  
 18 am an architect and work in the area. One of  
 19 the things I wanted to mention about this  
 20 project is, it's very rare when a whole  
 21 property like this is assembled, and it's very  
 22 interesting to me to see that a hundred years  
 23 after Coral Gables' founding, that we have an  
 24 opportunity to create another village, in  
 25 keeping with kind of an urban plan that the

Page 148

1 a community with nice streets, trees and  
 2 Miracle Mile. I think a project of this  
 3 nature, the size of the project, the  
 4 architecture, is commendable and should be  
 5 supported. Thank you very much.

6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, sir.  
 7 THE SECRETARY: Jose Rivera-Font.  
 8 MR. RIVERA-FONT: Good evening. I'm a  
 9 neighbor at 5-02 Malaga. I'll be directly  
 10 affected.

11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Would you just state  
 12 your name, for the record?  
 13 MR. RIVERA-FONT: For the record, Jose  
 14 Rivera-Font. Like I said, I'm a neighbor of  
 15 5-02 Malaga. I'll be directly affected by this  
 16 project.

17 We are very much in favor of this project.  
 18 We believe in the quality of life and value  
 19 that it offers. Specifically, we've lived in  
 20 front of this existing set of buildings for a  
 21 number of years, since 2001, to be specific, so  
 22 20 years ago, until today, and we see the  
 23 tremendous value this proposed and significant,  
 24 I should say, development would provide to the  
 25 community.

1 One of the things that I've heard in this  
2 presentation, because I was on the phone  
3 listening to the Zoom call, is that some  
4 associations have had some concerns about some  
5 of the design and proposed heights of  
6 buildings. From what I've seen and the plans  
7 that have been shared with me, it seems to be  
8 fully compliant with what Zoning has provided  
9 for these architects to do this marvelous job.

10 One of the things I can tell you is that  
11 the current setting of the existing set of  
12 buildings, some of buildings are in extreme  
13 disrepair, and some of the folks that come  
14 visit the area do not properly -- visit or live  
15 in the area, do not properly follow the  
16 guidelines of the City on how to keep it clean  
17 and beautiful. So this idea of keeping with  
18 the Merrick vision, and this idea of keeping  
19 within the scope of the Zoning regulations, I  
20 think is something that is going to help the  
21 community.

22 Something else is, some of these  
23 associations that have presented tonight, I  
24 don't know how many of them -- I think one of  
25 them represents 16,000 Coral Gables residents,

1 but I don't know how many of them live in this  
2 neighborhood, live in this particular area, and  
3 how can this association represent that all  
4 16,000 of them would be opposed to this? So I  
5 just want to make sure that you have that into  
6 consideration, because it's very important for  
7 the people that we -- that live there, do  
8 benefit from this magnificent development that  
9 has been proposed. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, sir.

11 MR. BEHAR: Mr. Chairman, we're getting  
12 close to the time. I'll make a motion that we  
13 extend it for another fifteen minutes.

14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have a motion for  
15 fifteen more minutes.

16 MS. MIRO: Second.

17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have a second? Any  
18 discussion?

19 MR. COLLER: You can do a voice vote.

20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Go ahead, please, call  
21 the roll.

22 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?

23 MR. BEHAR: Yes.

24 THE SECRETARY: Claudia Miro?

25 MS. MIRO: Yes.

1 THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?

2 MR. REVUELTA: Yes.

3 THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?

4 MR. WITHERS: Yes.

5 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat?

6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.

7 Does this conclude the people that are in  
8 the Chambers?

9 THE SECRETARY: Yes. We have one speaker  
10 via Zoom.

11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay.

12 THE SECRETARY: Brett, can you please  
13 unmute yourself?

14 MR. GILLIS: Hello, can you hear me?

15 THE SECRETARY: Yes.

16 MR. GILLIS: Hello, my name is Brett  
17 Gillis, 915 Ferdinand Street, Coral Gables,  
18 Florida 33134.

19 First, I'd like to begin by saying I think  
20 that this project is one of the best I've seen  
21 proposed for a project in Coral Gables, by one  
22 of the best architects in Coral Gables,  
23 however, my objection will be based on the  
24 location of the project and the PAD. You know,  
25 the Board of Architects reviewed the beauty of

1 the project. I've mentioned that already. I  
2 can't mention it enough. However, you're the  
3 Planning & Zoning Board, and I would bring your  
4 attention to a few factors to consider.

5 First of all, 503 Santander, I received a  
6 message from the Historic Preservation  
7 Association that this building has not been --  
8 it has been applied for, but the Historic  
9 Preservation Board has not reviewed that it can  
10 even be demolished yet.

11 And, second of all, the PAD provisions, as  
12 per our Zoning Code, substantial additional  
13 public benefit must be provided. And I really  
14 must respectfully disagree with the Staff. I  
15 don't find that there have been substantial and  
16 additional public benefits with this PAD  
17 proposal. I look at it, and we keep hearing  
18 the term village being used, and I think that  
19 that sounds accurate. Most of the wonderful  
20 amenities of this project will be enjoyed by  
21 the people that are inside the walls of this  
22 project. If I'm a member of the community  
23 walking by, I live in the single-family  
24 neighborhood, I see the single-family homes  
25 across the street, what benefits am I going to

Page 153

1 have, what are the substantial benefits? I  
 2 would like that explained. I think that for  
 3 this Board to approve a PAD for this project,  
 4 you must comply with our Zoning Code.  
 5 So Point Number Two would be to encourage  
 6 enhancement and preservation of lands. That's  
 7 part of our Zoning Code. I don't believe that  
 8 this complies.  
 9 Number Three, the third point that I do not  
 10 believe is complied with, with the Zoning Code  
 11 is that, to provided an alternative and more  
 12 efficient use and opportunities for public and  
 13 private open space, preservation of areas and  
 14 maintain the neighborhood and community  
 15 identity. It's very obvious that the  
 16 neighborhood identity will be drastically  
 17 changed by this building. There are currently  
 18 World War II garden apartment houses in that  
 19 area, with substantial green space in between,  
 20 and this project will serve to close off this  
 21 block to the public.  
 22 The fourth one would be, encourage  
 23 harmonious and coordinated development and  
 24 preservation of natural features, scenic areas,  
 25 community facilities and reduce the utilization

Page 154

1 of roads and separate pedestrian and vehicular  
 2 circulation systems. I think that the project  
 3 architect already stated they're actually going  
 4 to be creating new roads. So it's not going to  
 5 reduce land utilization for roads or drives.  
 6 And Point Number 5, professional  
 7 application of planning and design techniques  
 8 to achieve overall coordinated development,  
 9 eliminating the negative impacts, unplanned and  
 10 piecemeal developments. Currently, across the  
 11 street, you have single-family homes and the  
 12 garden apartment buildings that are currently  
 13 in place tend to be more aesthetically  
 14 compatible with that, because you have spaces  
 15 in between the buildings. There are not large  
 16 walls in the front and there are spaces in  
 17 between that provide that open space, that  
 18 gives the neighborhood the feel that it has  
 19 currently.  
 20 This Village will basically close off this  
 21 area to the surrounding areas and I really have  
 22 concerns about the public benefits of this. I  
 23 do not feel that it complies with our PAD  
 24 provisions, as I have enumerated here, and I  
 25 really hope that you work with this team to

Page 155

1 come up with a reasonable solution. Thank you.  
 2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, sir.  
 3 Is that it, Jill?  
 4 THE SECRETARY: Yes.  
 5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: At this time, I'd like  
 6 to go ahead and close for public comment.  
 7 Mario.  
 8 MS. DE LA GUARDIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
 9 I'll be brief in responding to some of these  
 10 objections. I think you probably heard four  
 11 categories of objections, one of them being  
 12 height. This project has given tremendous  
 13 attention to height and the sensitivity to  
 14 height. When we're across from single-family,  
 15 it's where the townhouse product is. When  
 16 we're across from apartment or apartment  
 17 zoning, is where it's a little bit higher, at  
 18 45 5-02 feet. The duplex units fronting  
 19 Segovia are a lower height, also.  
 20 You heard earlier, in the previous  
 21 discussion, of how 45 5-02 feet is sort of the  
 22 number for the smaller scale, the maximum  
 23 height that it should be, and it's at maximum  
 24 height, 45 feet. There is some areas on our  
 25 own property where we have those MF1 and MF3

Page 156

1 zonings, where typically you would be required  
 2 to be at 35, instead of 45, but, again, it's  
 3 our own property, and the PAD is giving us the  
 4 flexibility to go to 45 5-02 for that small  
 5 portion of property. There's also a much  
 6 larger area of property, where we could be at  
 7 455-02 but we're not. Again, we're planning  
 8 this on a block level, so we can have  
 9 appropriate height, depending on what the  
 10 street space is.  
 11 There's argument, there was a claim for  
 12 more green space. We have a tremendous amount  
 13 of green space. We're complying with the  
 14 landscape open space definition as it is  
 15 provided for in the Zoning Code.  
 16 There was mention of 5-02 Santander as  
 17 being potentially historic. The City Historic  
 18 Resources staff, they're here tonight, if you  
 19 need to hear from them, have already determined  
 20 that that property is not historically  
 21 significant, after considerable deliberation,  
 22 and it's in writing.  
 23 Lastly, they claim that there's no public  
 24 benefit, they think it doesn't pay attention to  
 25 all of the public benefit that there is, or

1 regard public spaces and a tremendously  
2 improved streetscape, improved parking  
3 situation, all of this is improved for the  
4 benefit of the public and the neighbors that  
5 live around there.

6 With that said, that will be the conclusion  
7 of our presentation and we ask for your  
8 favorable consideration of this project.

9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, sir.

10 What I would like to ask is, the gentleman  
11 that's here from Historic Preservation, would  
12 you come up a second? Would you verify,  
13 please, what Mario has stated on the record?

14 MR. ADAMS: Yes, absolutely.

15 Warren Adams, Historic Resources and  
16 Cultural Office Director, any time a building  
17 is potentially going to be demolished, it has  
18 to be demolished, it has to get a letter from  
19 my department stating whether it meets the  
20 requirements for designation or it does not.

21 If it does, we would move ahead with a  
22 designation report. In this case, we've put a  
23 lot of thought into it. We spent a lot of time  
24 looking at it. And my opinion was, when I  
25 first looked at this block, there were thirteen

1 properties on it. When I started with the  
2 City, eleven of them had already been signed  
3 off for not meeting the criteria.

4 My opinion was that this property may have  
5 been a contributing building with any historic  
6 district; however, because all of the rest of  
7 them had been signed off, there was no option  
8 to create the district. So, in my opinion,  
9 this was definitely eligible as a contributing  
10 building in a District, but it did not stack up  
11 to the requirements for individual designation,  
12 and this also is an opinion shared by Jorge  
13 Hernandez, who's an architect and a faculty  
14 member of the University of Miami School of  
15 Architecture, and this is an opinion also  
16 shared by Ricardo Lopez, Principal, Florez  
17 Lopez Architecture, and assistant director UCD  
18 UM School of Architecture.

19 And I would also like to point out that the  
20 initial decision for this property, and the  
21 determination, was made on August 26th, and as  
22 far as I'm aware, this letter was only written  
23 today, October the 13th, and I have not  
24 received a request for historic designation  
25 from anyone up to this point.

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, sir.

2 MR. ADAMS: Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Chip, would you like  
4 to go first?

5 MR. WITHERS: Yeah.

6 Ramon, can I ask you a couple of questions?  
7 I'm trying to get a handle on -- first of all,  
8 have we ever done a PAD in a Residential  
9 neighborhood like this?

10 MR. TRIAS: I don't know. I would have to  
11 check. It's not typical.

12 MR. WITHERS: Again, I don't know of  
13 what --

14 MR. TRIAS: If that is the question, it's  
15 not typical, yes.

16 MR. WITHERS: I mean, are PADs intended to  
17 be in Residential neighborhoods or are they  
18 intended to be in Commercial areas where you  
19 can move massing around?

20 MR. TRIAS: I think most likely the  
21 original intent was for the Commercial areas,  
22 yes.

23 MR. WITHERS: Yet we use the same  
24 requirements for a Commercial PAD as we do a  
25 Residential PAD, but it's a totally different

1 type of application. I mean, that's where I'm  
2 having a big issue.

3 MR. TRIAS: I mean, like I said, I can say  
4 with certainty that this is less dense than  
5 what's there now, I think a lot of people will  
6 be very happy, because there's going to be  
7 less --

8 MR. WITHERS: Yeah, but also PADs are to  
9 move density from sides of the property to be  
10 less obtrusive or whatever the word is, to the  
11 other side.

12 MR. TRIAS: Which I never quite understood  
13 exactly what that meant, because most of the  
14 time --

15 MR. WITHERS: But you're supposed to be the  
16 Director of the Department.

17 MR. TRIAS: No, but this is a serious  
18 question, because the issue is that most of the  
19 time, it's a single parcel, with a single  
20 Zoning designation, right, and so, I mean, you  
21 can move that around without any kind of  
22 special process. So it's interesting that that  
23 was placed in the original --

24 MR. WITHERS: So is the lot coverage on a  
25 PAD the same as lot coverage on just a regular



1 lot?  
 2 MR. TRIAS: The PAD requires more open  
 3 space.  
 4 MR. WITHERS: I'm sorry?  
 5 MR. TRIAS: The PAD requires more open  
 6 space, 20 percent or more.  
 7 MR. WITHERS: So, in this current piece of  
 8 property, it's Zoned primarily, what,  
 9 Single-Family on the north side? Is that what  
 10 it is? And then duplex on the west side?  
 11 MR. TRIAS: Duplex and then townhome, yeah.  
 12 MR. WITHERS: So is there any Residential  
 13 on this at all?  
 14 MR. TRIAS: Right now, there's a house,  
 15 yeah.  
 16 MR. WITHERS: But I mean, Residential  
 17 Zoning. It's just one lot that's Residential?  
 18 MR. TRIAS: Residential, you mean,  
 19 single-family?  
 20 MR. WITHERS: Yeah, single-family.  
 21 MR. TRIAS: Not right, no.  
 22 MR. WITHERS: Not right now.  
 23 Okay. And so is the lot coverage on the  
 24 existing properties now 45 5-02 percent, is  
 25 that what it is, that's required?

1 MS. DE LA GUARDIA: How we -- or what is  
 2 included in the open space requirement?  
 3 MR. WITHERS: I took your total square  
 4 footage of the piece of property, 113,000. I  
 5 took away your 37,00 square feet of landscaping  
 6 that you're giving, 37 percent, and I came up  
 7 with 71,000 square foot residual left over  
 8 area, and I want to find out, is that lot  
 9 coverage or what makes up that 71,000?  
 10 MS. DE LA GUARDIA: No, because there are  
 11 certain things, like your driveways --  
 12 MR. WITHERS: Okay.  
 13 MS. DE LA GUARDIA: Like our drives do not  
 14 count toward -- they don't count toward open  
 15 space.  
 16 MR. WITHERS: Toward lot coverage.  
 17 MS. DE LA GUARDIA: So what counts toward  
 18 open space are the garden, the courtyard, the  
 19 gardening courts, the via, which is pedestrian.  
 20 Those count toward the open space. But drives,  
 21 where cars can drive, don't count toward open  
 22 space.  
 23 MR. WITHERS: Okay.  
 24 MS. DE LA GUARDIA: So the remainder, that  
 25 balance that you mentioned, would be a

1 MR. TRIAS: Are you reading from my --  
 2 MR. WITHERS: Yeah. I'm trying to  
 3 understand what you wrote. So what I'm trying  
 4 to get to is, and maybe I'm going at it in an  
 5 entirely different, incorrect way, but I took  
 6 the 115,310 square feet of the project, I took  
 7 away the landscaped open space of 42,662 feet,  
 8 and I came up with about 71,000 square feet of  
 9 coverage.  
 10 So I'm trying to see how that falls within  
 11 their -- exceeds the amount of coverage that  
 12 the PAD requires and that's what I'm trying to  
 13 back into, and maybe, is that because the PAD  
 14 -- do you take into account the stone walkways  
 15 and all of that as open space?  
 16 MR. TRIAS: I think, if you have that level  
 17 of question, I think we should have a Site Plan  
 18 here and the Applicant should explain how --  
 19 seriously, there are multiple ways to create  
 20 public space. That's what they've done with  
 21 the Site Plan. They can explain it in great  
 22 detail.  
 23 MR. WITHERS: Okay. I'd like to hear it.  
 24 So I'm trying to come up -- you heard my  
 25 question, correct?

1 combination of the drives, as well as the  
 2 building --  
 3 MR. WITHERS: The pedestrian walkway  
 4 between the -- okay.  
 5 MR. BEHAR: A better question, Chip,  
 6 physically, what percentage of the site is  
 7 taken by the buildings or the footprint?  
 8 MR. WITHERS: Yeah. It wasn't in here. It  
 9 wasn't in there. That's why I was trying to  
 10 back into that.  
 11 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Right. I think, if you  
 12 look at Page 6, though, the Staff  
 13 recommendation, you're going to see the lot  
 14 coverage that's listed there, how much is  
 15 permitted for MF1, how much is permitted for  
 16 MF3, and if you add those two number together,  
 17 the total lot coverage that could be permitted  
 18 is 73,860 and what we have proposed in lot  
 19 coverage is 56,970. So we're under.  
 20 MR. WITHERS: Okay. So how did you come up  
 21 with the 73 then, the 9823 and the 64 --  
 22 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Correct.  
 23 MR. WITHERS: Okay. And you're proposing  
 24 56.  
 25 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Right.

1 MR. WITHERS: Okay. On Malaga, the height  
 2 is, what, 35 5-02 or 455-02MS. DE LA GUARDIA:  
 3 35.  
 4 MR. WITHERS: I have two more chances.  
 5 Okay, so on Hernando, it's 45?  
 6 MR. REVUELTA: No.  
 7 MR. WITHERS: I'm just kidding. I know. I  
 8 understand.  
 9 MR. REVUELTA: It's not Segovia, it's  
 10 Santander, right?  
 11 MR. WITHERS: So I guess I'm struggling a  
 12 little bit with the fact that we've never  
 13 really done this before. It's a whole city  
 14 block. This is a game changer for what could  
 15 take place in every other lot in Coral Gables  
 16 and it's concerning to me. I mean, it really  
 17 is, because this is --  
 18 MS. DE LA GUARDIA: It's an amazing  
 19 opportunity to do the right thing, and I have  
 20 asked George Fink and Frank --  
 21 MR. WITHERS: You've summoned them, okay.  
 22 MS. DE LA GUARDIA: -- to guide our design.  
 23 We have asked the design Gods to guide us  
 24 through the process and it's not something that  
 25 we have taken lightly. We worked very closely

1 MR. REVUELTA: Yes, I'll make a motion to  
 2 extend it further, fifteen, twenty minutes? We  
 3 need to finish this item, right?  
 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Well, we are here now,  
 5 but the question is, can we finish in fifteen  
 6 minutes? Does that give enough time for  
 7 everybody? I mean, is it fair to the  
 8 developer?  
 9 MR. REVUELTA: That's an excellent  
 10 question.  
 11 MR. BEHAR: I think we try. I'll second  
 12 your motion.  
 13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So motion for 15  
 14 minutes --  
 15 MR. REVUELTA: I'm willing to spend the  
 16 time, but there are other people on the Board  
 17 here.  
 18 MR. WITHERS: I'm done.  
 19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So we have a motion  
 20 for 15 minutes. Robert second. Any  
 21 discussion?  
 22 MR. REVUELTA: No.  
 23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Call the roll, please.  
 24 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  
 25 MR. BEHAR: Yes.

1 with the development in arriving at the number  
 2 of units. With Mediterranean Bonus, you could  
 3 go to 57 units. We're proposing 48 units. And  
 4 that was arrived in conversation with our team,  
 5 as well as in conversation with Ramon, and so  
 6 we feel that this is a strong project, where  
 7 it's a balance of garden and outdoor spaces --  
 8 MR. WITHERS: It's a beautiful project.  
 9 You don't have to convince me of that.  
 10 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Withers --  
 11 MR. WITHERS: When we did the new French  
 12 Village, it was all basically, you know, the  
 13 same type of buildings. When you look at the  
 14 Chinese Village --  
 15 MR. BEHAR: I'm sure that was a PAD.  
 16 MR. TRIAS: That was done in the '20s.  
 17 Those are historic villages.  
 18 If I could read from the Code just briefly.  
 19 "A pad may be approved as a Conditional Use in  
 20 any Zoning District, except single-family."  
 21 MR. WITHERS: That's what I was asking.  
 22 MR. TRIAS: It's not in single-family.  
 23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Before we continue,  
 24 because we're getting to the time, is there a  
 25 motion to extend further?

1 THE SECRETARY: Claudia Miro?  
 2 MS. MIRO: Yes.  
 3 THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?  
 4 MR. REVUELTA: Yes.  
 5 THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?  
 6 MR. WITHERS: Yes.  
 7 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat?  
 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.  
 9 Thank you. So we're done?  
 10 MR. WITHERS: Yeah. Thank you.  
 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.  
 12 Claudia.  
 13 MS. MIRO: Yes, hi. I do have a question.  
 14 So when we opened it up for public comments,  
 15 one of the speakers was mentioning that the  
 16 property that is there now, two bedrooms go for  
 17 a rental of \$1,600 a month, and now the  
 18 proposed project is \$800,000 a unit. Is that  
 19 accurate? What can you tell me about that? Or  
 20 what considerations were taken with this  
 21 project, as far as affordable housing, which  
 22 was, I think, something that was mentioned by  
 23 the Historic Preservation Association as one of  
 24 their concerns, as far as, you know, keeping  
 25 that still as part of Coral Gables, as part of

1 the fabric?

2 MS. DE LA GUARDIA: Well, I think the idea

3 that we came up with a product that might

4 affect different demographic. So there are

5 two-bedroom flats that perhaps could attract

6 senior, senior citizens. There's the duplexes

7 and the townhouses, which they can attract

8 families. There's the lofts, which I think

9 will probably attract young professionals, and

10 so there's different products that will

11 hopefully bring together a nice cross-section,

12 and I believe that the two bedrooms will come

13 out at around that price, that \$800,000 a unit,

14 and it is impossible to compete with the garden

15 apartments, because they're just the most

16 affordable housing type in the Gables.

17 But at same time, I think economically they

18 are difficult to sustain and the owners are not

19 sort of investing money into them, to fix them

20 up, and they're sort of deteriorating, but, you

21 know, the idea was to come out with more

22 affordable two-bedroom and more expensive

23 four-bedroom townhouses and duplexes.

24 MS. MIRO: So you're saying that with this

25 project, the affordable component of the

1 which is a much wider street, and if you needed

2 to turn north and south, Malaga and Santander,

3 put some 45 5-02 feet there, but I would have

4 tried to avoid, and I'm not second-guessing

5 here the architectural or the planning, but I'm

6 just saying, that would have been my initial

7 intention, and I'm wondering what drove the 45

8 5-02 feet towards the south rather than to the

9 west?

10 MS. DE LA GUARDIA: So, actually, the full

11 front on Segovia is Zoned MF1. MF1 is duplex.

12 And the maximum height on duplex is 30 feet.

13 And so we could not do any other product, other

14 than a duplex, on Segovia.

15 MR. REVUELTA: And 35 feet.

16 MS. DE LA GUARDIA: And 30 feet.

17 MR. REVUELTA: And 30 feet.

18 MS. DE LA GUARDIA: 30 feet. Meanwhile,

19 the rest of the property is zoned MF3, which

20 means that the rest of the property could go up

21 to 45 5-02 feet, except in those situations

22 when it's across from single-family, where

23 we've dropped it to 35 5-02 feet, and we

24 actually dropped a lot of the housing --

25 several housing that we didn't have to drop to

1 project is the 800,000?

2 MS. DE LA GUARDIA: The more affordable.

3 MS. MIRO: The more affordable. And then

4 what would be the rest? So that's the most

5 affordable, then what would be the rest of the

6 project price point?

7 MS. DE LA GUARDIA: I don't have those

8 numbers, but, you know, there will probably be

9 some products out at a million and some more

10 products out at two million.

11 MS. MIRO: Okay. Thank you. That's my

12 question.

13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

14 Luis.

15 MR. REVUELTA: Yes. I have a couple of

16 questions, as well. I have to give credit to

17 Chip for focusing on something that I had not

18 honestly focused on, but I'll ask, I guess, the

19 more simpler question first.

20 The reason why 45 5-02 feet was not placed

21 on Segovia, which is a much wider street, as I

22 understand it from the City presentation, was

23 because the properties to the south are allowed

24 to be higher? My initial reaction would have

25 been, place it the 45 5-02 feet on Segovia,

1 35 5-02 feet, but we dropped it, to keep it --

2 MR. REVUELTA: But you went ahead and did

3 it. I think the project is very sensible, very

4 charming. It's a very nice design.

5 MS. DE LA GUARDIA: Thank you.

6 MR. REVUELTA: But this goes toward what

7 Venny Torre was saying before, I think there

8 are elements in our Code that I agree with Mr.

9 Trias, the process and procedure have to be

10 re-evaluated and enforced. There are some

11 things that are inherently, in my opinion, and

12 this is no fault, I believe, of the current

13 Staff or Administration, but there are things

14 that don't make any sense to me, because to me

15 it makes a lot of sense to have the higher on

16 Segovia, a wider street, and then transition

17 down to it.

18 So, at this point, I'm not trying to blame

19 anybody, but this goes almost to the crux of

20 the problems that we've been talking about.

21 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Revuelta, the Zoning is

22 what dictates. You're absolutely right, in

23 terms of an urban design, that's where you

24 would have more flexibility, however, the

25 existing Duplex Zoning, which goes all of the

1 way on Segovia, has those regulations. So  
2 that's what's going on.

3 MR. REVUELTA: No. No. No. If that's  
4 what it is -- I am a firm believer that  
5 whatever is in the books, that's what I need to  
6 follow as an architect. I mean, if everybody  
7 has a problem with that, then the problem has  
8 to be fixed at another level, at another time.

9 MR. TRIAS: I think that the project is  
10 trying to be compatible -- we use that word  
11 again -- with the existing development on  
12 Segovia.

13 MR. REVUELTA: Yeah. I counted 13 units,  
14 but Mr. Trias, you're saying that the density  
15 existing right now is higher than the 48 that  
16 are being proposed?

17 MR. TRIAS: There are more units right now,  
18 yes, sir.

19 MR. REVUELTA: More keys, more doors, more  
20 habitable spaces?

21 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

22 MR. REVUELTA: The Monterey style, was  
23 there any philosophy picking that, the Monterey  
24 style versus another style? I'm just curious.  
25 It doesn't have a bearing on my vote.

1 incredible vision of multiple Zoning and  
2 beautiful architecture and all, if he would  
3 have been here a hundred years later, I believe  
4 that the vision that Mr. George Merrick had,  
5 today it would be different, because we will  
6 adapt to different situations.

7 I'm not here to criticize on the  
8 architecture, because this is not the place for  
9 that. That happens at the Board of Architects.  
10 I tell you, I think this project is extremely  
11 well planned. I think it's sensitive to all of  
12 the adjacent lots, Zonings, streets, and I  
13 think that it has done something -- yes, I do,  
14 in fact, believe, that, you know, and I commend  
15 you for creating a village. I think that I do  
16 like the fact that you have internalized cars.  
17 You have done -- you know, created spaces that  
18 are going to be great spaces, you know, with  
19 the exception of the via that you created going  
20 from east to west. It doesn't go all of the  
21 way through, you know, terminates at that.  
22 That's the only thing I'm looking at, your  
23 paseo, your via.

24 But other than that, I think you've done a  
25 fantastic job. Again, I'm not here to comment

1 MS. DE LA GUARDIA: What you've heard about  
2 the Monterey style is not the style of our  
3 project, but, rather, than existing building  
4 that is on one of the corners of the block.  
5 It's a fourplex and it's in the Monterey style,  
6 and Historic has deemed that it's not  
7 significant.

8 MR. REVUELTA: And the last issue, which  
9 goes back to Mr. Withers, it's interesting to  
10 me how, if somebody buys enough property, they  
11 can request a PAD in an area like that, and I  
12 was wondering, again, I'm sorry for an ignorant  
13 question, but I live on Castile, on the corner  
14 of Castile and Cordova, if somebody started  
15 buying homes from Cordova to Granada and from  
16 Castile to Asturia, could they ask for a PAD?

17 MR. TRIAS: No, sir. As I read before, it  
18 does not apply to single-family.

19 MR. REVUELTA: Okay.

20 MR. TRIAS: Now, every other Zoning  
21 designation, maybe, but not single-family.

22 MR. REVUELTA: Thank you. That's it.

23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Robert.

24 MR. BEHAR: I'm thinking, a developer that  
25 came from Pennsylvania and had a vision, that

1 on the architecture, but I think this is  
2 something that today, a hundred years later,  
3 the founder of this City would be very pleased  
4 with this type of project, and many others, but  
5 I think this is a great project, so I commend  
6 you for that.

7 MS. DE LA GUARDIA: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

9 Well, I also questioned the idea of a PAD,  
10 as Chip did, the Code does allow for it,  
11 because it's not in a single-family residence.  
12 I feel the same as Robert, I think it takes the  
13 massing and it takes the vision of the  
14 neighbors, and it actually plays with the  
15 residential areas around.

16 I also think, if our fathers from back  
17 when, or Merrick, or how many years back, would  
18 be looking at this, I think there would be a  
19 time that there would be an evolution or it  
20 would evolve and you have to evolve to what is  
21 today. I think the project, to me, looks  
22 beautiful. I don't know how much of a concern  
23 I have, because whether it's \$1,800 a month or  
24 \$800,000, I think that's a decision and a  
25 question that would be up to the developer, in

Page 177

1 relation to his cost to develop. To me, that's  
 2 something that's not for me to look at, at this  
 3 stage and with what I'm given.  
 4 I just -- overall, I think it's a nice  
 5 project. I think, as Ramon has said, you  
 6 didn't go to the maximum number of units that  
 7 you could have gone. I think you've created a  
 8 lot of outdoor space, paseos, and so forth, and  
 9 I like the project.  
 10 Thank you.  
 11 MS. DE LA GUARDIA: Thank you.  
 12 MR. BEHAR: Mr. Chairman, I'll make a  
 13 motion to approve the project.  
 14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have a motion to  
 15 approve. Is there a second?  
 16 MR. REVUELTA: Second.  
 17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Who second it, I'm  
 18 sorry? Mr. Revuelta second.  
 19 THE SECRETARY: Sorry, we need to make two  
 20 separate motions.  
 21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Let's do it on the  
 22 first one. Correct.  
 23 MR. COLLER: First one.  
 24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Is there a motion to  
 25 approve the first, Item E-1?

Page 179

1 the parking, so that, I think, was great.  
 2 My question, you know, I was troubled by  
 3 the price point, and I know that, you know, my  
 4 fellow Board Member said maybe it's not  
 5 something for us to look at, and I understand  
 6 the concept behind the fact that, you know, the  
 7 developer has expenses, and I will say that it  
 8 was one of the speakers that spoke, I think it  
 9 was Mr. Jose Rivera-Font that helped me make my  
 10 decision, when he said -- he talked about the  
 11 property across the street, that he actually  
 12 lives there, so that weighed really heavily,  
 13 and saying that the property across over time  
 14 had not been taken care of, and also the kind  
 15 of crowd that it attracts.  
 16 You know, I have experience living in, you  
 17 know, old buildings, where the prices on that  
 18 street were actually affordable, for affordable  
 19 housing for workforce. I consider myself a  
 20 part of the workforce, so it's sad, you know,  
 21 that we're not finding that price point, but I  
 22 understand what happens in those situations and  
 23 I think that Mr. Rivera-Font was right on point  
 24 about that.  
 25 The other thing that I wanted to mention is

Page 178

1 MR. BEHAR: So moved.  
 2 MR. REVUELTA: Second.  
 3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have a first, we  
 4 have a second. My discussion on E-1? No?  
 5 Call the roll, please.  
 6 THE SECRETARY: Claudia Miro?  
 7 MS. MIRO: I'd like to explain my answer.  
 8 I want to start off by saying that I found  
 9 Ms. De La Guardia's presentation to be  
 10 refreshing. This is only my second meeting, as  
 11 having the honor of serving on this Board, and  
 12 from what I've heard so far -- when I saw it, I  
 13 just saw it was a breath of fresh air, and I  
 14 want everyone to know, that as everybody came  
 15 up to speak, my decision came back and forth  
 16 the entire time, because I think a lot of good  
 17 points were brought up, not just by the public  
 18 speakers and also the applicants, but also by  
 19 my fellow Board Members.  
 20 I think that the Applicant has taken great  
 21 care to ensure that this project is  
 22 aesthetic -- outwardly aesthetic. I really  
 23 like the fact that you went out of your way to  
 24 camouflage the parking and addressing the fact  
 25 that there was an existing eyesore problem with

Page 180

1 that I think -- even though, you know, some of  
 2 the organizations brought forward the concern  
 3 about the property, I feel comfortable with the  
 4 historic -- the City's Historic Preservation's  
 5 explanation and the professors that also backed  
 6 up that it wasn't something historic, because  
 7 that was an initial concern for me. I said,  
 8 "Oh, my goodness, wait a minute. Can we try  
 9 and work around that?"  
 10 As far as having a public park there, I  
 11 think that, you know, you have taken great care  
 12 and putting in -- I love the idea of the  
 13 Glorietas, I love the idea of the library and  
 14 people who are walking their dog and just take  
 15 a break. So I think that that addresses the  
 16 fact that, you know, it is accessible. I don't  
 17 expect them to be able to use the pool, that's  
 18 different, right, but I think that a lot of  
 19 great care has been taken into this project,  
 20 and also I agree with Mr. Garcia-Serra's  
 21 comment earlier, having seen what I've seen so  
 22 far, I think that we need projects like this to  
 23 serve as an example to other developers.  
 24 I know developers -- development is coming,  
 25 it's here, but I really like -- it really felt

1 sincere and genuine to me the care that was  
 2 taken by your firm to make sure that all of  
 3 these elements, that were not tiny elements or  
 4 by the way elements, they were big elements  
 5 that were taken into consideration, I think  
 6 this is going to be a beautiful project. I  
 7 don't think there's ever going to be a perfect  
 8 project. I would be surprised. On the day  
 9 that we vote on a perfect project, I will  
 10 mention it, but so far I -- like I said, I wish  
 11 that we had workforce housing in the Gables,  
 12 but I understand the concept behind why we  
 13 don't and why we can't keep it as much, but my  
 14 vote for this is, yes.  
 15 THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?  
 16 MR. REVUELTA: Yes.  
 17 THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?  
 18 MR. WITHERS: Yes.  
 19 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  
 20 MR. BEHAR: Yes.  
 21 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat?  
 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.  
 23 The next one is Item E-2. Is there a  
 24 motion for E-2?  
 25 MR. BEHAR: So moved.

1 MS. MIRO: Second.  
 2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Second. All in favor?  
 3 (All Board Members voted aye.)  
 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We're adjourned.  
 5 Thank you.  
 6 (Thereupon, the meeting was concluded at 9:50  
 7 p.m.)  
 8  
 9  
 10  
 11  
 12  
 13  
 14  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: There's a motion --  
 2 MS. MIRO: Second.  
 3 MR. REVUELTA: Second.  
 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: And we have a second  
 5 with Claudia. Any discussion? No?  
 6 Call the roll, please.  
 7 THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?  
 8 MR. REVUELTA: Yes.  
 9 THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?  
 10 MR. WITHERS: Yes.  
 11 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  
 12 MR. BEHAR: Yes.  
 13 THE SECRETARY: Claudia Miro?  
 14 MS. MIRO: Yes.  
 15 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat?  
 16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.  
 17 Thank you very much.  
 18 MS. DE LA GUARDIA: Thank you.  
 19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have three minutes  
 20 left. We don't need to extend. I like to  
 21 thank everybody for coming.  
 22 MR. BEHAR: And I'll make a motion to  
 23 adjourn.  
 24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have a motion to  
 25 adjourn.

1 CERTIFICATE  
 2  
 3 STATE OF FLORIDA:  
 4 SS.  
 5 COUNTY OF MIAMI-DADE:  
 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 19th day of October, 2021.  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20 \_\_\_\_\_  
 21 NIEVES SANCHEZ  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25