

1 better control than what we have right now.
 2 Right now, we either go through MX2 or then you
 3 jump to MX3, which is what we've been fighting
 4 against, because developers are not going to go
 5 for the lower square footage and the lower
 6 buildings. So, I think, having the MX2.5
 7 makes a lot of sense.

8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Any other comments?
 9 MR. BEHAR: I agree with Julio. And at the
 10 end of the day, whatever application comes
 11 through this Board, it's up to us whether it's
 12 MX2, MX3. The application has to come through
 13 us, and it's up to us to approve or not
 14 approve. So, I mean, I agree. I feel very
 15 good about the 2.5. I think it's going to set
 16 additional control for future sites that we
 17 don't have today. I really think this is going
 18 to give, you know, an insurance that somebody
 19 in the future cannot do a bate and switch and
 20 say, "Hey, you know, I'm going to sell this
 21 property to the other company, and the other
 22 company is going to go 190 feet," and that's
 23 going to be a way to limit that.

24 I really feel this is -- more than
 25 anything, it's a safety measure that we put in

101

1 place. I'm in favor. I mean, I'll make a
 2 motion to approve it.

3 MR. GRABIEL: I'll second it.
 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have a motion to
 5 approve. We have a second. Any further
 6 comments, discussion? No?
 7 Call the roll, please.
 8 THE SECRETARY: Sue Kawalerski?
 9 MS. KAWALERSKI: No.
 10 THE SECRETARY: Felix Pardo?
 11 MR. PARDO: No.
 12 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell?
 13 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.
 14 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?
 15 MR. BEHAR: Yes.
 16 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat?
 17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes. I feel
 18 comfortable with the explanations. Thank you.

19 MR. COLLER: Okay. So because we don't
 20 have four votes, it goes without a
 21 recommendation.

22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Understood. Thank
 23 you.

24 If you would, let's move on, in the agenda.
 25 We have G-6. Mr. Coller.

102

1 MR. COLLER: I just want to check with the
 2 court reporter, if she needs a break. We've
 3 been going since 6:00. Are you good? Okay.
 4 Too bad.

5 MR. BEHAR: How about the Board Members?
 6 MR. COLLER: How about the Board Members?
 7 The Board Members, that's up to the Chair.
 8 MR. VAZQUEZ: I'll be brief.
 9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Anybody need a
 10 bathroom break? No?
 11 Let's continue.

12 MS. COLLER: G-6, an Ordinance of the City
 13 Commission of Coral Gables, Florida granting
 14 Conditional Use for a Building Site
 15 Determination approval pursuant to Zoning Code
 16 Article 14, "Process", Section -- the building
 17 is saying something to us -- "Building Site
 18 Determination" approval pursuant to Zoning Code
 19 Article 14, "Process," Section 14-202.6
 20 "Building Site Determination" and Section
 21 14-203, "Conditional Uses" to separate to two
 22 single-family building sites on the property
 23 zoned Single-Family Residential (SFR) District,
 24 legally described as Lots 21 and 22, Block 3,
 25 Coral Estates, Coral Gables, Florida; one

103

1 building site consisting of Lot 21 (east
 2 parcel), and the one one building site
 3 consisting of Lot 22 (west parcel); including
 4 required conditions; providing for a repeater
 5 provision, severability clause, and an
 6 effective date.

7 Item G-6, public hearing.
 8 MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you.
 9 Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, Board
 10 Members. My name is Andre Vazquez, 1892
 11 Southwest 10th Street, Miami, Florida. I'm
 12 here on behalf of Adrian Construction Group.
 13 With me, from Adrian Construction Group, is my
 14 client, Alvaro Adrian. We also have our
 15 architect -- I believe we have our architect
 16 via Zoom, Jennifer Salman.

17 So the subject property of our application
 18 is 631 Zamora Avenue, which is currently a
 19 vacant parcel, comprised of two platted lots.
 20 Our intention is to build two single-family
 21 homes, which will be accomplished by a lot
 22 split, which is achieved via a Conditional Use
 23 Site Plan Review, which is why we're here
 24 today.

25 Now, I'd like to highlight a few points in

104

1 the Staff report prepared by the professional
 2 members of your Planning and Zoning Staff.
 3 First, a quick history of the property, which
 4 contained one single story structure, built in
 5 1940. In 2020, it was demolished. Shortly
 6 after that, Adrian Construction Group purchased
 7 the property, in November of 2020. Important
 8 to note is that the demolished structure sat on
 9 one of the two platted lots, which is the
 10 subject of the application, and this is
 11 important, because had the structure sat on the
 12 lot line, it would have been detrimental to the
 13 application itself. Also, worth noting from
 14 the Staff report, that there is no unity of
 15 title tying the lots together and the Staff
 16 report confirm this.

17 Okay. As to designations, it's designated
 18 single-family low density and zoned SFR,
 19 Single-Family Residential. That won't change.

20 A quick procedural history of the
 21 application. So in May of 2022, we went to the
 22 Development Review Committee, accepted several
 23 department comments, and they were addressed.
 24 Then, after that, we went to the Board of
 25 Architects twice, once in November of 2022,

105

1 I said, three of the four are met, so we're
 2 good there.

3 Okay. As to the Comprehensive Plan itself,
 4 instant analysis of all conditional use
 5 applications, Staff also looks at the
 6 Comprehensive Plan for an evaluation of
 7 consistency with its goals, objectives and
 8 policies. Page 12 and Page 13 of the Staff's
 9 report goes through each plan -- plan's goal,
 10 objective and policy, and across the board, it
 11 complies with each and every single one.

12 Lastly, another important part of this
 13 process is the notice to the neighbors and
 14 meeting with them, and we recognize that a few
 15 may not be in favor of the project, but, as I
 16 stated, we meet the criteria in the Code, we
 17 are consistent and compatible with the
 18 objectives, goals and policies of the
 19 Comprehensive Plan. So this is exactly the
 20 type of project -- an application that is
 21 contemplated within your Comprehensive Plan.

22 So, briefly, just to summarize, before I
 23 conclude, DRC, Development Review Committee,
 24 received comments, addressed them. Board of
 25 Architects approved our plan. No issue there.

107

1 and, again just a few months ago, in March of
 2 2023, where the Board of Architects approved
 3 our design from there.

4 So that brings us here in front of the
 5 Planning and Zoning Board, where we come with a
 6 recommendation of approval from the Planning
 7 and Zoning Staff.

8 First, I want to get into the City Code --
 9 Zoning Code itself. Section 14-2002.6F lays
 10 out the criteria that are required for a lot
 11 split in the City of Coral Gables. Lot splits
 12 in the City of Coral Gables are very difficult
 13 due to the stringent Code requirements, and it
 14 lays out, like I said, four criteria. Of the
 15 four criteria in the Code, three need to be met
 16 in the application. Our application meets
 17 three of the four.

18 I can go into it, for the record, one by
 19 one, but I will point to the Staff report, on
 20 Page 11, which lays out the four criteria, Page
 21 11 and Page 12. The only criteria of the Code
 22 which is not met is that the owner must own the
 23 property for ten years or more. As I stated
 24 just before, the applicant purchased the
 25 property in 2020. So that's not met. But like

106

1 Check. City Code, four criteria that need to
 2 be met -- three of four which need to be met.
 3 We've met three of four. Check. Comprehensive
 4 Plan, is it compatible, consistent with the
 5 characteristics -- with the goals, objectives,
 6 and policies of Coral Gables? Check. And,
 7 lastly, we come with a recommendation of
 8 approval, with conditions, all of which we are
 9 in agreement with.

10 So, with that, we would respectfully
 11 request a Board recommendation of approval and
 12 I'd like to save time for rebuttal, if
 13 necessary.

14 MR. BEHAR: Mr. Chair, I have a question to
 15 the applicant.

16 MR. VAZQUEZ: Yeah.

17 MR. BEHAR: You say that the original
 18 house, the building, the 1940, it was built on
 19 one lot, not straddling both lots?

20 MR. VAZQUEZ: That's correct, yeah. And we
 21 have -- attached to my statement of use and
 22 also in the packet before you is the survey of
 23 that existing structure, which shows that.

24 MR. BEHAR: Okay. And was there a recorded
 25 covenant or anything -- you know, unity of

108

1 title on this property?
 2 MR. VAZQUEZ: No. No unity of title
 3 issues. It was -- quite frankly, we were -- at
 4 first, we didn't understand why we had to come
 5 through to do this process, but we understood,
 6 at that point, that a lot split, there is --
 7 MR. BEHAR: But if you've got -- I mean,
 8 I'm just -- and Staff will come up. If you got
 9 two platted lots, right -- and you do have two
 10 platted -- legally platted lots --
 11 MR. VAZQUEZ: Right.
 12 MR. BEHAR: Why are you here? I'm going to
 13 let Staff, when Staff do the --
 14 MR. PARDO: Was there a fence going around
 15 it or is there --
 16 MR. VAZQUEZ: Around the -- you mean, the
 17 lots?
 18 MR. PARDO: A fence going around the entire
 19 property, the non-built on lot and that lot? I
 20 think that's where Robert is going. In other
 21 words, there are certain thresholds, that back
 22 in the day, even if you had a fence going
 23 around it, would tie both lots together.
 24 MR. VAZQUEZ: I would have to check on
 25 that. I'm not sure if there was a fence or

109

1 not.
 2 MR. PARDO: I'm trying to wrap my head
 3 around the same thing that Robert is, in
 4 understanding why Staff determined that it
 5 was -- that it needed a lot split, when it
 6 doesn't seem like any of the criteria are
 7 there, right, Robert?
 8 MR. BEHAR: I don't see any. I mean, if
 9 the house was not built -- so let Staff do the
 10 presentation and find out, because --
 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Just one quick
 12 question. Do you have one folio number or two
 13 folio numbers?
 14 MR. VAZQUEZ: Right now we have one folio
 15 number.
 16 MR. ADRIAN: Two.
 17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So there's two folio
 18 numbers, which means it was never -- it was not
 19 tied. If you have one folio number, then that
 20 property was tied. If you have two folio
 21 numbers, to me it shows that the property was
 22 not tied.
 23 MR. ADRIAN: Good afternoon --
 24 MR. COLLER: Wait.
 25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Can you go to the

110

1 microphone, please?
 2 MR. ADRIAN: Yes.
 3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Raise your right hand,
 4 please.
 5 (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.)
 6 MR. ADRIAN: I do.
 7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Can you please state
 8 your name and address, for the record?
 9 MR. ADRIAN: Good afternoon, Board Members.
 10 My name is Alvaro Adrian, and the reason that
 11 we had to come here --
 12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: And your address,
 13 please.
 14 MR. ADRIAN: The address is 631 Zamora, and
 15 the reason that we had to come here is because
 16 we have to get a second address for the second
 17 property. So we couldn't present plans without
 18 a second address.
 19 MR. PARDO: Wait. Wait. Can you say that
 20 again?
 21 MR. ADRIAN: We have two folios with the
 22 city -- Dade County. When we proposed our
 23 building permit, they asked for a second
 24 address. That's why we're here, to get our
 25 second address for our second --

111

1 MR. BEHAR: Yeah, because an empty property
 2 does not get an address until you apply for a
 3 building permit.
 4 MR. PARDO: I'm still lost, because
 5 normally a lot split has nothing to do with
 6 assigning a property address.
 7 MR. BEHAR: No. Felix, you have one
 8 address, which was where the house was. The
 9 house has an address. The empty lots are not
 10 given addresses. They're given folio numbers.
 11 MR. ADRIAN: So I can't apply for a
 12 building permit without an address.
 13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Speak into the mike,
 14 just for the court reporter, please.
 15 MS. GARCIA: Just to clarify --
 16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.
 17 MS. GARCIA: -- the folio -- the second
 18 folio is new. He was assigned that folio when
 19 he applied for the Board of Architects, because
 20 you need to have a second folio to assign the
 21 property to.
 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So that's a new folio
 23 number?
 24 MS. GARCIA: Yes.
 25 MS. ADRIAN: That was given to us by Dade

112

1 County, the Property Appraiser's Office.
 2 MS. GARCIA: Right. Right.
 3 MS. ADRIAN: When we applied --
 4 MR. COLLER: You need to really speak into
 5 the mike. Nobody can hear you.
 6 MR. ADRIAN: I apologize.
 7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. Thank you for
 8 the clarification.
 9 MR. BEHAR: Okay. Now I'm more confused.
 10 MR. GRABIEL: Join the club.
 11 MR. BEHAR: Can I get a bathroom break?
 12 So --
 13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Go ahead.
 14 MR. BEHAR: -- just to -- were there ever
 15 two folio numbers from the beginning?
 16 MS. GARCIA: No.
 17 MR. BEHAR: So what was -- that other
 18 platted lot, how was that identified in
 19 Miami-Dade County Property Appraisal?
 20 MS. GARCIA: They included both platted
 21 lots. That one folio included both platted
 22 lots.
 23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So there was only one
 24 property tax being paid on both properties the
 25 entire time?

113

1 MR. ADRIAN: No. There's two folios and
 2 two properties taxes.
 3 MR. BEHAR: But today.
 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Today, now?
 5 MR. ADRIAN: As of two years ago.
 6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. All right.
 7 MS. GARCIA: Yes. When this application
 8 was reviewed, we determined it as one building
 9 site. There was only one folio number at the
 10 time.
 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Was there a pool,
 12 any --
 13 MS. GARCIA: They had a fire pit on the
 14 vacant lot as an accessory structure.
 15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Was that fire pit
 16 straddled on the property line at all?
 17 MS. GARCIA: No. It was on the other
 18 platted lot.
 19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So it is independent,
 20 separate?
 21 MS. GARCIA: Oh, it was an accessory to the
 22 house that was on the other lot.
 23 MR. BEHAR: A fire pit?
 24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: It was a fire pit, but
 25 it was on the separate lot?

114

1 MS. GARCIA: Yes.
 2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: On the survey, the old
 3 survey, it will show if you had a fence on it.
 4 Does that survey show any type of fence?
 5 The reason I'm asking, and I think this is
 6 the reason Felix is asking, I remember, from
 7 years and years and years, if there was a fence
 8 or something that was around the property --
 9 MR. GRABIEL: Continuous.
 10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: -- a continuous --
 11 you're right. You were on the Board, also.
 12 MS. GARCIA: Yes, there was a continuous
 13 fence along the property, as well, that linked
 14 the property. It was always considered one
 15 property since the '40s.
 16 MR. GRABIEL: And owners could do a fence
 17 to the property line and then start the fence
 18 again on the other side of the property --
 19 MS. GARCIA: No, there was never a fence
 20 between the two lots to link them together.
 21 MR. GRABIEL: No, I'm saying, to keep the
 22 separation of lots at that time, to avoid the
 23 fence making it or forcing it to be a single
 24 property, you would stop the fence on the
 25 property line and then start another one on the

115

1 other side.
 2 MR. BEHAR: An inch apart.
 3 MR. GRABIEL: An inch apart, yes.
 4 MR. PARDO: Yeah. Yeah. That's exactly
 5 how it was done.
 6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I clearly remember
 7 that. And, I think -- you know, it's
 8 interesting, I think that one of the reasons
 9 that that was, done, too, was years ago, to
 10 keep the big properties as big properties, but
 11 I also think that that was done to keep those
 12 big properties in the major thoroughfares, not
 13 in the back portions or in the internal areas,
 14 from what I recall. That was the vision of
 15 that.
 16 MR. PARDO: I sat twice on the Board of
 17 Adjustments for all variances, so these things
 18 would come up every once in a blue moon, but
 19 normally it was somebody had built, you know, a
 20 rock fence that was continuous; couldn't split
 21 it, you know. Or sometimes there was even a
 22 unity of title, which would go straight to the
 23 Commission, not to the Board of Adjustments to
 24 release that.
 25 MR. VAZQUEZ: Just as to that point real

116

1 quick, right now the property is 11,300 square
2 feet. A lot split would make the properties
3 5,650 square feet, and just on Zamora Avenue
4 itself, 12 of the 16 lots on Zamora Ave are
5 5,650 square feet. So it would be very
6 consistent and compatible with the existing
7 square feet. I mean, in fact, the two
8 properties in front and the two properties next
9 to the lot are 5,000 square feet.

10 MR. BEHAR: Has the architect done an
11 analysis, if you were doing one house, which
12 would be much more intrusive, versus two? And,
13 you know --

14 MR. PARDO: It's on there. It's on Page 8.

15 MR. BEHAR: I didn't print that whole thing
16 out.

17 MR. PARDO: It's Page 8, and the difference
18 is that if you did only one house, you could
19 get only 4,525 square feet, but if you do the
20 two separate ones, you get 2,619.22 feet, plus
21 2,556.21, giving you a combined of 5,175.43
22 feet.

23 MR. BEHAR: Versus if you did one --

24 MR. PARDO: Robert, about a fifteen-percent
25 difference, but -- for me, I'm looking at this,

117

1 again, going back to, if there was something
2 continuous, if there was a permanent structure
3 -- if they had a swimming pool there, if they
4 had anything there, I couldn't find it, and I
5 looked through every page twice. I couldn't
6 find it. So I was getting confused on that.

7 And in my opinion, for me, then it becomes
8 now an exercise, well, technically, if you had
9 this or you had that. That's why many years
10 ago, back then, the City Attorney said, I don't
11 care if you're building an addition, you have
12 to execute a unity of title and it has to be
13 recorded, so they wouldn't have this kind of
14 situation happen in the future, because the
15 thing is, you go in, you demolish the house,
16 well, you can't tell what was here and what was
17 there.

18 The difference here is, Staff can go back
19 to the aerial photographs and see if there was
20 some type of improvement going back years
21 before that.

22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: What I'd like to do --
23 I just want to make sure the presentation that
24 is being presented is finished.

25 MR. VAZQUEZ: Yes, our presentation is

118

1 finished.

2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. Sorry, go
3 ahead, Sue.

4 MS. KAWALERSKI: So there was one folio,
5 one tax bill -- one tax bill?

6 MS. GARCIA: I'm assuming, one tax bill.

7 MR. ADRIAN: As of 2020, there's been two
8 tax bills. There are two folios, there are two
9 tax bills.

10 MS. GARCIA: Before a couple of years ago,
11 there's only one folio?

12 MR. VAZQUEZ: Prior.

13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: When was the house
14 demolished?

15 MR. ADRIAN: In 2020.

16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: The house was
17 demolished in 2020.

18 MR. PARDO: And do you have the survey that
19 had the original house there with you?

20 MR. VAZQUEZ: Yes. It is attached to the
21 statement --

22 MR. BEHAR: Jill, can I get one of those
23 packages, because I didn't print mine and --

24 MR. VAZQUEZ: I thought they were passed out.

25 MR. PARDO: No bathroom break for you for

119

1 not bringing your laptop.

2 MR. BEHAR: Thank you.

3 MS. GARCIA: So attached to his Statement
4 of Use, there is, you know, a survey that shows
5 the barbecue pit on the vacant parcel.

6 MR. PARDO: That's why.

7 MS. GARCIA: Yes.

8 MR. PARDO: So it's a barbecue.

9 MS. GARCIA: Yes. Whenever you have an
10 accessory structure on the other property, it's
11 considered to be a unified parcel -- a unified
12 property.

13 MR. PARDO: That's what it is. It's the
14 barbecue.

15 MR. BEHAR: It's the what, I'm sorry?

16 MS. GARCIA: Barbecue pit.

17 MR. PARDO: There's a barbecue in the
18 northwest corner.

19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: What section, Felix?

20 MR. BEHAR: Right here.

21 MR. PARDO: Two pages before Tab 3 -- or
22 four pages before Tab 3, you'll see the old
23 survey.

24 MR. BEHAR: And one more from Staff --

25 MR. PARDO: And there's a continuous fence.

120

1 MR. BEHAR: -- the applicant stated that
2 the properties in that area are fifty --
3 MS. GARCIA: Yes. I have a graphic in the
4 Staff report for that.

5 MR. BEHAR: So all of the other properties
6 are compatible to the proposed size of the lot;
7 is that correct?

8 MR. VAZQUEZ: That's correct. And if you
9 look at the actual Statement of Use, which is
10 right before, I believe, the exhibit of the
11 survey, on Page 2 of the Statement of Use,
12 there's a breakdown of every property --
13 adjacent or properties within the radius, and
14 its gives the breakdown of the square feet, and
15 as I stated, 12 of the 16, just on Zamora Ave,
16 are 5,650 square feet, and our lot split would
17 be --

18 MR. BEHAR: No, I see it right before Tab
19 5. There is that, right, where it shows all of
20 the properties are compatible.

21 MR. VAZQUEZ: That's correct.

22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: But, Felix, I don't
23 think -- to me, the barbecue is not an issue,
24 and that's because the barbecue is strictly in
25 Lot 5 and not straddled between -- anywhere

121

1 you --

2 MS. GARCIA: I have some graphics. Do you
3 want to see them?

4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Please.

5 MR. BEHAR: Yes.

6 MS. GARCIA: Yes. Can you pull up my
7 PowerPoint?

8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: And then I'd like to
9 open it up for public comment, after you're
10 done.

11 MS. GARCIA: Okay. Perfect.

12 So, of course, this is the site, the two
13 lots, Lot 21 and 22 on Zamora. That's an
14 aerial showing that block. The zoning, of
15 course, and land use are consistent,
16 single-family, and that's a picture showing Lot
17 22 and Lot 21. This is the plans. This is the
18 building information that you have in your
19 Staff report. I was hoping to see if there's
20 -- oh, this is the renderings of the two lots
21 together, what they have approved from the
22 Board of Architects. This is Lot 22, the one
23 on the west and Lot 21 on the east. I was
24 hoping that the graphic was in here, but I
25 guess it's not.

123

1 straddling between the property line.

2 MS. KAWALERSKI: Is there a continuous
3 fence here?

4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: That's different. I'm
5 just talking about the barbecue. The barbecue
6 that you mentioned, to me, it's not an issue.

7 MR. PARDO: Imagine if you had a swimming
8 pool there. You know, the use is obviously
9 from the owner, but I think here -- though,
10 unfortunately, here, the fence is continuous.

11 MR. VAZQUEZ: Well, this fence is for the
12 demo permit. If you go there today, the east
13 side of the property has no fence. This is
14 when the previous owner applied for a demo
15 permit and they demolished --

16 MR. PARDO: This is a permit for a fence.
17 Very different.

18 MR. BEHAR: Yeah.

19 MR. PARDO: Yeah.

20 MR. BEHAR: And I want to make sure that
21 the presentation is concluded before we really
22 get into it.

23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: That's why I asked him
24 that, and he said it was.

25 MR. BEHAR: Okay. Staff, Jennifer, do

122

1 Again, the review time line started in May
2 of 2022 -- it's been a long process -- at the
3 DRC, Board of Architects a couple of times,
4 neighborhood meeting this year in May, and here
5 we are at the Planning and Zoning Board.
6 They've mailed out their notices to the
7 property owners without a thousand feet, and
8 500 feet, outside of the City limits, two times
9 they've mailed out to the property owners,
10 three times property posting, two times per the
11 website posting and one time for newspaper
12 advertisement.

13 So Staff recommends approval based on it
14 being consistent with the Comp Plan, and also
15 just the standards that are in the Zoning Code.
16 And we have three conditions. These are the
17 three conditions that are standard in our
18 Zoning Code whenever you review and approve a
19 separation of building site. These are the
20 three conditions, so that they can't have any
21 variances in the future, their site plans that
22 you see today, the elevations, are tied to this
23 approval. If they change those elevations or
24 site plans, they have to come back and do the
25 whole process again, and they're required to

124

1 have a bond, as well.
 2 And that concludes it.
 3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.
 4 Jill --
 5 THE SECRETARY: Yes.
 6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: -- do we have any
 7 members of the audience that have signed up to
 8 speak?
 9 THE SECRETARY: Yes.
 10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: How many do we have?
 11 THE SECRETARY: One.
 12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Would you please
 13 call -- you're done with your presentation?
 14 Thank you.
 15 Could you please call that individual?
 16 MS. ZANETTI: I'm here.
 17 THE SECRETARY: Ann Zanetti.
 18 MS. ZANETTI: Is that on?
 19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: One second, please.
 20 MR. VAZQUEZ: Just that I'd like to reserve
 21 five minutes for rebuttal, if necessary.
 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes, of course.
 23 What's the name, please?
 24 THE SECRETARY: Ann Zanetti.
 25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Did you get sworn in?

125

1 Could you raise your right hand, please, for
 2 the court reporter?
 3 MS. ZANETTI: I do.
 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.
 5 If you'd please speak into the microphone
 6 and states your name and address, for the
 7 record?
 8 MS. ZANETTI: Is it on?
 9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: It's on.
 10 MS. ZANETTI: Thank you. Okay.
 11 My name is Ann Zanetti, and I am a 30-year
 12 resident of Zamora Avenue. I reside at 621
 13 Zamora Avenue.
 14 So, in thirty years, I've seen a lot of the
 15 history of the parcels that are in -- you know,
 16 being under discussion. It was a family that
 17 lived there, that used both of them, so for the
 18 thirty years plus, more, that I lived there.
 19 And, you know, the house was demolished.
 20 It was a family type of situation, an old lady
 21 lived there, blah, blah, blah. And then it
 22 went into disrepair after the hurricanes and it
 23 was eventually demolished and the family sold
 24 the property after the death.
 25 So my one thing is, some of the pictures I

126

1 see that the developer has presented, I don't
 2 really feel that they show the impact to the
 3 600 block of Zamora. We currently have no
 4 two-story structures on the 600 block of
 5 Zamora, save, maybe, 601 did an addition that
 6 goes up in the back, but on the 600 block,
 7 that's it.

8 So, introduction of a two-story house is
 9 something new, and spitting a lot and putting
 10 two side-by-side totally changes the feel of
 11 our block, where all of the houses are
 12 single-family.

13 I also had a concern about the -- because a
 14 lot of the -- the left one most parcel was
 15 empty, we have a lot of foliage there. I
 16 understand the mangos -- it's like a hundred
 17 year old mango, probably from the days when
 18 this area used to be orchards, and not being
 19 able to protect the fruit trees in the North
 20 Gables really puts a lot of our canopy in
 21 jeopardy, as development occurs, because we --
 22 this area was orchards. We all know that. We
 23 have -- a lot of our canopy are loquats and
 24 mangos and avocados, and I have seen so much
 25 street canopy disappear in the last few years.

127

1 Our block, the 600 block of Zamora, had
 2 like a minor twister -- there was some kind of
 3 microburst go through in 2017, when Hurricane
 4 Michael came through, and it took down numerous
 5 loquats, avocado. Then, you know, again,
 6 invasive trees have been taken out. There
 7 was -- my neighbor behind took out a couple of
 8 schefflera. There was an avocado and a
 9 schefflera taken down between my property and
 10 the property that's under development, but I'm
 11 just wondering, you know, we know we're getting
 12 hotter and hotter all of the time. The past
 13 few days show it. But, you know, this lot
 14 splitting is going to limit the opportunity
 15 even for replacement trees to grow to the size
 16 of what's there now.

17 And I hope the Planning and Zoning Board is
 18 starting to look -- I hear all of this
 19 discussion about building sizes, but how are
 20 we, you know, protecting the coolness of the
 21 Gables? I mean, that's one of our big
 22 attractions in living here, is our environment,
 23 which includes our tree canopies and everything
 24 else, not just creating beautiful structures
 25 and making our population density, you know,

128

1 higher and higher all of the time.
 2 But, again, as a thirty-year resident --
 3 the other property, even if it's separate, it
 4 never had infrastructure, it never had
 5 plumbing, never had anything, you know, put on
 6 it since, I don't know, way back -- way, way,
 7 way, way back. So, again, you know, I'm kind
 8 of getting tired of the overdevelopment that --
 9 and it's not overdeveloping. I mean, I know
 10 you have to control it in the commercial area,
 11 and now I see it happening in residential, and
 12 I'd just like to protect our neighborhoods
 13 more. I don't like every lot being uniform.
 14 That is aesthetically unpleasing to me. When I
 15 drive through the North Gables, the variety in
 16 the lots and the houses is what makes it
 17 different.

18 So that's all I have to say. Thank you.
 19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.
 20 Do we have any other speakers?
 21 THE SECRETARY: No, no more speakers.
 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Do we have anybody on
 23 Zoom?
 24 THE SECRETARY: No.
 25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: The phone platform?

129

1 No?
 2 At this time, I'd like to go ahead and
 3 close it for public comment.
 4 MR. VAZQUEZ: I'll be really fast.
 5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.
 6 MR. VAZQUEZ: Just quickly -- so just to
 7 address some of her concerns -- while there is
 8 no two-story houses on the actual Zamora
 9 Avenue, I mean, there are several within the
 10 1,000 foot radius of the property, and, of
 11 course, as we all know, there's several
 12 two-story houses in Coral Gables. So there's
 13 nothing in the Code or the Comprehensive Plan
 14 that would prohibit Mr. Adrian to build a
 15 two-story home.
 16 So we satisfied the requirements in the
 17 Code. We're compatible and consistent with the
 18 Comp Plan. We have a recommendation of
 19 approval, so we would request approval. Thank
 20 you.
 21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.
 22 I'd like to go ahead and open it up for
 23 Board comment.
 24 Sue, why don't you go first?
 25 MS. KAWALERSKI: Yeah. I'm still confused.

130

1 Is it one lot or two lots?
 2 MR. PARDO: It's two lots, two platted
 3 lots.
 4 MS. KAWALERSKI: So we're not deciding to
 5 split a lot? There's no action needed,
 6 correct?
 7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Jennifer, will you
 8 come up here and answer these questions,
 9 please? Thank you.
 10 MS. GARCIA: Yeah. So many parts in Coral
 11 Gables are containing more than one platted
 12 lot. Actually, some of our site specifics
 13 require that you have to have multiple platted
 14 lots to, you know, be on Granada or all of
 15 these major streets.
 16 So, when there's a vacant lot, the
 17 requirement of the Zoning Code says you have to
 18 come through Planning and Zoning, to
 19 Development Services, and request a building
 20 site determination.
 21 So when they requested that, Staff looks at
 22 the history of the property, they look at the
 23 survey, they look at the past conditions and
 24 they make a determination if it's going to be
 25 one building site or two building sites. In

131

1 this case, Staff -- I wasn't involved -- Staff
 2 determined it's one building site.
 3 So only way for them to develop two houses
 4 here is for it to go through the conditional
 5 use process, which involves coming to Planning
 6 and Zoning -- well, first DRC, Board of
 7 Architects, get their approval of that house
 8 and site plan, coming to Planning and Zoning
 9 for a recommendation, and going to the
 10 Commission for final approval.
 11 So, right now, it's one building site, that
 12 consists of two platted lots. What they're
 13 requesting is to split that building site, to
 14 separate it into two building sites.
 15 MR. BEHAR: But just to -- because I'm a
 16 bit confused, as well, and trying to
 17 determine -- when I look at the actual plotted
 18 lots on that block, it shows as two plotted
 19 lots, Lot 21 -- or 20 and 21. If it would have
 20 been one lot, it would not be the case.
 21 MR. PARDO: I took the old survey. I did
 22 the math. And they actually complied with the
 23 original setback of just over five feet on that
 24 interior side. In other words, that house was
 25 built specifically there to stay as one house

132

1 on that one lot. There's no doubt.
 2 MS. GARCIA: Right. That's one of the
 3 criteria.
 4 MR. PARDO: The architect at that time, the
 5 builder at that time, didn't put it there willy
 6 nilly. They calculated it based on the
 7 five-foot side setback and it has just a couple
 8 of inches beyond that.
 9 MR. BEHAR: Over the five feet?
 10 MR. PARDO: Not over the five feet. In
 11 other words, within the five feet, it complies
 12 with the old Zoning Code of the five-foot side
 13 setback.
 14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Understood.
 15 MR. PARDO: In other words, it was done
 16 intentionally, without a doubt, that that was
 17 one lot.
 18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Meaning the house was
 19 on one lot and the other property was another
 20 lot?
 21 MR. PARDO: Another lot. And they most
 22 likely, which was --
 23 MR. BEHAR: Felix, but if you look at this
 24 survey, it shows five feet from the right side,
 25 and you got 55.42 feet from the left side.

133

1 original intent was to have two lots.
 2 Now, I also understand, you know, the
 3 neighbor's point of view, but, you know, at the
 4 same time, what I'm applying is, you know, back
 5 in the day, you would come in here to see
 6 someone and they would give you a
 7 determination. Unfortunately, I don't see the
 8 letter -- the determination letter in here. Do
 9 you have it?
 10 MS. GARCIA: It's attached to the Staff
 11 report.
 12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I'm sorry?
 13 MS. GARCIA: It's attached to the Staff
 14 report. It's Attachment B.
 15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: The determination
 16 letter?
 17 MS. GARCIA: Attachment B is the building
 18 site determination.
 19 MR. PARDO: B?
 20 MS. GARCIA: Attachment B.
 21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: While Felix is looking
 22 that up, just a question. Were there any Code
 23 violations on the property?
 24 MS. GARCIA: I don't believe so.
 25 MR. VAZQUEZ: I don't believe so.

135

1 MR. PARDO: Robert, I took the width of the
 2 two lots. I subtracted the side setback and
 3 the width of the existing house, and you had a
 4 little over five feet to the platted line --
 5 the platted line.
 6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: In other words, I
 7 think what Felix is saying is that it conforms
 8 as one lot to the right and it conforms as one
 9 lot to the left.
 10 MR. PARDO: If the house would not have
 11 been torn down, they could have kept that house
 12 and lived in it and built another house.
 13 MR. BEHAR: Another house anyway. Okay.
 14 Okay. Okay. I didn't get that.
 15 MR. PARDO: Yeah. There's no doubt it was
 16 done -- there's one here --
 17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: It was specifically
 18 done.
 19 MR. PARDO: And a lot of people did that.
 20 Where I live, you know, there was a neighbor,
 21 and he bought five or six lots, and then he
 22 would build one and sell it, build -- they kept
 23 one for themselves. The family's been there
 24 since the early '50s and all of them were built
 25 up. So there's no doubt in my mind that the

134

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So it was always
 2 conforming, it was always -- there was no
 3 additions made --
 4 MS. GARCIA: No.
 5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Before it was knocked
 6 down, there were no additions that were made
 7 that were illegal or so forth?
 8 MS. GARCIA: No.
 9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay.
 10 MR. BEHAR: No, you're right, Felix, 39.70
 11 and five feet, so you had --
 12 MR. PARDO: That wasn't a joke. They did
 13 it on purpose.
 14 MR. BEHAR: They did it on purpose to be
 15 able to build another house next door.
 16 Look, I personally -- I don't think we're
 17 doing a lot split. I think that the lots are
 18 already split. I don't know what determines
 19 the lot split. I'm in favor of having two
 20 houses versus one bigger house.
 21 MR. PARDO: And I want to add a personal
 22 note, especially for the neighbor. I've only
 23 lived in my house for 32, 33 years, in the same
 24 house. I added to it, et cetera. And I had an
 25 empty lot next to me. And that empty lot was

136

1 just a 50-foot wide lot. All of the other lots
2 in the entire block, both sides of the block, a
3 hundred feet, because it was two, 125, because
4 it was two and half, there was one 75, but they
5 were all bigger. And they built a two-story
6 house, and they had to shoe horn in it in
7 there, with the septic tank provisions and all
8 of that, and you know what, I wasn't pleased.
9 It's a nice family living there. We're good
10 friends. And that's the end of that.

11 But the point I'm trying to make is, that
12 was less compatible, because it was the only
13 50-foot wide lot. Everything else was a
14 hundred, 125, except one exception of a 75,
15 which took it from the other 125 feet. So you
16 also look at compatibility, which Staff did,
17 and they did a very good job in marking all of
18 the different things to see the compatibility.
19 And to be quite honest, I've looked at the
20 application and I thought, you know, it's just
21 a typical developer trying to get a little more
22 square footage out of the thing.

23 I don't think the developer is trying to
24 get a little more square footage of 15 percent.
25 I think what he's trying to do is simply build

137

1 one house here and one house there, because
2 that was the original intent of this thing.
3 That's my perspective, you know, and,
4 unfortunately, most of the properties there, up
5 and down, and when you look at the map -- and I
6 made a copy of the map and I'm looking at it
7 and I'm saying, you know, most of them are
8 50-foot in that area.

9 The corner lots, every once in a while
10 you'll find something, but, you know, I now
11 feel very conflicted, because I think that the
12 developer wasn't doing anything wrong and I
13 think that we're more caught up in a
14 technicality of a folio number versus the this,
15 versus the that, and I don't think it would be
16 fair to say no.

17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Julio.

18 MR. GRABIEL: I agree. It's -- that area
19 is growing. It's very attractive. New
20 families are moving in. Our children, who need
21 homes, are moving into that area. So two homes
22 is better than a single home. And if it fits
23 all of the parameters of the City, I'm all for
24 it.

25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Would anybody like to

138

1 make a motion?

2 MS. KAWALERSKI: Can I just make a comment?

3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yeah, of course.

4 MS. KAWALERSKI: You know, it looks like
5 there were two lots. I mean, it does. And
6 with that said, all of the other properties on
7 that street are 50-foot frontage. So, you
8 know, one thing adds up to another, and it
9 looks like there was two lots there, regardless
10 of folio. So I would be inclined to be a yes
11 vote for this, because I think it's proper.

12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Would you like to make
13 a motion?

14 MS. KAWALERSKI: Sure. My first motion.

15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yeah, of course. Go
16 ahead.

17 MS. KAWALERSKI: So I'm not exactly sure if
18 it's a motion to split the lot, because there
19 are two lots.

20 MR. COLLIER: Well, the motion is to approve
21 the lot split in accordance with the
22 Department's recommendation, which includes
23 conditions. That would be the motion.

24 MS. KAWALERSKI: That would be my motion.

25 MR. BEHAR: But to her point, we're not

139

1 splitting a lot. The lot is already split.

2 MR. COLLIER: I understand the feeling of
3 the Board, that they feel that the lot has been
4 split, but the building site determination was
5 one building site.

6 MR. BEHAR: You're going to make a motion
7 to approve the application.

8 MS. KAWALERSKI: Yeah.

9 MR. COLLIER: You can do it that way. Don't
10 even mention lot split, just say, approve the
11 application in accordance with the Department's
12 recommendation.

13 MS. KAWALERSKI: Yeah. I make a motion to
14 approve the application based on the
15 Department's recommendation.

16 MR. BEHAR: And I'm going to second. Maybe
17 this will be the only time.

18 MS. KAWALERSKI: You never know. Things
19 could change.

20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have a motion and
21 we have a second. Any discussion?

22 Call the roll, please.

23 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?

24 MR. BEHAR: Yes.

25 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell?

140

1 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.
 2 THE SECRETARY: Sue Kawalerski? Sue?
 3 MS. KAWALERSKI: Yes.
 4 THE SECRETARY: All right. Felix Pardo?
 5 MR. PARDO: Yes.
 6 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat?
 7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I'm going to say, no,
 8 and the reason I'm going to say no is because
 9 of the fence. It doesn't make a difference,
 10 but it's always been my policy, based on
 11 properties and so forth -- it's not going to
 12 make a differences to you, but I want to be
 13 consistent.
 14 MR. PARDO: I don't think there's a fence
 15 there.
 16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: There was a fence
 17 there that was all of the way around.
 18 MR. BEHAR: No, but you don't -- I mean,
 19 you can't tell from that. You cannot tell from
 20 that.
 21 MR. PARDO: That --
 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Was there no fence?
 23 If there was no fence, then I'm a yes. I just
 24 need clarification.
 25 MR. PARDO: The "X"s that are drawn on this

141

1 old survey, it does -- first of all, a chain
 2 link fence is not allowed in the front. So
 3 that's not a chain link fence.
 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay.
 5 MR. PARDO: The one in the back is. So if
 6 there were a fence and it was a legitimate
 7 fence, I would be voting against it.
 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. So given that
 9 there was no fence, I'm a yes, also, but I just
 10 want to be clear, with any other properties
 11 that come before me for lot splits, you know,
 12 if there's anything that was in the past that
 13 was dividing it or so forth, it's always been a
 14 certain way. So if there's no fence, then,
 15 yes.
 16 MR. BEHAR: I agree. And, look, you know,
 17 Felix brought up a good point. This was
 18 intended, because by dimension it was intended
 19 to be two lots.
 20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I agree with the
 21 intention, it's just the practice that we've
 22 always had.
 23 MR. PARDO: Without a doubt. And if they
 24 would have put something like a pool or a fence
 25 or something like that or if the building would

142

1 have straddled, there's no doubt it's not a lot
 2 split --
 3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I agree.
 4 MR. PARDO: At least I wouldn't have voted
 5 in favor of it all --
 6 MR. BEHAR: Okay. The application --
 7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: It passed.
 8 MR. BEHAR: Passed.
 9 MR. COLLER: Mr. Chairman, are we taking a
 10 break at this point, five minutes?
 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Sir, it sounds like
 12 you would like to take a break. Yes. Let's
 13 take a five-minute break.
 14 MR. COLLER: Well, you can read it.
 15 MR. BEHAR: How many more items do we have?
 16 THE SECRETARY: Two more items.
 17 MR. COLLER: Mr. Chair, did you say it was
 18 a five-minute break?
 19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.
 20 (Short recess taken.)
 21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: If everybody is here,
 22 let's go ahead and resume, please.
 23 Mr. Coller, please read Item G-7.
 24 MR. COLLER: Item G-7, an Ordinance of the
 25 City Commission of Coral Gables, Florida,

143

1 amending Ordinance Number 2014-05 to increase
 2 the maximum student enrollment from 140 to 195
 3 students at the Margaux Early Childhood School
 4 at Temple Judea located at 5500 Granada
 5 Boulevard, Coral Gables, Florida; all other
 6 conditions of approval contained in Ordinance
 7 Number 2014-05 shall remain in effect, and
 8 providing an effective date.
 9 Item G-7, public hearing.
 10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.
 11 Mr. Guilford.
 12 MR. GUILFORD: Good evening, Mr. Chair and
 13 Members of the Board. Sue, welcome to the
 14 Board, and, Felix, welcome back.
 15 MS. KAWALERSKI: Thank you.
 16 MR. PARDO: Thank you.
 17 MR. GUILFORD: For the record, my name is
 18 Zeke Guilford, with offices at 400 University
 19 Drive. I'm here with Juan Espinoza, David
 20 Plummer and Associates, if you guys have any
 21 questions on their parking analysis.
 22 You all probably know where Temple Judea
 23 is, but just in case, it's on the west side of
 24 US-1. To the north is the Baptist Church of
 25 Coral Gables. To the south is Ponce Middle

144