

**City of Coral Gables
 Planning and Zoning Board Meeting
 Wednesday, May 17, 2016
 Coral Gables City Commission Chambers
 405 Biltmore Way, Coral Gables, Florida**

MEMBERS	J13	F10	M9	A13	M11	M17	J8	J13	A10	S14	O12	N9	APPOINTMENT
	'16	'16	'16	'16	'16	'16	'16	'16	'16	'16	'16	'16	
Robert Behar	P	E	P	P	P	E							Board-As-A-Whole
Marshall Bellin	P	P	P	P	P	P							Commissioner Vince Lago
Jeffrey Flanagan - Chair	E	P	P	P	P	P							Commissioner Pat Keon
Julio Grabiell	P	P	E	E	P	E							Mayor Jim Cason
Maria A. Menendez Vice Chair	P	P	P	P	P	P							City Manager Swanson-Rivenbark
Alberto Perez	P	E	P	P	P	P							Commissioner Frank C. Quesada
Frank Rodriguez	E	P	P	P	P	E							Commissioner Jeannett Slesnick

P = Present
E = Excused
C = Meeting Cancelled

City Staff and Consultants:

Charles Wu, Asst. Asst. Development Services Director
 Ramon Trias, Planning & Zoning Director
 Craig E. Leen, City Attorney
 Megan McLaughlin, City Planner
 Jill Menendez, Administrative Assistant
 Javier Betancourt, Economic Development Director
 Yamilet Senespleda, Public Works City Engineer

Court Reporter:
 Nieves Sanchez

Craig H. Coller, Esq., Special Counsel

Attachments:

- 05 17 16 Planning and Zoning Board Verbatim Minutes
- 05 17 16 Attendance/Speaker Sign In Sheet
- Email in support of Gables Station by Debra Sinkle-Kolsky, Redevco (Bahamian Village)
- Petition in Support of Gables Station by Lola B. Walker Homewowners' Association
- Additional material – updated architectural design and Underline Design Advisory Committee comments on the site plan and proposed Underline improvements submitted by applicant.
- PowerPoint presentation by City Staff re: Gables Station.

1 CITY OF CORAL GABLES
 2 LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY (LPA)/
 3 PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING
 4 VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT
 5 CORAL GABLES CITY HALL
 6 405 BILTMORE WAY, COMMISSION CHAMBERS
 7 CORAL GABLES, FLORIDA
 8 TUESDAY, MAY 17, 2016, COMMENCING AT 6:07 P.M.

9 Board Members Present:
 10 Jeffrey Flanagan, Chairman
 11 Maria Alberro Menendez
 12 Marshall Bellin
 13 Alberto Perez

14 City Staff and Consultants:
 15 Ramon Trias, Planning Director
 16 Scot Bolyard, Principal Planner
 17 Meggan McLaughlin, City Planner
 18 Jill Menendez, Planning Administrative Assistant,
 19 Board Secretary

20 Also Participating:
 21 Mario Garcia-Serra, Esq.
 22 Jeffrey Bass, Esq.
 23 Jorge Hernandez, Architect
 24 Juan Espinosa, Traffic Engineer

25 Public Speakers:
 Brad Richter
 Jeff Berkowitz
 Leona Cooper-Baker
 Judith J. Davis
 Roberto Rovira

1 I now officially call the City of Coral
 2 Gables Planning and Zoning Board of May -- what
 3 is today -- May 17th to order. The time is
 4 6:07 p.m.

5 Jill, if you could call the roll, please.
 6 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?
 7 Marshall Bellin?

8 MR. BELLIN: Here.
 9 THE SECRETARY: Julio Gabriel?
 10 Maria Menendez?

11 MS. MENENDEZ: Here.
 12 THE SECRETARY: Alberto Perez?
 13 MR. PEREZ: Here.

14 THE SECRETARY: Frank Rodriguez?
 15 Jeff Flanagan?

16 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Here. We have four
 17 Members present.

18 For the notice regarding ex parte
 19 communications, please be advised that this
 20 Board is a quasi-judicial Board and the items
 21 on the agenda are quasi-judicial in nature,
 22 which requires Board Members to disclose all ex
 23 parte communications and site visits.

24 An ex parte communication is defined as any
 25 contact, communication, conversation,

1 (The following proceedings were held.)
 2 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Ladies and
 3 Gentlemen, we're going to get the meeting
 4 started.

5 Good evening. I'll read some introductory
 6 statements. The Board is comprised of seven
 7 Members. Four Members of the Board shall
 8 constitute a quorum and the affirmative vote of
 9 four Members of the Board present shall be
 10 necessary for the adoption of any motion. A
 11 tie vote shall result in a request moving
 12 forward for Commission's consideration without
 13 a recommendation, if the Applicant does not
 14 request a continuance.

15 The lobbyist registration and disclosure,
 16 any person who acts as a lobbyist pursuant to
 17 the City of Coral Gables Ordinance Number
 18 2006-11 must register with the City Clerk prior
 19 to engaging in lobbying activities or
 20 presentations before City Staff, Boards,
 21 Committees and/or the City Commission. A copy
 22 of the Ordinance is available in the Office of
 23 the City Clerk. Failure to register and
 24 provide proof of registration shall prohibit
 25 your ability to present to the Board.

1 correspondence, memorandum or other written or
 2 verbal communication that take places outside
 3 of the public hearing between a member of the
 4 public and a member of a quasi-judicial Board
 5 regarding matters to be heard by the Board.

6 If anyone made any contact with a Board
 7 Member regarding an issue before the Board, the
 8 Board Member must state on the record the
 9 existence of the ex parte communication and the
 10 party who originated the communication. Also,
 11 if a Board Member conducted a site visit
 12 specifically related to the case before the
 13 Board, the Board Member must also disclose such
 14 visit. In either case, the Board Member must
 15 state on the record whether the ex parte
 16 communication and/or site visit will affect the
 17 Board Member's ability to impartially consider
 18 the evidence to be presented regarding the
 19 matter. The Board Member should also state
 20 that his or her decision will be based on
 21 substantial competent evidence and testimony
 22 presented on the record today.

23 Does any Member of the Board have any such
 24 communication or site visit to disclose at this
 25 time?

1 There are none.
 2 For the swearing in, everybody who is going
 3 to speak today must be sworn in, so you must
 4 also, please, complete the roster on the podium
 5 with the Board Secretary. We ask that you
 6 print clearly, so the official records of your
 7 name and address will be correct.

8 Now, with the exception of the attorneys
 9 representing the Applicant, all persons who
 10 will speak on agenda items before us this
 11 evening please rise to be sworn in.

12 (Thereupon, the participants were sworn.)

13 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And in deference to
 14 those present, we ask that all cell phones,
 15 pagers and other electrical devices be turned
 16 off or silenced at this time.

17 And we will now proceed with the agenda.

18 I know we have one item on the agenda
 19 tonight, although I don't have a copy of the
 20 agenda before me.

21 Thanks.

22 All right. We've got five items on the
 23 agenda tonight. As we usually do, and, Craig,
 24 can you confirm, we'll read them all into the
 25 record, we'll hear everything, since they are

1 Agency Review.

2 Item 6 is an Ordinance of the City
 3 Commission of Coral Gables, Florida requesting
 4 an amendment to the Zoning Map of the City of
 5 Coral Gables pursuant to Zoning Code Article 4,
 6 "Development Review", Division 14, "Zoning Code
 7 Text and Map Amendments", from "Industrial"
 8 District to "Commercial" District and removing
 9 the "South Industrial Mixed-Use District" for
 10 the property legally described as Tracts A and
 11 B, Block 5 and Tract 1, MacFarlane Homestead
 12 and St. Albans Park, located at 215 and 251
 13 South Dixie Highway, Coral Gables, Florida;
 14 providing for a repealer provision, providing
 15 for a severability clause, providing for an
 16 effective date. The legal description is on
 17 file at the City.

18 Item Number 7 is an Ordinance of the City
 19 Commission of Coral Gables, Florida providing
 20 for text amendments to the City of Coral Gables
 21 Official Zoning Code, by amending Appendix A,
 22 "Site Specific Zoning Regulations," Section
 23 A-66, "MacFarlane Homestead," by modifying
 24 provisions for height and setbacks, and adding
 25 new provisions, for the property legal

1 all related, and then vote on each one
 2 individually?

3 MR. COLLIER: Yes, I would handle it that
 4 way.

5 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So I'll read
 6 them in.

7 Item Number 5 on the agenda is an Ordinance
 8 of the City Commission of Coral Gables, Florida
 9 requesting an amendment to the Future Land Use
 10 Map of the City of Coral Gables Comprehensive
 11 Plan pursuant to Zoning Code Article 3,
 12 "Development Review," Division 15,
 13 "Comprehensive Plan Text and Map Amendments,"
 14 and Small Scale amendment procedures (Statute
 15 163.3187, Florida Statutes), from "Industrial"
 16 Land Use to "Mixed Use" Land Use and removing
 17 the "Mixed Use Overlay District" Land Use for
 18 the property legally described as Tracts A and
 19 B, Block 5 and Tract 1, MacFarlane Homestead
 20 and St. Albans Park, located at 215 and 251
 21 South Dixie Highway, Coral Gables, Florida;
 22 providing for a repealer provision, providing
 23 for a severability clause, and providing for an
 24 effective date. The legal description is on
 25 file at the City and that's Local Planning

1 described as Tracts A and B, Block 5 and Tract
 2 1, MacFarlane Homestead and St. Albans Park,
 3 located at 215 and 251 South Dixie Highway,
 4 Coral Gables, Florida; providing for a repealer
 5 provision, providing for a severability clause,
 6 codification, and providing for an effective
 7 date. The legal description is on file with
 8 the City.

9 Item 8, an Ordinance of the City Commission
 10 of Coral Gables, Florida requesting review of a
 11 Planned Area Development pursuant to Zoning
 12 Code Article 3, "Development Review", Division
 13 5, "Planned Area Development (PAD)", for the
 14 proposed project referred to as "Gables
 15 Station" on the property legally described as
 16 Tracts A and B, Block 5, and Tract 1,
 17 MacFarlane Homestead and St. Albans Park, at
 18 215 and 251 South Dixie Highway, Coral Gables,
 19 Florida; including required conditions;
 20 providing for a repealer provision, providing
 21 for a severability clause and providing for an
 22 effective date. The legal description is on
 23 file with the City.

24 If we could please silence cell phones and
 25 other devices. That would be appreciated.

1 Item Number 9 on the agenda is a Resolution
 2 of the City Commission of Coral Gables, Florida
 3 requesting Mixed-Use Site Plan Review pursuant
 4 to Zoning Code Article 4, "Zoning Districts,"
 5 Division 2, "Overly and Special Purpose
 6 Districts," Section 4-201, "Mixed-Use District
 7 or MXD," for the proposed project referred to
 8 as "Gables Station" on the property legally
 9 described as Tracts A and B, Block 5, and Tract
 10 1, MacFarlane Homestead and St. Albans Park,
 11 215 and 251 South Dixie Highway, Coral Gables,
 12 Florida; including required conditions;
 13 providing for a repealer provision, providing
 14 for a severability clause, and providing for an
 15 effective date. The legal description is on
 16 file with the City.

17 We'll hear from the Applicant first and
 18 then the City's presentation.

19 MR. BASS: Mr. Chairman, Members of the
 20 Board, Jeffrey Bass is my name, 46 Southwest
 21 First Street is my address. I'm here
 22 representing the Applicant. I'm joined by a
 23 calvary of co-counsel that I need not
 24 introduce, because you should recognize each
 25 and every one of them.

1 Before I start, I would like to thank you,
 2 Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Board, for
 3 having this Special Meeting and for
 4 accommodating us.

5 There are three words that encapsulate the
 6 Gable Station project; Live Work and Play.
 7 These are the themes that have driven our
 8 design, and I would just like to briefly
 9 highlight those themes for you, within the
 10 context of this application, briefly, before I
 11 have Mr. Jorge Hernandez walk you through the
 12 actual drawings.

13 So let me start, with the Live Work Play,
 14 with Live. This is a mixed-use project, with a
 15 sizable residential component. There are
 16 approximately 450 residential units proposed
 17 for the project, and I'd like to emphasize for
 18 you that previously there was a commercial
 19 project approved on this site, and by changing
 20 the complexion of the use from a completely
 21 commercial site to a mixed-use residential
 22 site, by making this a residential site, in
 23 essence, we have reduced the amount of traffic
 24 generated on this site by 50 percent of the
 25 project that was previously approved there.

1 That's a fact, and I believe that that's a
 2 vitally important fact.

3 Work, this is a project that is designed
 4 with Live Work in mind. By creating a
 5 mixed-use residential project here along a
 6 transit corridor, Gables Station, as the name
 7 implies, is all about creating residential
 8 density within a transit corridor. And by
 9 doing so, we fulfill what I call the mobility
 10 mandate of your Comprehensive Plan, to increase
 11 density in close proximity to transit.

12 So this project, Gables Station, we submit,
 13 represents the quintessence of a
 14 transit-oriented project because of its
 15 location.

16 On the Work part, of the Live Work Play, we
 17 have a hotel. And a hotel is a new use for
 18 this site, never previously shown, and the
 19 hotel is a place where people who come to work
 20 in Coral Gables can stay when they shop in our
 21 shops and eat and drink in our restaurants.

22 So on the Work part, we believe that this
 23 will be an engine for the economy of Coral
 24 Gables. But, also, on the Work part, because
 25 we have a hotel, this project will create jobs.

1 It will create jobs in the hotel, on a wide --
 2 of a wide variety.

3 We also have approximately 60,000 square
 4 feet of commercial. Of the 60,000 square feet
 5 of commercial, approximately 10,000 are
 6 dedicated for restaurant use. Our commercial
 7 space, including our restaurant space, will
 8 also be a job creator in this area. And by
 9 having the restaurant, and by having the
 10 commercial, we believe we make this a far more
 11 lovely place to Live and Work, by having
 12 amenities for the people who live with us and
 13 stay with us, to serve their needs right on the
 14 property, and, again, within close walk to
 15 transit.

16 Play, of the Live Work Play, and I think
 17 that this is perhaps the most significant
 18 departure from anything that you've seen
 19 before, this project has an unprecedented move
 20 towards creating urban park space, and Jorge
 21 Hernandez will expressly explain to you the
 22 magnitude of the gesture towards creating
 23 public park space, but to just to steal his
 24 thunder a bit, what we propose to do here is to
 25 take existing surface parking spaces and fund

1 their transformation into what will be the
 2 largest urban park within the City of Coral
 3 Gables. And we're very excited about that.
 4 Another equally important component of the
 5 Play, of Live Work Play, is that this
 6 Applicant/Developer Team has committed to fund
 7 one quarter mile of the Underline, right here,
 8 as it fronts this project. So, together, these
 9 public realm components of this project are
 10 truly transformational of what has just been a
 11 sea of surface parking lots into just a
 12 transformative place to live, to work, to shop,
 13 to eat and to stay in a hotel.
 14 Now, there are several applications that
 15 are before you. I'd like to really just
 16 crystalize them to their essence and explain
 17 why it is that we're asking for your approval
 18 here this evening.
 19 And before I do, I would just like to note
 20 that we have a favorable recommendation from
 21 your Staff, and I'm going to ask you twice,
 22 because it's that important, to make sure,
 23 before we leave this evening, that you make the
 24 findings and adopt as your own the findings
 25 that your Staff has included in its

1 additional approximate 35 feet in height, and
 2 that is the height of the Metrorail with a car
 3 on top of it, because we're trying to make it
 4 as lovely as it can possibly be for the
 5 residents who will live here and the guests who
 6 will stay here.
 7 The heights that we seek, we have a hotel
 8 on the southernmost piece. We propose 160 feet
 9 there. And on the two residential towers, we
 10 propose 147 feet. And, again, Mr. Hernandez
 11 will talk to you about that.
 12 We have the support from the homeowners
 13 within the Lola B. Walker Homeowners
 14 Association. Their letters are in the packet
 15 before you and are included in the record. I
 16 would like to be sure that they're included in
 17 the record of these proceedings. I believe
 18 some are here to speak in support.
 19 As I mentioned before, we have the support
 20 of your Staff and their recommendation, and we
 21 would ask for your support, as well.
 22 I'd like to take a few minutes for rebuttal
 23 at the end, in the close, after the public
 24 speak, but because this is a Comprehensive Plan
 25 Amendment of a Small Scale variety, and because

1 recommendation.
 2 So what are the applications and what are
 3 we asking for? The applications work as
 4 follows: This is a tough site, as you can
 5 imagine, and it's a particularly tough site to
 6 do residential and a hotel. And it's a tough
 7 site, because it's on US-1. It's a long,
 8 narrow site. It is adjacent to the Metrorail.
 9 And it spans two substantial intersections,
 10 that of US-1 and Ponce and US-1 and Le Jeune.
 11 This is a difficult site to develop, and
 12 the best evidence of that fact is, it has
 13 remained substantially undeveloped for as long
 14 as I have lived in South Florida. It's been a
 15 parking lot.
 16 What we propose to do here and what we're
 17 asking your approval for, is to allow us to
 18 build additional height on our three
 19 buildings -- and this is designed into three
 20 buildings -- so that we can adjust and
 21 accomodate for the height of the existing
 22 Metrorail structure and the Metrorail cars that
 23 run on top of the structure.
 24 So it's no coincidence, we're asking for
 25 these approvals so that we can build an

1 you are reviewing it for consistency with the
 2 Comprehensive Plan, and because your Staff has
 3 found consistency with a host of goals,
 4 policies and objectives of the Comprehensive
 5 Plan, I'd like to be sure, as part of this
 6 proceeding, that you make those findings
 7 yourselves.
 8 So thank you, again, for accommodating us
 9 on this special meeting. I'd like to now have
 10 Jorge Hernandez present the project to you.
 11 Thank you.
 12 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.
 13 MR. HERNANDEZ: Good evening. Jorge
 14 Hernandez, 337 Palermo Avenue.
 15 Can you all see the boards or should we
 16 move them a little further in this direction?
 17 You can see them?
 18 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Are you okay? You're
 19 the furthest.
 20 MS. MENENDEZ: Yeah, fine.
 21 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No, I think we're good.
 22 Thank you.
 23 MR. HERNANDEZ: Well, good evening and
 24 thank you, again. It's a pleasure to be here.
 25 And thank you for holding a special meeting for

1 this project.
 2 As Jeff said, this really is an unusual and
 3 extraordinary site -- yeah, thank you -- may be
 4 somewhat encumbered by its geometry, the length
 5 of it, but nevertheless critically positioned,
 6 and so we see the aerial that has been put up
 7 on the board previously. Just to be clear,
 8 it's a site fronting US-1, between Ponce
 9 Boulevard and Grand Avenue and Le Jeune Road
 10 intersection of US-1. That is the site. It's
 11 175 feet deep, and it is almost 1,200 feet long
 12 on the frontage.
 13 You know, Jeff talked about this site,
 14 where the notion of Live and Work and Play
 15 become instrumental in making place and finding
 16 a kind of way of giving back to the City, then
 17 the vehicle, the planning and architectural
 18 vehicles with which that is done, is by the
 19 making of a park, a street, and a square. And
 20 so I'd like to walk you through that, if I may,
 21 the making of a park, a street, and a square.
 22 So, on your left is a series of comparative
 23 scale drawings of our urban parks, and they are
 24 all at the same scale. You can see that what
 25 we were calling for the moment Gables Station

1 Underline is really the notion of how we're
 2 bringing a park to the space. It's already
 3 public lands, but nobody has taken the
 4 initiative to be the catalyst and start talking
 5 to the different municipalities to be able to
 6 bring forth a vision, and as you heard earlier,
 7 they are going to fund one quarter mile of the
 8 Underline, which is a portion -- the portion
 9 that runs right there, right along the west
 10 side of the parcel.
 11 So it's a significant park improvement that
 12 I think will certainly up the ante of our
 13 public park space and increase the quality of
 14 life.
 15 This is a view of some of what that will
 16 look like. It's quite a wide swath. It's over
 17 200 feet of green space, and it will be built
 18 out and framed or bookended between the
 19 existing project, on the left of the drawing,
 20 which is the Gables Grand, and the proposed
 21 project, which is Gables Station, on the right.
 22 And so it's a large green median that rambles
 23 through, including active play and passive
 24 play.
 25 These are a series of diagrams that talk

1 Park, for lack of a better word -- is this on?
 2 Hello? Hello? Yes -- what we're calling
 3 Gables Station Park is the one at the top.
 4 Here is Hartnett Park. Here is Ingram Park.
 5 Here is Jaycee Park. And here is the
 6 MacFarlane Park. And, by and large, this park
 7 is the largest one, at 2.895 acres, sometimes
 8 two-fold some of those other urban parks.
 9 Now, I must say that the initiative -- you
 10 can see on the right the parcel in question,
 11 and this parcel is the parcel that is owned by
 12 the developer, by NPI, but there is this swath
 13 of land, just west of it, which, as you know,
 14 is currently a series of more surface parking,
 15 and it is shared by multiple municipalities.
 16 Some of it is County, some of it is County
 17 which is leased to Coral Gables, and so on and
 18 so forth. It's a quilt of ownership and leases
 19 and son on. And then I don't know if you can
 20 see, under that red line is the actual space
 21 under the Metrorail, where the Underline is
 22 projected to be.
 23 So NPI's vision of bringing together all of
 24 these different potential park lands and
 25 creating a kind of synergy and a unity with the

1 about the extent to which green space is being
 2 increased, and the open space -- the notion of
 3 a PAD had been mentioned to you. The open
 4 space, the ground floor open space of the lot,
 5 of the actual parcel, is 45 percent. So
 6 between sidewalks, arcades, colonnades,
 7 squares, parks and so on, almost half of the
 8 ground floor of this parcel is being given back
 9 to the public, 45 percent.
 10 When you put that together with the -- I'm
 11 sorry, so that's two acres, 87,000 and change,
 12 two acres. When you add these two acres, with
 13 the three acres of the park just west, that is
 14 being created by that kind of synergy and
 15 collaboration, we will have five acres of
 16 public open space on the ground floor, as a
 17 result of the construction of this project, and
 18 those five acres are being improved with the
 19 Underline and other improvements within the
 20 parcel, which, again, is a significant
 21 contribution to the City, and it's part of this
 22 notion of livability and play and the making of
 23 a park here.
 24 So I'd like to talk for a moment about the
 25 street, the new street, which again we're

1 calling for the moment Gables Station Drive.
 2 That is the street that is immediately to the
 3 west of the parcel. There is no street there
 4 currently. There is US-1, and the next
 5 official -- or the next built street is Ponce.
 6 And for reasons of access and entry and exit
 7 and approach and even handicap curb access,
 8 we're proposing an additional street, that does
 9 a great deal in bringing people here, both as
 10 pedestrians and as vehicular traffic, but it
 11 also creates a kind of filter, where people
 12 from across the Highway can walk through the
 13 property, to the green park, the new park, and
 14 the same in reverse. So the site acts as a
 15 kind of porous field, where people can travel
 16 through.

17 Let me talk a little bit about the length
 18 of the project and how the massing and the
 19 volumetrics of the project have been broken
 20 down. So, as we said, the project is nearly
 21 1,200 square feet, US-1 frontage, and it's been
 22 broken down into sort of five mini blocks, if
 23 you will, which are kind of building elements.

24 They are, on an average, about 150 feet
 25 deep, each mini block, and they range from 280

1 to about 300 feet long, with their frontage on
 2 the US-1 sidewalk. And this pretty much
 3 conditions the volumetric massing, which you
 4 can see there in the perspective, where the
 5 project on the right, you can see that there's
 6 a cutting of the grain in the short dimension,
 7 and in the cutting of the grain is where a
 8 majority of entrances or special places happen.

9 The first cut, which is the one furthest
 10 north, is the vehicular entry into the site,
 11 and also has two paseos, two pedestrian
 12 passages, that cut through it. The second cut
 13 is where the square, the third protagonist that
 14 I mentioned, this kind of square is, and we'll
 15 talk about the square later, and then I think
 16 it's important to note that at the very
 17 southern tip, what we call the nose of the
 18 parcel, there is a green park there, that
 19 mirrors a verdant space existing in the tip of
 20 that gas station.

21 There's a wonderful stand of native trees,
 22 some black olives and oaks, and by recognizing
 23 them and drawing them and providing a kind of
 24 partner on the opposite side, when you go
 25 through the Grand Avenue approach, you'll

1 actually go under a canopy, under a tree
 2 canopy, to Le Jeune.

3 Lastly, and most importantly, in the
 4 drawing on the left, you see clearly the height
 5 of the rail, the height of the rail, and as has
 6 been mentioned, the rail height and speeding
 7 car are at about 35 feet of height above grade.
 8 So it was very important to stack the program
 9 in these buildings in such a way that we could
 10 avoid all of the negative impact of having the
 11 speeding cars.

12 So, as is normative, all of the ground
 13 floor space is commercial, obviously, and
 14 there's a varied scale of commercial, which
 15 we'll talk about later.

16 The rail car is moving across at that
 17 35-foot height, and so all of the parking is
 18 being placed at that sectional height of the
 19 project, so that the rails are moving through
 20 the levels -- or parallel to the levels of
 21 parking, and then the dwelling units of the
 22 apartment buildings occur well above that, two
 23 stories or three stories of parking above that.

24 Let me speak a little bit about the three
 25 buildings, if you will, and the programmatic

1 distribution of the buildings. You've heard
 2 there's a hotel of about 150 keys. There are
 3 apartment buildings of about 450. There's
 4 60,000 square feet of commercial, 10,000 square
 5 feet of which is restaurant, right. And
 6 they're distributed in three buildings. So
 7 let's call the northern one Building 1, then
 8 the middle building, and Building 3.

9 So Building 1 and 2 are programmatically
 10 the same. They have retail on the ground
 11 floor. They have five floors of structured
 12 parking, which are elevating the dorm units
 13 well above the rail. And those buildings are
 14 U-shaped, and the open space of the "U" faces
 15 US-1 and provides pool decks and other public
 16 amenities at that level.

17 The last building, which is Building 3,
 18 let's say, is the one with the greatest mixture
 19 of uses. It has retail on the ground floor, no
 20 parking. All of the parking for the entire
 21 project is banked in Building 1 and 2. So
 22 Building 3 has all habitable program, all of
 23 the way to the sidewalk, which does a great
 24 deal to enliven the sidewalk.

25 So Building 3 has no parking, retail on the

1 ground floor. The middle body of the building
 2 is hotel, and the side of the building which is
 3 adjacent to the rail has all of the hotel back
 4 of house functions, kitchens, laundries, linen
 5 storage, et cetera, so, again, we could guard
 6 against the noise and the occurrence of the
 7 rail. The rooms are on the US-1 side, and,
 8 then -- above the height of the rail, and then
 9 the apartment buildings are above that.

10 So the building has been carefully composed
 11 sectionally to give quality of life issues, but
 12 deal with the rail, and that is the principal
 13 reason for the height asked, because the height
 14 of the rail, is which 35 feet, is a little more
 15 than what we're asking for. The recommended
 16 height was 120. It was an approval, with a
 17 condition of a recommended approval height of
 18 120, and these buildings average at about 150.
 19 The difference being 30 feet. The rail cars
 20 are riding at 30 to 35 feet of height. That's
 21 the reason to work that section and work those
 22 volumetrics, to get all of the habitable space
 23 well above or well below the rail.

24 So this board is an enlargement of what you
 25 saw just previously. I'd just like to talk

1 about a couple of micro-scale planning issues
 2 with relationship to this board. Again, it's a
 3 very long, narrow lot, but you can start to
 4 see -- by the way, this is a deceleration lane
 5 from US-1, that is cut within our property, so
 6 that one can handle turning in, and our traffic
 7 engineer is here, he can certainly answer any
 8 questions, but this project is generating half
 9 the amount of traffic than the previously
 10 approved single use project generated. And
 11 in spite of that, we're still doing a number of
 12 traffic calmings and being sensitive to the
 13 traffic.

14 But all of the buildings, as you can see on
 15 the east, south and north side, are wrapped
 16 with very generous arcades, ranging from 12 to
 17 sometimes 18 or more feet wide. This allows
 18 that notion of the site acting like a kind of
 19 filter, where people can walk through all of
 20 it, and we are providing frontages to the
 21 commercial on all sides. The most difficult
 22 side, obviously being the US-1 side, is planted
 23 and buffered, and it's very easy, every 300
 24 feet, you can cross the site through a very
 25 generous width and get to the park side.

1 The side on the west, the side that is
 2 adjacent to the rail, is the one side that does
 3 not have an arcade or a colonnade, and the
 4 reason for that is, in working with the
 5 Planning Staff, we realized that the
 6 infrastructure of the Metro actually is a form
 7 of an arcade and has a soffit or a ceiling and
 8 shades that space. So to create even greater
 9 shade on the northwest side would have been a
 10 deterrence. So, for that reason, and working
 11 with Staff, that side is a very lively
 12 pedestrian small street, the new street, but it
 13 has no arcades. There will be awnings and
 14 other architectural features that animate that
 15 site, and you will be walking along the
 16 Underline, so you'll see people jogging and
 17 biking and it will be that kind of a very
 18 lovely, lively environment.

19 Because of the narrowness of the site, and
 20 we have been through this many times with
 21 Staff, it's impossible to service the site from
 22 anywhere but one of the principal streets. So
 23 the servicing is being done from that north
 24 street. You can't do it from US-1. You can't
 25 have trucks backing up on US-1. And the other

1 streets are too short. So that is something
 2 that we have to deal with, but, again, I think
 3 the project deals with it as best as it can be.
 4 It's one of the hardships of the project.

5 So we've talked about the park, and we've
 6 talked about the street. And, if I may, for
 7 just an instance, talk about the square. So
 8 the square is this portion here, which is the
 9 third sort of protagonist of public urban realm
 10 sort of experiences. It's a hundred feet by
 11 175 feet. It takes the whole width. And there
 12 is a fountain that is producing a curtain of
 13 water, to provide white noise to the hum of the
 14 vehicles. And the curtain is also blocking
 15 views in.

16 Then there is a square, which you'll see
 17 more current renditions of, which will be
 18 filled with cafes, because the spaces around it
 19 are lined with cafes and restaurants and alike.
 20 And you see a signature view of the project
 21 there, which also talks about, in a way,
 22 building the bookend to Gables Ponce, and
 23 finally coordinating and planting that swath of
 24 green space that will be the park, animated by
 25 the kind of speed and connectivity of the rail.

1 These are a series of views that I believe
 2 Mr. Trias sent to you this morning or may have
 3 given you when you walked in. They are further
 4 developments of the aesthetics of the square.
 5 So you see kind of a view, on the left, which
 6 shows the width of the square, opening to the
 7 Underline, and on the right, you see a
 8 sectional cut, which is a more technical
 9 drawing, that shows the great bridge, the
 10 bridge that is masking US-1. This is the US-1
 11 side. This is the square. This is the
 12 Underline side, with the rail, and then is the
 13 park.

14 I think it's important to mention that at
 15 the narrowest, we are 35 feet from the rail.
 16 You know, the rail and this property line are
 17 not parallel. The rail converges. But at the
 18 narrowest, that train is moving 35 feet away
 19 from our building facade, which is why the
 20 stacking and the height became so important.

21 And, then, between the rail and the first
 22 building, on the opposite side of Ponce, and
 23 the small commercial buildings, and the Gables
 24 Ponce Building is over 130 feet, so you can see
 25 why we had to watch and guard ourselves against

1 and 160, and it's 100 feet wide.
 2 So we present the project to you. We're
 3 available for any questions and answers and
 4 we're happy to present it, because we feel that
 5 it follows this pride and tradition of
 6 City-making that we have enjoyed for 90 years.

7 Thank you.
 8 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.
 9 Mr. Bass, does that wrap up the Applicant's
 10 presentation?

11 MR. BASS: Yeah. I know there are people
 12 to speak from the public, and I know that the
 13 Planning Department would like to make a
 14 presentation, so that concludes the Applicant's
 15 presentation. If we may have just a moment or
 16 two for rebuttal.

17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Of course.
 18 Thank you.

19 Mr. Trias.

20 MR. TRIAS: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman.
 21 First of all, I want to thank you all for
 22 joining us for a Special Meeting. I think the
 23 citizens know that you serve as volunteers, and
 24 that's a lot of your time that you're donating.

25 In front of you, you have an updated set of

1 the train, but this public space, I think, will
 2 be very active, and is a signature space of the
 3 project.

4 I'm just going to show you a series of
 5 drawings about it. It's configured, as I said,
 6 as a 155 by 100 foot urban room. There are
 7 colonnades all around it, and the featured
 8 architectural element is this bridge, which
 9 follows the tradition of Mediterranean
 10 architecture in the Gables, has an arcade on
 11 the first floor, a colonnade on the second
 12 floor, and it gathers everyone coming out of
 13 the parking garage, everyone going to the
 14 hotel, and it delivers them onto the square
 15 through this monumental stair that you see
 16 there in that drawing.

17 And I think we just have one more. Yeah,
 18 that's a section in the other direction, with
 19 the two buildings on either side, and then the
 20 bridge shown at a distance. I show it, because
 21 we've had a number of discussions about scale
 22 in the public realm and proportions and we know
 23 Merrick's recommendation of proportionality of
 24 streets and spaces, and this follows the one to
 25 1.5 rule. So it's 150 feet tall, between 147

1 drawings, and also the comments from the Design
 2 Review Committee of the Underline, and I gave
 3 that to you today. The drawings represent the
 4 most recent development of the architecture,
 5 which the architect has been working on since
 6 they made a presentation to the Board of
 7 Architects a couple of weeks ago.

8 In addition, you also have the PowerPoint
 9 presentation in front of you. So what I'll do
 10 is, I'll give the PowerPoint and then answer
 11 any questions you may have.

12 So can I have the PowerPoint please? Thank
 13 you very much.

14 The Applicant explained the location of the
 15 project. I think that most of us who are from
 16 the Miami area have always seen it as a parking
 17 lot. It's not exactly a parking lot, in terms
 18 of use, but that's the way it looks. That is
 19 the way it is designed at this point.

20 The area around it is fully developed. As
 21 the Applicant mentioned, this is within the
 22 Industrial area of the City. Now, in Coral
 23 Gables, what that means is that the Mixed-Use
 24 area, has the Mixed-Use Overlay in that area,
 25 allows and encourages the type of development

1 that has happened immediately to the north of
2 the property.

3 If you look at the three dimensional
4 quality of the area, you can see that there are
5 some significant buildings already built
6 towards the north of the property. And you've
7 also reviewed, recently, at least one more
8 project. So there are some very interesting
9 projects going on. And then the Underline and
10 the Metrorail is right there.

11 US-1 has been a major thoroughfare for a
12 very, very, long time, and then immediately to
13 the east of US-1 is mostly single-family
14 neighborhoods most throughout that area. The
15 MacFarlane Homestead District is in the City of
16 Coral Gables, and then there are some areas in
17 the City of Miami beyond that District.

18 The project, as the Applicant has shown,
19 fits right in that sliver of land between US-1
20 and Metrorail, and it's at a scale that is
21 comparable to some of the most recent Mixed-Use
22 developments that have been taking place in the
23 District.

24 The Applicant has explained the effort to
25 create high quality pedestrian areas, and

1 property beyond that's actually, in the
2 right-of-way of Metrorail, which is controlled
3 by the County Transportation Department at this
4 point. And the reason I say that that's part
5 of the project is because those are some of the
6 Conditions of Approval, the fact that some
7 improvement in that area is proposed.

8 I'm having difficulties with the
9 PowerPoint. Can I have the next slide, please?

10 It's working now. Very good.

11 The large 11 by 17 document that you have
12 before you has some outdated drawings, but, in
13 general, the big ideas are the same. The
14 details of the drawings have evolved since the
15 Applicant submitted these drawings, but in
16 terms of massing, in terms of size, all of that
17 is the same.

18 The review timeline, as with all projects,
19 this has been reviewed multiple times. It went
20 to the DRC in January. The Board of Architects
21 reviewed it in April, April 28th, and the Board
22 of Architects approved it conceptually, and
23 they expect to review it again, perhaps several
24 times, to refine the quality of the
25 architecture. There was a required

1 they're still working on it, and that is one of
2 the conditions that we have. And we'll go over
3 all of that in more detail later on, but I
4 would like you to understand, this as a work in
5 progress, in terms of the architecture and the
6 design.

7 The Existing and Future Land Use and Zoning
8 is Industrial, as we said before, which
9 includes the Mixed-Use -- that existing
10 Mixed-Use Overlay, and the request has five
11 items.

12 Item Number 1 is a Comprehensive Plan
13 Amendment. Number 2 is a Zoning Code Map
14 Amendment. Number 3 is a Text Amendment to the
15 Zoning Code. Number 4 is a PAD, the Planned
16 Area Development. And Number 5 is the
17 Mixed-Use Site Plan.

18 And this is all fairly technical, in terms
19 of the reason why we have five requests, but
20 the reality is that it's basically one big
21 idea, that in order to be implemented, from a
22 technical point of view, we have to do five
23 different things.

24 The Site Plan, as explained by the
25 Applicant, includes their property and the

1 neighborhood meeting in April, also, and today
2 we're dealing with the Planning and Zoning
3 meeting.

4 Staff has reviewed the application. All of
5 the different departments have had a chance to
6 make comments and review them. However, there
7 are some outstanding reviews that will take
8 place between now and the final approval, and
9 we can go into more detail, if we need to.
10 Most of them deal with traffic.

11 Letters were mailed to the property owners
12 within 1,500 feet, and that's the map that
13 shows the area. We had two -- or there were
14 two mailings, one of the neighborhood meeting
15 and also the Planning and Zoning Board meeting.
16 The property was posted three times, and there
17 were three website postings and one newspaper
18 advertisement.

19 The first request, the Comprehensive Plan
20 request, is very similar to a request that was
21 reviewed recently, which was the Paseo request,
22 in which the Land Use was requested to be
23 Mixed-Use. The same type of request is taking
24 place here.

25 The Mixed-Use Land Use allows for more

1 precise regulations, in terms of height and
 2 FAR, et cetera, than, for example, the
 3 High-Rise Land Use will be. So from the point
 4 of view of the City and the protection of the
 5 neighbors, I think it's a good choice, and that
 6 is what the Applicant is requesting.

7 The attorney explained that you have to
 8 make some findings of fact and those are listed
 9 in the PowerPoint and also in the Staff report,
 10 and basically what it is, is that the request
 11 complies with the Comprehensive Plan standards
 12 of review and they deal with the objectives of
 13 the City, in the big picture, but also with the
 14 issues about traffic and infrastructure that
 15 we're all very familiar with.

16 So Staff has reviewed the request, and it
 17 complies. Therefore, Staff recommends approval
 18 of the Comprehensive Plan request to Mixed-Use,
 19 as the standards have been met.

20 Now, in terms of Zoning, the request is to
 21 also change the Zoning to Commercial. Right
 22 now the Zoning is Industrial. The Zoning of
 23 Commercial allows for the Mixed-Use request
 24 that is coming later. So that is the main
 25 reason for that.

1 the north of this parcel, the Planning and
 2 Zoning Board and the Commission have approved
 3 120 feet, recently.

4 So, in our review, that seems to be the
 5 current discussion, in terms of policy, and
 6 that is why, in the Staff report, we have
 7 recommended 120. If you want to make some
 8 other recommendation and if the Commission
 9 chooses to set a different policy, certainly
 10 they have that authority and they're able to do
 11 that.

12 In addition, the floor area ratio is
 13 limited to the 3.5, which, as you know, is the
 14 typical maximum floor area ratio in any project
 15 that has Mediterranean bonus. So it's a
 16 typical size in Coral Gables. And, also, the
 17 density in the request is that it be 140 units
 18 per acre, which reflects the project as
 19 presented.

20 Now, Staff has reviewed this request, and
 21 we do find, also, that it complies with the
 22 Comprehensive Plan. And the Staff
 23 recommendation is approval, with modifications.
 24 And the modifications is that the setback
 25 requirements on Grand Avenue should not be

1 So what happens is that that Zoning is
 2 appropriate for that area, and, again, the
 3 findings of fact also include that it is
 4 consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, as it
 5 does promote the high quality development, the
 6 new development, in an area that needs it, and
 7 it also will have a positive effect on the
 8 neighboring properties. Staff recommends
 9 approval, as the standards of review are
 10 satisfied.

11 Now, Request Number 3 is the Zoning Code
 12 Text Amendment, and, this, in terms of the
 13 concept, what this has to do with is with the
 14 specific regulations of that Mixed-Use, okay.
 15 So the Comprehensive Plan says that whenever a
 16 property has the Mixed-Use Land Use, then there
 17 has to be Zoning Regulations that deal with FAR
 18 and height. So here you're able to target
 19 those regulations very precisely to the
 20 project.

21 The Applicant has requested 160 feet in
 22 height. That is the request of the Applicant.
 23 What Staff has expressed in the Staff report is
 24 that, in the recent past, in this area,
 25 particularly in the Industrial area, just to

1 removed. And we may discuss this further, if
 2 need be. But one of the important
 3 recommendations, which is the one that is a
 4 policy choice, is the one that sets the height
 5 as 120. And, again, this is just to be
 6 consistent with recent discussions in the City.
 7 And if there's a different policy view, that's
 8 a perfectly appropriate issue to discuss.

9 Request Number 4 is the Planned Area
 10 Development. The Planned Area Development, as
 11 you all know, allows for customizing the design
 12 of a project to make it as good as it can be,
 13 in terms of the context and the way it responds
 14 to existing conditions. So the Planned Area
 15 Development also has some beneficial aspects to
 16 it, which were discussed by the architect,
 17 which is the additional requirement for public
 18 open space, and that was explained in great
 19 detail.

20 The statistics of the request is that the
 21 area is a little over four acres. FAR, as I
 22 said, was 3.5. And the request of the
 23 Applicant is that one building is going to be
 24 160 in habitable height, and the other two
 25 buildings are going to be 148. So that is what

1 the Applicant is requesting.
 2 The program is a perfectly appropriate
 3 Mixed-Use balance between ground floor retail
 4 and then a hotel and a variety of units of
 5 different sizes and different bedrooms, and
 6 about two acres of public areas on-site, and
 7 the four acres in the Underline, 969 parking
 8 spaces, which, by the way, is the result of a
 9 combination of the Shared Parking that you
 10 recently have reviewed and adopted, and also
 11 the new regulations for parking for residential
 12 units, particularly the one bedroom, one space
 13 regulation.

14 There are multiple public benefits, and
 15 that is one of the findings that are made
 16 whenever a Planned Area Development is
 17 proposed, and what I would say is that the more
 18 evident benefits have to do with open space,
 19 have to do with the pedestrian areas, also
 20 contributions to the trolley, which are in the
 21 Conditions of Approval, some of the built in
 22 improvements along US-1, in particular,
 23 crosswalks and pedestrian enhancements, some
 24 better parking, public parking options around
 25 the site. If you look at it in detail, there's

1 Plan, which is basically what allows for the
 2 residential component of the project, once a
 3 property is zoned Commercial. I think that the
 4 Applicant has explained this in some detail,
 5 and I just want to make clear just one unique
 6 characteristic of this project, which is that
 7 the hotel, you see that red line in the
 8 building, the hotel is below that red line. So
 9 it's actually like the base of that building,
 10 it's not the whole building. The upper stories
 11 of that building, towards the west, is actually
 12 residential. I want to make that clear,
 13 because, to me, it's significant.

14 Now, in the drawings that we provided
 15 today, that building is not fully -- or, in
 16 fact, it's blank. It's not designed. They're
 17 still working on the design. This is the
 18 drawings that were provided to you in your
 19 package, which are still being improved. So
 20 that's one of the issues that I think is still
 21 a little bit up in the air.

22 But based on the meeting that I had this
 23 morning with the architect, the design has
 24 improved significantly, and hopefully it will
 25 be something that we can get very soon for

1 parallel parking all over the place. In fact,
 2 I think it could be even improved, if we work
 3 on it a little bit more, better landscape on
 4 US-1. Certainly that buffer that they're
 5 proposing enhances the aesthetics of US-1,
 6 bicycle parking and support facilities,
 7 electric car charging stations, the LEED
 8 Silver, which is a requirement now, but it's
 9 certainly a benefit, and multiple ways to walk
 10 around the site on very high quality arcades
 11 and sidewalks.

12 The Standards of Review also include these
 13 findings of fact, that the PAD is consistent
 14 with the Comprehensive Plan, and that, in fact,
 15 the special aspects of the project provide
 16 public benefits. And that is something that I
 17 think is one of the findings that we
 18 recommend -- Staff believes that it does
 19 comply. Therefore, Request Number 4, which is
 20 the Planned Area Development, Staff recommends
 21 approval with conditions. And the conditions
 22 are extensive and they're listed in the Staff
 23 report. So whenever we need to, we can go over
 24 them in some detail.

25 The final request is the Mixed-Use Site

1 review.

2 The rest of it is pretty much as expected.
 3 Gables Ponce is right towards the north, more
 4 or less, the north, and then the US-1 frontage,
 5 as you can see, completely is transformed into
 6 a much more pedestrian friendly area, with
 7 retail at the ground level.

8 The findings of fact also include that the
 9 proposed Mixed-Use, which is a conditional use,
 10 as you well know, is consistent with the
 11 Comprehensive Plan and Staff believes it is,
 12 and Staff recommends approval with
 13 conditions -- again, fairly extensive
 14 conditions, that are included in your Staff
 15 report.

16 The Conditions of Approval include the
 17 maximum height, which we could discuss, but
 18 also include issues that I think are still not
 19 fully reviewed, and some of them is, for
 20 example, that Public Works needs to finalize
 21 some of the review of the traffic impact, and
 22 also the civil engineering plans, and in terms
 23 of landscape, from my perspective, the design
 24 of the Underline is still being discussed.

25 We have very good comments from the

1 committee that reviews the Underline, but I
 2 would interpret that as a placeholder that
 3 needs to be further refined, and there are
 4 multiple issues that deal with that project,
 5 including some existing parking that we may
 6 want to keep some, or not, depending on the
 7 priorities of the City. And then some existing
 8 uses, such as the Passport Office, the very new
 9 Passport Office that is right there. So all of
 10 that is conceptual at this point, and I would
 11 expect that it's refined significantly in the
 12 next few weeks.

13 In addition, the architectural plans, as I
 14 mentioned, are also conceptual at this point,
 15 and they have to be significantly reviewed and
 16 improved. So one of the conditions is that the
 17 Board of Architects will have to review them in
 18 more detail. We've done this in the past, in
 19 some of the larger projects, and I think it has
 20 worked effectively, but I want you to be aware
 21 of that.

22 The issue of the building height, as
 23 illustrated in this image, if you look at this
 24 diagram, the red is the 120, the 160 is what
 25 they're proposing. That gives you an idea of

1 the scope of what we're talking about, in terms
 2 of massing and in terms of design. And in
 3 Buildings B and C, it's 148, and, again, that's
 4 the 120.

5 The Conditions of Approval include mobility
 6 contributions, US-1 pedestrian improvements,
 7 Underline improvements, on-street parking, the
 8 additional City reviews that I mentioned, peer
 9 review and inspection, a fully finalized
 10 landscape plan, signage, resolution of the
 11 building height issue, parking garage design,
 12 which they've already began to address with the
 13 more recent drawings provided to you today.

14 The loading areas, which is that new street
 15 that Mr. Hernandez was mentioning about, some
 16 of the pedestrian access, the paseos, a lot of
 17 these issues are being worked on and were part
 18 of the presentation, and I'm very happy to see
 19 that there is positive progress on them. And
 20 then construction staging, which is a
 21 requirement, traffic improvements, the
 22 encroachment plan, which includes a significant
 23 issue, which is that that street that is being
 24 proposed is actually not on their property.
 25 It's on the right-of-way of Metrorail. So I

1 wanted to make that clear, also, so there is no
 2 confusion on that issue, and a variety of other
 3 typical Conditions of Approval.

4 The Underline, as I said, I see it as a
 5 placeholder, as ideas, but certainly not as a
 6 final plan at this point. And, interestingly,
 7 the rendering that the Applicant showed had
 8 more green than the original submittal. The
 9 original submittal, as you can see, has a
 10 parking lot there. The rendering they showed,
 11 they have made it green. In addition to that,
 12 they also made green the plaza in the Grand
 13 Avenue entrance. So there are some changes
 14 that I found interesting in the presentation
 15 that the Applicant gave, but they simply
 16 reflect the fact that the final design is not
 17 done yet, it's still a work in progress.

18 The US-1 pedestrian improvements focus
 19 mostly on either end of the project, the fact
 20 that pedestrian areas on Grand Avenue and Ponce
 21 de Leon are non-existent at this point. So
 22 there's some coordination with the County that
 23 needs to take place to be able to improve that.

24 And, finally, some of the typical
 25 conditions that need to be done prior to the

1 CO, and the quality of the open spaces, the
 2 Applicant -- these are drawings from this
 3 morning. The Applicant has shown really a
 4 great effort to enhance the quality of the open
 5 spaces and also the quality of the design of
 6 the buildings.

7 So all of that is going on. And, as I
 8 said, I want to thank you for taking the time
 9 to have this special meeting, and we have
 10 rushed through this review, and we've done the
 11 best we can, but, as you can see, there are
 12 still some items that need to be finalized.

13 Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you, Mr. Trias.

15 A quick question, some of the items that
 16 still need to be finalized pertain to the Site
 17 Plan, correct?

18 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. And that's
 20 before us tonight for review?

21 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Thank you.

23 Okay. We'll open up the public hearing.
 24 Jill, do you have any speakers signed up?

25 THE SECRETARY: Yes. We have four

1 speakers.
 2 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.
 3 THE SECRETARY: Dr. Brad Richter.
 4 MR. RICHTER: Hi, I'm Dr. Brad Richter, a
 5 proud owner of the Coral Gables Animal
 6 Hospital, 4569 Ponce de Leon Boulevard.
 7 First of all, I want to say that I have no
 8 objection to development. I have no objection,
 9 really, to this project, except that I have
 10 some concerns for my area, which is the north
 11 part of Ponce de Leon Boulevard. There's a
 12 number of businesses there. There's two animal
 13 hospitals there. That's the only place, pretty
 14 much left in Coral Gables, that you can have
 15 animal hospitals.
 16 I've been there since 1982. Dr. Brown was
 17 there before me, for thirty years before that,
 18 and my biggest concern has always been the
 19 traffic on that street and the parking.
 20 I met with Mr. Reynolds and
 21 Mr. Garcia-Serra, and I've seen some renditions
 22 of this project, but what I saw was a little
 23 bit different than what I see today. Right
 24 now, the parking on that street, on the street
 25 on the north and south side of Ponce, is very

1 Next to me, we have a day school, which I
 2 was not in favor of, but the City let a day
 3 school go into that area. And if you are there
 4 at certain times of the day, you will see that
 5 that is another nightmare.
 6 It was my understanding that the day school
 7 was to drop off and pick up in the alley. That
 8 has never happened. They said, when the
 9 construction of Gables Ponce happened, that was
 10 going to go back. That has never happened.
 11 You cannot, I don't think, enforce that
 12 that happens. I mean, people will park where
 13 they are going to park, and I don't think we're
 14 going to put a policeman out there every day to
 15 make sure that they do that, and people that
 16 are dropping off and picking up are going to do
 17 whatever is easiest, and what they do is, they
 18 park up along there, and sometimes they stay
 19 ten minutes, sometimes they stay a lot longer.
 20 The City of Coral Gables has now put the
 21 Passport Office where the old License Bureau
 22 was. They knew that there was a problem. When
 23 the License Bureau was there, those people
 24 would park anywhere and everywhere, because
 25 they would come every five years, and if they

1 congested. Both of those gentlemen are very
 2 sensitive to that. I've been a proponent on
 3 working on that street for many, many years.
 4 I was instrumental in getting the employee
 5 parking lots twenty or thirty years ago, to
 6 accommodate the employees for the businesses on
 7 the north side of Ponce and for the employees
 8 and for all of the customers.
 9 With all of the development that's
 10 happened, that street has become a traffic
 11 nightmare at certain times of the day. It's a
 12 parking nightmare at certain times of the day.
 13 And it affects not only my business, but it
 14 affects everybody on that street's business.
 15 For me, selfishly, I have an animal
 16 hospital. I've been servicing the people of
 17 Coral Gables pretty much most of my
 18 professional career. My customers need to be
 19 able to park in a reasonable manner and bring
 20 in animals safely and a reasonable distance
 21 from my animal hospital. I can't ask people to
 22 carry in a large labrador, maybe in the rain,
 23 maybe not in the rain, a significant distance,
 24 when they have an emergency. I mean, it's a
 25 daily thing.

1 got an eighteen dollar ticket, they really
 2 didn't care, and that was a nightmare.
 3 The City took away the license or they
 4 moved, and now -- and then they had a furniture
 5 store there, which was fine, didn't take up a
 6 lot of parking. Now they've put the Passport
 7 Office there, which takes up a lot of parking
 8 again.
 9 The plans that I saw here today -- and I
 10 have to look at it better -- but I think it
 11 eliminated all of the employee parking or most
 12 of the employee parking, so I don't know where
 13 my employees are going to park, where the
 14 school instructors are going to park, where the
 15 Passport people are really going to park, and
 16 now we have a nice park, which I'm all in favor
 17 of, and we have the Underline, the people that
 18 live in this area will not have a problem
 19 getting to that park, but, let's say, the
 20 people that want to use the Underline and come
 21 to that nice, beautiful park, where are they
 22 going to park?
 23 I don't think they're going to park in the
 24 hotel parking lot. I think they're going to
 25 park along Ponce, if they can, with their

1 bicycles, and bring out their bikes. And so
2 now the few spaces that might be there are
3 going to be taken up by people that are
4 visiting the park and using the Underline, and
5 those people could be two or three or four
6 hours at a time taking up a space.

7 So I'm asking the City, the Commissioners,
8 to really think about the traffic on that
9 street, to think about the employee parking,
10 and to conduct a parking study, because, right
11 now, you cannot buy an employee parking pass.

12 For the last ten years, I have 20 of them.
13 I've had 20 of them since the City of Coral
14 Gables authorized those things. I know that
15 the people next door, they sometimes borrow
16 some of my passes, because they don't have
17 enough for their teachers, and now with the
18 Passport Office there, they're going to have a
19 significant number of employees, and they have,
20 of course, a lot of people coming for
21 passports.

22 So I'm asking the Commissioners and the
23 City to conduct a parking study, and to tell me
24 how my -- where my employees are going to park.

25 I've talked with Mr. Reynolds about maybe

1 parking inside of his, but what about the day
2 school, what about the Passport people? What
3 about people that are coming to park? What
4 about people that are coming to the commercial
5 park?

6 If you can convince me of that, I would be
7 all in favor of this project, but I need
8 somebody to tell me where all of these spaces
9 that are there now -- and there's not enough of
10 them -- if they disappear, where are all of my
11 employees and everybody else's employees going
12 to park?

13 Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.
15 (Inaudible.)

16 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'm going to finish the
17 -- so that way we're going not going to have a
18 one-on-one after every speaker potentially.
19 Thank you.

20 Jill, our next speaker, please.

21 THE SECRETARY: Jeff Berkowitz.

22 MR. BERKOWITZ: Good evening. My name is
23 Jeff Berkowitz. I'm a 35-year resident of the
24 City of Coral Gables. I am the owner of this
25 property, which is under contract to NP.

1 I'd like to complement NP on what I
2 consider -- and their team, on what I consider
3 to be a brilliantly conceived plan. This
4 particular property, which I've owned for a
5 number of years, is unique in Coral Gables.
6 It's an oasis, without neighbors. It has a gas
7 station to the south. It has US-1 -- and I
8 don't need to tell anybody how heavily
9 trafficked US-1 is -- to the east. It has an
10 automobile dealership to the north. And it has
11 Metrorail to the west.

12 And I think it is a testament to this
13 developer and to his team that there are not
14 serious numbers of people and neighbors here to
15 oppose the project, rather there are neighbors
16 here to support the project.

17 So ultimately the issue here is height, and
18 you heard the argument about how important it
19 is to move the residential portion of the
20 project up, to avoid the noise of the
21 Metrorail.

22 I designed a project -- Mike, if you don't
23 mind, and haven't had it fully approved by the
24 Coral Gables Commission -- to do a 360,000
25 square foot retail project, which was far more

1 intense, in terms of traffic.

2 But if you were to compare what this
3 developer is offering this community, to what
4 has been approved on this site, it should be
5 clear that they have brought forward to this
6 community a far superior project.

7 So let me tell you the argument that we
8 haven't heard for the increased height they're
9 seeking, and I'm supportive of that. Number
10 One, they have a four-and-a-half acre -- almost
11 a four-and-a-half acre site, fully two acres of
12 which are being devoted to public spaces.
13 Alternatively, they could squash the project,
14 and they could shrink the public spaces, and
15 they wouldn't need that. But if there's any
16 location in all of Coral Gables that justifies
17 this kind of height, it's in this oasis, where
18 there's US-1 on one side, and Metrorail on
19 another, and a gas station on another, and an
20 auto dealership on the fourth side.

21 The other thing that nobody has mentioned
22 is the fact that Florida Power & Light is
23 looking to increase its nuclear power plant,
24 and in conjunction with that, it is proposing
25 that it have the ability to run high powered

1 transmission lines down this corridor, which
 2 would run, I believe, right down Ponce.
 3 Now, the City of Miami, the City of
 4 Pinecrest, the City of South Miami, and, at one
 5 point, the City of Coral Gables, all sued to
 6 stop that. The City of Coral Gables, unique
 7 among those other municipalities who continue
 8 the fight against those transmission lines,
 9 settled with Florida Power & Light, and have
 10 invited those high powered transmission lines
 11 to be located in the proximity of this project.
 12 And there is another reason that we need to
 13 get those residences higher and up above those
 14 high powered transmission lines. Arguably,
 15 they're ugly, and there are those out there who
 16 would argue that they are dangerous. So I'm
 17 going to urge your support. I want to
 18 congratulate you and your team and invite your
 19 support. Thank you for hearing me out.
 20 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.
 21 THE SECRETARY: Ms. Cooper-Baker.
 22 MS. COOPER-BAKER: Good evening. My name
 23 is Leona Louise Cooper-Baker, and I always like
 24 to begin by saying that I was born in the City
 25 of Coral Gables, that little section that's

1 located just west of Carver Elementary School.
 2 It's called the Golden Gates.
 3 And another reason why I'm standing here is
 4 to let you know that having been born and
 5 raised on the same site where I still live
 6 today, I've seen all kinds of changes, and I'm
 7 also very proud to say that I've lived on that
 8 site almost 80 years, and never moved, only to
 9 go to college and come back.
 10 I stand before you today to say that I
 11 approve the project that the members of the
 12 team have talked about and they have presented
 13 here tonight, and another reason why I am
 14 especially proud of it is because they have
 15 taken the time to come to our homeowners'
 16 meetings, and we don't get that all of the
 17 time, to explain to us exactly what was going
 18 on and to answer our questions.
 19 And another reason that I'm very proud is
 20 because they kind of recognized us and know
 21 that being of a Bahamian descendent family,
 22 they're going to recognize the kinds of
 23 contributions that my parents and so many
 24 others have made to the City of Coral Gables.
 25 A lot of people don't realize that, but that

1 happened. And I'm also standing here thinking
 2 about my brother, Bill Cooper, if he were
 3 alive, and many of you remember him, he was the
 4 president of our homeowners', and he was
 5 standing here all of the time, he would come,
 6 and his wife, Leona, who isn't able to be here
 7 tonight, but she is still a very important part
 8 of your homeowners'.
 9 So I'd ask you tonight to please consider
 10 all of the requests that they have made, and I
 11 look forward to working with them, because I
 12 understand that we're going to do some things
 13 to work with the Underline project, and I get a
 14 chance to show off all of the slides and
 15 pictures of the Bahamians who helped to make
 16 this City what it is today, and I'd like you to
 17 know that I support their project.
 18 Thank you for allowing me to speak.
 19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you. And before
 20 you leave, I've been reminded, I've been
 21 slacking in my duties. I need, and also from
 22 Mr. Berkowitz, your address, please.
 23 MS. COOPER-BAKER: Oh, I'm so sorry. 201
 24 Washington Drive.
 25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.

1 MS. COOPER-BAKER: The corner of Lincoln
 2 and Washington Drive.
 3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Perfect. Thank you.
 4 MS. COOPER-BAKER: Thank you.
 5 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Berkowitz, I know
 6 you said you've lived in the City a few
 7 decades, but I don't think we got your address.
 8 MR. BERKOWITZ: I reside at 160 Edgewater
 9 Drive, in Coral Gables.
 10 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.
 11 THE SECRETARY: Judith Davis.
 12 MR. WU: Mr. Chair, I believe we need to
 13 swear in the speaker.
 14 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: You need to be sworn
 15 in, ma'am? You were not sworn in earlier,
 16 correct?
 17 MS. DAVIS: My name is Judith Davis and I
 18 live at --
 19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: One moment, please.
 20 I'm sorry, you need to be -- okay.
 21 MS. DAVIS: Sworn in. Okay.
 22 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. If we could
 23 please swear in the speaker.
 24 (Thereupon, Judith Davis was sworn.)
 25 MS. DAVIS: I do.

1 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.
 2 MS. DAVIS: Okay. Now that we took care of
 3 that, my name is Judith Davis, and I reside at
 4 236 Washington Drive. And like Mrs. Baker, I
 5 have been a life-long resident of Coral Gables.
 6 I was born in the MacFarlane area, and I now
 7 live in Golden Gates. And I've lived in both
 8 areas for the last 68 years, off and on.
 9 I've canvassed my neighborhood. I attended
 10 the homeowners meetings, when the group spoke
 11 and did their presentation. I was impressed by
 12 the idea of having a hotel and retail spaces so
 13 close to where I live. When the renewal came
 14 in, we lost a lot of little mom and pop stores
 15 that we had in the neighborhood. We lost a lot
 16 of jobs that we had in the neighborhood.
 17 Something like this will give us, in close
 18 proximity to where we live, retail space and a
 19 hotel, which will provide for the economic
 20 development of the community. I'm looking
 21 forward to that.
 22 I canvassed my neighborhood, and I got a
 23 list got a list of people who signed -- I have
 24 16 plus names, and I had to discuss with
 25 them -- even though some of them were present

1 at the meeting, they weren't quite as familiar
 2 as I was with the project. So, yes, we have a
 3 few people who don't think it's good for the
 4 neighborhood, but the majority of us support
 5 the project, and we're looking forward to that
 6 project coming into the community.
 7 I came here before you this evening,
 8 because I support it, and I also encourage my
 9 neighbors to support it, and I hope that you
 10 will allow them to develop that piece of
 11 property. At one time, I know people who lived
 12 on that property. So it was a residential
 13 area.
 14 Having cars parked there doesn't do much
 15 for the economic development. Having a
 16 building there, with retail shops, hotel and
 17 additional housing in the neighborhood, would
 18 encourage growth.
 19 We were looking and discussing how
 20 buildings in the Gables could only be five
 21 stories high, when I was a little kid, and now
 22 we have New York style buildings. Well, that
 23 has to do with change, and I understand it and
 24 I accept it. As long as it doesn't block my
 25 breeze from the ocean on the southeast side, I

1 can deal with it. This is on the north side of
 2 where I live.
 3 Thank you.
 4 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.
 5 THE SECRETARY: Robert Rovira.
 6 MR. ROVIRA: Good evening. My name is
 7 Roberto Rovira. I'm a resident of Coral
 8 Gables. I live in 1107 Lisbon Street, and I've
 9 been a resident for almost eleven years here.
 10 Today I come before you as the Chair of the
 11 Design Advisory Committee for the Underline
 12 project, and we submitted some comments
 13 regarding the proposal, and I wanted to go
 14 through a few of the salient points there, but
 15 not before really thanking NPI, because they've
 16 been a supporter of the Underline from the very
 17 beginning and open to discussions. We've had
 18 an opportunity to meet several times, and I
 19 think that the project has evolved in a very --
 20 great direction, as far as the goals and the
 21 mission and vision of the Underline are
 22 concerned.
 23 So our Committee is comprised of landscape
 24 architects, architects, planners, and it has a
 25 great representation of academics and

1 practitioners. We've had a chance to go
 2 through the plans, and we have -- in the
 3 package that we submitted, we have basically
 4 eleven design criteria, and I won't go through
 5 all of them, but they range from whether the
 6 project enhances the natural context, whether
 7 it promotes connectivity, how well does it
 8 promote health and well-being, et cetera.
 9 So the Committee went through our criteria
 10 and assessed these things. And I'd like to go
 11 to -- if you have the packet, it would be on
 12 the second page, but I can go through these
 13 specific issues. Overall, we feel that the
 14 project is consistent with the goals and the
 15 vision of the Underline. Where we find areas
 16 where the project can have some improvements is
 17 in one of the eleven criteria, in terms of the
 18 way that it promotes connectivity and public
 19 access. These are things that in informal
 20 conversations with NPI, they feel that they can
 21 accomplish very well, so I'm really happy about
 22 that.
 23 So the first thing, in today's
 24 presentation, the surface parking seems to have
 25 diminished and we felt that if there is a

1 significant amount of surface parking, not only
 2 would that interrupt the flow of the Underline,
 3 but issues of stormwater management and just
 4 the visual impact of an uninterrupted parking
 5 surface, we wanted to make sure that that was
 6 understood as an area that could be improved,
 7 and I'm happy to see that it's moving in that
 8 direction.

9 The other aspect is the distance and the
 10 separation between the project's ground level
 11 Mixed-Use facilities and the pedestrian-way for
 12 the Underline. Here, we're thinking, in one of
 13 the plans, the pedestrian-way -- the Underline
 14 consists of two separate paths, an eight-foot
 15 pedestrian path and a ten-foot wide bicycle
 16 path. We feel that moving or placing the
 17 pedestrian path as close as possible to the
 18 Mixed-Use facilities is good for business, good
 19 for the exposure of this new project. So we
 20 wanted to make sure that that was enhanced.

21 The fact that the height, whether it's 120
 22 or 160, of the structure, and you have this
 23 thoroughfare of the vehicular access way or the
 24 drive between the Metrorail and the building,
 25 we spent some time really looking at that, and,

1 On the Staff report, which we by and large
 2 really have gone through and are consistent in
 3 our views as what's being said there, but one
 4 of the things is the inclusion of parallel
 5 parking. And one of the ideas that we think we
 6 should spend some time looking at is, there is
 7 a term called Woonerf. This is a term that's
 8 been adopted. It's kind of the equivalent of a
 9 complete street. This is a technique of
 10 creating traffic calming, low speed, often
 11 curbsless shared street space, that doesn't
 12 separate pedestrian users from cars in a
 13 strictly divisive or hierarchical way.

14 This is something that in the package,
 15 you'll see that we put some references for
 16 three, ranging from the New York Times to other
 17 resources that speak to the statistics. To
 18 date, in the U.S., about 400 cities have
 19 adopted the Woonerf inspired or complete
 20 streets approach. In the Netherlands, there's
 21 over 6,000 and it has resulted in about 40
 22 percent reduction in traffic accidents.

23 The reason for that is that when you
 24 breakdown that sort of conceptual barrier
 25 between the domain of the vehicle (sic) and

1 I guess, in the vehicular circulation and
 2 footprint of that internal drive, we feel that
 3 a lot can be done to really improve the feeling
 4 that you would be crossing the domain of the
 5 car.

6 We really want to make sure that since this
 7 park, the Underline park, is being put in west
 8 of the Metrorail, that we don't create the
 9 perception of a barrier between that park and
 10 the access to the Mixed-Use facilities and
 11 building.

12 So one of the things that we talked about
 13 and want to have the Applicant consider is,
 14 transforming that thoroughfare into a one way,
 15 possibly a southbound one way vehicle. And, by
 16 doing that, you would gain the footprint of
 17 that lane, and we feel that it's really
 18 important to then take that and hopefully put
 19 it adjacent to the Mixed-Use building, so that
 20 you're not walking on a narrow sidewalk, next
 21 to a, you know, ten-story plus building, but
 22 rather that you have a much broader, much more
 23 generous, much more shaded condition,
 24 pedestrian friendly condition, next to the
 25 building itself.

1 domain of the car, if you slow down the
 2 vehicle, so that they have to negotiate the
 3 presence of pedestrians, suddenly you have a
 4 living street. Woonerf is a Dutch term for a
 5 living yard. It's actually creating an
 6 environment that's much more democratic in the
 7 way that pedestrians interact with vehicles.

8 So we feel that, really, looking at that
 9 drive adjacent to the building, between the
 10 Metro and the building, this is an opportunity
 11 to really create an excellent paradigm for the
 12 rest of the development with the Underline.

13 We think that this project is really
 14 significant, because it really is substantial
 15 in its scale and its visibility, and for that
 16 reason, doing things that are innovative and
 17 that put the pedestrian and the cyclist, you
 18 know, as a first priority, that's really what
 19 will allow the entire Underline project to
 20 really be greater than the sum of its part. So
 21 we see this as a great example, possibly, of
 22 what could be done elsewhere.

23 The traffic conflicts with vehicular
 24 crossing and curbcuts across the Underline,
 25 this is really a very important design aspect

1 that we want to look at, because the beauty of
2 the Underline, potentially, is that you have
3 this continuous, safe route for pedestrians and
4 cyclists, that give people the motivation to
5 use it all of the time. It's a public space
6 that will be open day and night.

7 So at any moment that you have a
8 perpendicular crossing or a curbcut on that
9 Underline, on that flow, really is problematic.
10 So anything that can be done to minimize or
11 entirely remove those cuts should be looked at
12 very closely.

13 Finally, and we understand this is a
14 massive project, which has very practical needs
15 of loading and just the in and out of that, so
16 we wanted to make sure that as part of this
17 process, that we look at ways to visually and
18 acoustically screen those loading zones, so
19 that it doesn't detract from the experience of
20 this great new green space that we're about to
21 create.

22 I think that goes through -- the
23 majority of the remainder of the comments are
24 all considered to be consistent with our goals
25 and our vision, and, anyway, we're really

1 excited about the possibility of getting this
2 done and done in a very innovative and positive
3 way. So thank you for the opportunity.

4 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.

5 THE SECRETARY: No more speakers.

6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No more speakers, okay.

7 Mr. Bass, anything to rebutt?

8 MR. BASS: We have a few comments that we'd
9 like to rebutt. I'm going to ask my co-counsel
10 and Mr. Hernandez to do so, since they relate
11 to the parking.

12 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Good evening, Mr. Chair,
13 Members of the Board, Mario Garcia-Serra, with
14 offices at 600 Brickell Avenue, as Jeff
15 mentioned, co-counsel with him for the Land Use
16 and Zoning representation of this project.

17 The issues that Mr. Richter brought up, in
18 particular, I've been working with both, the
19 client and the business owners in the area
20 along Ponce on them, and the ones that he
21 mentioned were traffic and parking.

22 On traffic, I think it's very telling that
23 in the last eight years we've had two different
24 projects proposed for this property. One was,
25 what can be done as-of-right, essentially,

1 commercially, which was the previous Gables
2 Station project Mr. Berkowitz was referring to,
3 and now we have this new Gables Station 2.0
4 version, which is a Mixed-Use project.

5 And as has been mentioned already, the
6 traffic generated by the Mixed-Use version of
7 the project is 50 percent less than what was
8 generated by the commercial, retail proposal
9 that was previously approved.

10 And so where do we see the benefits of
11 that? We see the benefits of that in the fact
12 that there is a traffic signal that was
13 previously going to be required for the
14 entrance from Ponce, which is no longer there.
15 That means less -- no loss of any onstreet
16 parking along Ponce de Leon Boulevard, which
17 then takes us to the second issue of parking.

18 And it's very important, I think, to
19 clarify what the exhibit on the Site Plan is
20 dealing with, with regards -- or showing with
21 regards to parking in that area.

22 Number One, onstreet parking is going to
23 remain as it is right now, generally, both, in
24 number and in location. Number Two, parking
25 within the area of the municipal parking lots

1 that exist right now is indicated there in a
2 lighter shade of green than the rest of the
3 green that's on there. And why is that? It's
4 for two reasons. Number One, when we met with
5 Mr. Richter and some of his neighbors there,
6 the small business owners, they emphasized to
7 us the importance of keeping the parking there,
8 but actually wanted to see if in a different
9 location than what is indicated on that plan.

10 So what they want is parking that is closer
11 to where their businesses are, immediately in
12 front of their businesses. You may have
13 noticed the comments from the gentleman
14 representing the Underline. The Underline is
15 sort of looking in the other direction and
16 saying, you know what, we prefer to see as
17 little parking as possible in that area, so as
18 to maximize the green area.

19 And so what do we have? We have a
20 situation, sort of, where we're being pulled in
21 two different directions, by two different
22 interested parties. We ultimately want to
23 resolve it and try to do right by both, but
24 that's why we're showing flexibility in the
25 location of the parking and why it's shown in a

1 different shade of green there, both to
2 emphasize, we'll make it a greener area, Number
3 One, but we're also going to be relocating some
4 of that parking, but trying to satisfy all of
5 the parties involved.

6 Jorge, if you'd like to --

7 MR. HERNANDEZ: Just one last comment, and
8 I would like to show you, Dr. Richer, later,
9 the drawing. Essentially, it's not going to be
10 an asphalt parking lot with yellow stripes.
11 That's a thing of the past.

12 The reason the light green tone was placed
13 there is, we're going to be doing research to
14 look at really green eco-friendly parking, that
15 is permeable, and really it's cutting edge, so
16 it matches the thinking of the Underline, but
17 satisfies the needs of the businesses.

18 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: And on a third point,
19 we've also discussed with Mr. Richter and some
20 of his neighbors the possibility of actually
21 locating some of their employee parking in our
22 garage, so as to be able to help accommodate
23 their parking needs.

24 Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.

1 MR. BASS: Mr. Chair, just very briefly, in
2 close, I just want to pick up on one comment
3 that the Planning Director made. And the
4 Planning Director formulated his support for
5 120 feet based on the context of prior
6 approvals at that height in other portions
7 around the City in the North Industrial Area.

8 We would submit to you that every property
9 is different and our property is locationally
10 very different from those properties, due to
11 our location on US-1 and our adjacency to the
12 Underline. So 120 feet may have very well been
13 a suitable height at those other locations, but
14 we maintain, equally, that the heights that we
15 seek are suitable here.

16 Thank you again for seeing us, and, please,
17 we would urge your support to move us to
18 Commission. It's vitally important that we get
19 there. And thank you again.

20 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.

21 Mr. Bass, a quick question. You started
22 your presentation by saying, staff approves the
23 application, but I think it's clear Staff is
24 not approving it at the proposed 180 -- well,
25 160 habitable, goes up to 180 in places, so

1 whatever -- and it's like 148, 158.

2 MR. BASS: Staff has recommended approval
3 subject to conditions, and we have a difference
4 of opinion with respect to height in the Staff
5 conditions, but you're perfectly capable of
6 moving it forward pursuant to Staff's
7 recommendation at that condition.

8 As Mr. Trias said, the ultimate height
9 decision there is a policy decision that we
10 believe that the Commission is perfectly
11 capable of making, but, yes, we --

12 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I just want to make
13 sure we're on the same page.

14 MR. BASS: Yeah.

15 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: You said, Staff
16 approves it. To me, that was approval at 120,
17 but obviously the Applicant is not agreeing to
18 the 120 at this point, if that's being -- that
19 being what I read as being Staff's
20 recommendation.

21 MR. BASS: Correct. They have recommended
22 approval subject to their condition. Their
23 condition is that the height be 120.

24 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.

25 MR. COLLER: Mr. Chairman, this is kind of

1 a side issue, but an issue that Mr. Berkowitz
2 brought up with regard to the settlement of the
3 City on the transmission lines. I was trying
4 to get an indication from Craig on the nature
5 of that settlement.

6 It is far more complex than stated. I
7 don't want to go through everything that fit on
8 my iPhone screen on the explanation, but it is
9 a lot more than that. The City apparently gets
10 the benefit of any appellate decision and there
11 was a recent appellate decision, and the City
12 was in a different position, because of an
13 existing transmission line, but I didn't want
14 it to go unstated that the settlement was as
15 simple as stated. It's much more complex.

16 I'm sorry that Craig Leen is not here to
17 explain it, but it's a lot more involved than
18 what is stated. So I just wanted to advise the
19 --

20 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.

21 And as Maria just mentioned, I think I
22 remember reading there was a ruling recently
23 that --

24 MS. MENENDEZ: In favor of the cities.

25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: In favor of the

1 municipalities.
 2 MR. COLLER: Which the City gets the
 3 benefit of --
 4 MS. MENENDEZ: Right.
 5 MR. COLLER: -- in the City Attorney's opinion.
 6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.
 7 All right. I will close the public hearing
 8 and open it up for discussion and questions
 9 from the Board.
 10 MS. MENENDEZ: I have questions.
 11 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Maria.
 12 MS. MENENDEZ: Ramon, can I ask you a few
 13 questions?
 14 How high is the building across, on the
 15 other side of Ponce?
 16 MR. TRIAS: Gables Ponce?
 17 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.
 18 MR. TRIAS: That's 100 feet -- 99 feet to
 19 the top of the habitable --
 20 MS. MENENDEZ: 99 feet?
 21 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. Yeah.
 22 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: To the top?
 23 MR. TRIAS: To the --
 24 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think it's 77
 25 habitable, isn't it?

1 MR. TRIAS: Habitable is 99 feet.
 2 MS. MENENDEZ: Habitable is 99 feet, plus
 3 how much?
 4 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, plus -- I think it's a
 5 maximum of 25. I'm not a hundred percent sure
 6 of the --
 7 MS. MENENDEZ: Can we find out, because --
 8 MR. TRIAS: Sure. We can find out at some
 9 point.
 10 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, that's an
 11 important concept for me tonight.
 12 MS. MENENDEZ: Yeah, we'd like to know --
 13 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, but what's allowed is 25
 14 feet extra.
 15 MS. MENENDEZ: I'm sorry?
 16 MR. TRIAS: 25 feet additional is allowed.
 17 MS. MENENDEZ: Right. The question is, is
 18 it 99? So you're sure. If you're sure, that's
 19 great, but if you're not, I'd like to get an
 20 answer, if possible, of course.
 21 Did you want to say something, Mario?
 22 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Yeah. Having
 23 represented those projects, Gables Ponce 1 and
 24 2, I can tell you that it's 100 feet of
 25 habitable height, at its maximum point.

1 MS. MENENDEZ: A hundred feet?
 2 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: There is a corner of the
 3 property that is at 77 feet, sort of where the
 4 pool deck area is, but the maximum height of
 5 Gables 1 and 2, habitable, is 100 feet.
 6 MS. MENENDEZ: And then another 25, you're
 7 saying?
 8 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: 15. I'm pretty sure
 9 it's 15.
 10 MS. MENENDEZ: Another 15? So it's 115?
 11 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Architectural features.
 12 MS. MENENDEZ: Thank you.
 13 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.
 14 MS. MENENDEZ: I don't know if I could see
 15 the aerials that showed the linear park and the
 16 buildings.
 17 MR. HERNANDEZ: The perspectives?
 18 MS. MENENDEZ: The one that you had that
 19 you brought together.
 20 My question really is regarding the green
 21 space -- the percentage of green space, are we
 22 counting, I would imagine, the linear part as a
 23 green space, and I'm having a problem, and I
 24 know we had a discussion about this in the
 25 other project that was north of this site, all

1 of this hardscape that's going down as
 2 sidewalks, what material is that? Is that like
 3 a green friendly material, similar to what you
 4 have projected for the parking area?
 5 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah.
 6 MS. MENENDEZ: Because that's a lot of
 7 hardscape, if it's hardscape.
 8 MR. HERNANDEZ: Is it this aerial?
 9 MS. MENENDEZ: No. Actually, it was one
 10 you had that was together. It was an aerial,
 11 not a picture.
 12 MR. HERNANDEZ: It wasn't any of these?
 13 They were plans.
 14 MS. MENENDEZ: Yeah, it was --
 15 MR. HERNANDEZ: This one?
 16 MS. MENENDEZ: Well, it was one that had an
 17 aerial and you had it connected and you had it
 18 nicely shown --
 19 MR. HERNANDEZ: Oh, the two large boards.
 20 MS. MENENDEZ: Yeah.
 21 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.
 22 MS. MENENDEZ: Because that shows the
 23 proposed park.
 24 So my question is, you talked about the
 25 percentage. I guess this question is for the

1 architect. You talked about the percentages of
 2 green area, but are we really focused on the
 3 park itself, because I don't see a lot of green
 4 on the site itself?
 5 MR. HERNANDEZ: So the percentages I gave
 6 were for public open space, and I'll round up
 7 or down, there is 87,000 square feet, which is
 8 two acres, of public open space on this site.
 9 MS. MENENDEZ: On the site, not
 10 including --
 11 MR. HERNANDEZ: No, just on our site.
 12 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.
 13 MR. HERNANDEZ: So it's a 4.45 acre site,
 14 and two acres of it is public open space. Some
 15 of that open space is planted with plant
 16 material and some of it has hardscape. We are
 17 going to go for LEED Silver, so we are
 18 completely into researching and looking at
 19 permeable green pavement, but that gives -- I
 20 hope that answers the question.
 21 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes, it does. Thank you.
 22 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you.
 23 MS. MENENDEZ: I'd like to see the ingress
 24 and egress of the site and an explanation of
 25 how you get into the parking garages.

1 MR. HERNANDEZ: I'm sorry to keep coming up
 2 with the same board, but --
 3 MR. COLLER: Could you use the mobile mike
 4 when you speak?
 5 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, I apologize.
 6 Okay. Thank you.
 7 MS. MENENDEZ: So I see the dedicated lane
 8 towards the north of the building.
 9 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.
 10 MS. MENENDEZ: How do you get into that
 11 dedicated lane?
 12 MR. HERNANDEZ: So if you're traveling
 13 southbound on US-1, then this is the dedicated
 14 deceleration lane here.
 15 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.
 16 MR. HERNANDEZ: I'll give the straight --
 17 there you go. Sorry.
 18 That's the deceleration lane there.
 19 There's an entry here, and you'll enter here.
 20 This is the primary ramp. There is a parking
 21 structure under each of these two buildings,
 22 with an efficiency, because you only need to
 23 provide one ramp for the entire plate.
 24 MS. MENENDEZ: So that's the only ramp?
 25 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, this is the only ramp

1 for the entire parking structure, which bridges
 2 across these two buildings.
 3 MS. MENENDEZ: Under? You're saying it
 4 goes --
 5 MR. HERNANDEZ: Up.
 6 MS. MENENDEZ: It goes up?
 7 MR. HERNANDEZ: It goes up. There's no
 8 below grade parking.
 9 MS. MENENDEZ: Oh, okay. All right. I
 10 misunderstood.
 11 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, there's no below grade
 12 parking.
 13 Then, just to answer the other question of
 14 which are the other ways to get into that
 15 space, one can take a right and go around the
 16 oval -- the Ponce oval, with the fountain, come
 17 into Gables Station Drive, and take a left into
 18 that same entry point. Or one can bypass the
 19 site and take a right onto Gables Station
 20 Drive, and take a right into that ramp. Or one
 21 can use Ponce to come and cut through the park.
 22 This is a pre-approved -- Dade County
 23 pre-approved cut through the park, that we have
 24 the approvals standing from the previously
 25 approved project that Mr. Berkowitz referred

1 to.
 2 MS. MENENDEZ: But is that important,
 3 because that's what I was getting at? Is that
 4 particular one important to get to site, if you
 5 have all of the other opportunities?
 6 MR. HERNANDEZ: For a person who loves to
 7 color their drawings green, I would say, no,
 8 but the traffic engineering that Plummer's
 9 office did is saying it's vitally important to
 10 have many ways for the cars to disperse.
 11 MS. MENENDEZ: But you have a couple of
 12 ways --
 13 MR. HERNANDEZ: And they're here. They're
 14 here. So maybe -- that's beyond my expertise,
 15 certainly beyond my pay scale.
 16 MS. MENENDEZ: Well, if they'd like to come
 17 up --
 18 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.
 19 MS. MENENDEZ: My concern about that
 20 particular cut is, Ponce, in the peak hours, is
 21 really tough to get through and you have an
 22 over 900 parking garage -- or 900 space parking
 23 garage, and to introduce people to go on Ponce
 24 to enter the site --
 25 MR. BASS: I would say, if you would like

1 to make that a condition of this Board, that we
 2 close that, we would certainly look at it that
 3 way, as a condition.
 4 MS. MENENDEZ: Well, would it work, I guess
 5 is the question to the engineers?
 6 MR. PEREZ: They don't know yet, because
 7 the traffic report is still being reviewed.
 8 MS. MENENDEZ: No, there is one here.
 9 There is one inside here.
 10 MR. PEREZ: But it says here that it's
 11 still being reviewed by Staff.
 12 MS. MENENDEZ: Oh, Staff, okay.
 13 MR. PEREZ: So I don't know. I mean, to
 14 close that off, what recommendation, I'm not
 15 sure --
 16 MS. MENENDEZ: Right. I mean, I don't know
 17 if you want to contribute anything to what's
 18 been said, but my concern, though, is: A lot
 19 of people are going to take that entrance and
 20 exit, because a lot will be coming through that
 21 Ponce area, and there's going to be quite a jam
 22 in that area.
 23 Come on up.
 24 MR. ESPINOSA: Juan Espinosa, with David
 25 Plummer and Associates, 1750 Ponce de Leon.

1 We expect the majority of the traffic --
 2 MR. COLLER: Could you slow down, because
 3 they can't get you at that speed?
 4 MR. ESPINOSA: I'm sorry. We expect the
 5 majority of the traffic to come through US-1.
 6 MS. MENENDEZ: US-1 from east to west?
 7 MR. ESPINOSA: Yeah, this being
 8 residential. I mean, now we're talking about a
 9 mostly residential development. So the plan
 10 before was mostly commercial. So a lot of the
 11 traffic, we expected it coming from Ponce. Now
 12 we expect a lot of traffic, people coming, in
 13 the afternoon, from Downtown, people working in
 14 Downtown, coming on US-1, making the right
 15 turn, and then exiting to go back to Downtown.
 16 That's the majority.
 17 MS. MENENDEZ: How are they going to exit
 18 to go back? How is it going to be in the
 19 morning, I guess?
 20 MR. HERNANDEZ: I'll hold it for you.
 21 MR. COLLER: Do you want to pick up the
 22 other mike? It might be easier for you.
 23 MR. ESPINOSA: They can use -- they can
 24 exit here and make a right, to the second here,
 25 and make a right here, and then a left out into

1 US-1.
 2 So, I mean, we like this entrance here to
 3 distribute traffic, but it's not necessary.
 4 MS. MENENDEZ: It's not necessary?
 5 MR. ESPINOSA: No.
 6 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. Thank you.
 7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can I interject?
 8 MS. MENENDEZ: Sure.
 9 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I mean, I think having
 10 that access into Ponce -- don't go anywhere,
 11 sorry -- that's good, to disperse it. If I'm
 12 coming northbound on US-1, how can I get into
 13 that property?
 14 MR. ESPINOSA: You have two options. You
 15 can make a left here, go around the circle, and
 16 then make a right here. Or if you come through
 17 Le Jeune, you can come here. There's an
 18 entrance here. So you can come from Grand
 19 Avenue, if you're going from the Grove, and
 20 then make a right in and into the parking
 21 garage.
 22 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So if you're coming
 23 from the south, you have to know to either go
 24 north on Le Jeune or you've got to go through
 25 the roundabout on Ponce at Merrick?

1 MR. ESPINOSA: Yeah. I mean, the only
 2 movement that doesn't require you coming down
 3 on Le Jeune, because you don't have access,
 4 then you will have to take Ponce. A quick
 5 right and a quick right in here.
 6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. So I'm
 7 struggling with the traffic flow, because I'm
 8 in that area constantly, and I see both, in the
 9 morning and in the p.m., how the traffic piles
 10 up at the circle. I mean, it's without fail,
 11 traffic is backing up sometimes into the
 12 circle, but if not into the circle, awfully
 13 close to it, and that's morning and afternoon.
 14 So I have difficulty seeing how, if
 15 somebody wanted to leave the project, go
 16 northerly to Ponce, take a right onto Ponce and
 17 then trying to get onto US-1 and go north, it's
 18 going to be a very difficult process.
 19 Correct.
 20 MR. ESPINOSA: This right here?
 21 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah. It can be a very
 22 difficult process to do that.
 23 Likewise, that five-point intersection at
 24 Grand, Blue, Le Jeune, Ponce is difficult as it
 25 sits today. And while it may not impact this

1 project, whether it's a combination of the City
2 or FDOT, they've done a great job of kind of
3 boxing people in, because if you're on Le
4 Jeune, you can't go left to go south on US-1,
5 you can't go left to go south on Ponce, you
6 can't go left to go westbound on Blue, so it
7 creates for some people doing some circuitous
8 movements in order to get in the direction they
9 want to go.

10 I'm also curious to see -- I didn't see it
11 in the plans, and I think the confusion
12 continues, on Grand Avenue, as you approach
13 US-1, heading eastbound towards the Grove,
14 there used to be a left turn only lane and then
15 a through lane.

16 Through time and through lack of attention
17 or maintenance, the left turn arrow has
18 disappeared, and I was very surprised to see,
19 in these plans, that that left turn lane is
20 shown as a left turn and a through lane. Now,
21 it may have been changed. I don't think it
22 was, because if you sit in the through lane,
23 which is the right-hand lane, heading
24 eastbound, it's clear how it lines up in front
25 of the elementary school.

1 So I think I have -- it looks like, if you
2 come out of the project onto Grand, you're
3 supposedly, although I think your island could
4 be very defined, it looks like the intent is to
5 make the turning movement going west on Grand?

6 MR. ESPINOSA: Yeah, it will be a right
7 turn out.

8 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right turn only?

9 MR. ESPINOSA: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. We know how that
11 rarely works well, but I think there's going to
12 be a lot of issues on Grand -- there's issues
13 today -- and be extremely exacerbated with some
14 of the traffic.

15 And I understand, obviously, the traffic
16 generation may be reduced by this as to what
17 could go as a matter of right, which is always
18 nice, but I think we need to look harder at --
19 and I don't know what else could be done, but I
20 think we need to look harder at what else could
21 be done in order to alleviate some of the
22 traffic on the north, the west, and the south
23 side.

24 Can you come out of the project onto US-1
25 and go southbound?

1 MR. ESPINOSA: Can you, what?

2 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you come out of the
3 project and go southbound on US-1?

4 MR. ESPINOSA: Yes.

5 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.

6 MR. ESPINOSA: Absolutely.

7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right.

8 MS. MENENDEZ: Why don't you consider, on
9 Ponce and US-1, to create a more -- you know,
10 encroaching a little onto the site and create a
11 right-hand only through and then a turn, so you
12 don't have that conflict that Jeff just
13 described? Is that proposed? I didn't see it.

14 MR. ESPINOSA: No. I just want to see
15 what's the existing conditions in there.

16 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is anybody from the
17 City here, do we know who is responsible for
18 maintaining --

19 MR. ESPINOSA: That one has already double
20 right turn lanes.

21 MS. MENENDEZ: You have two double right
22 turn lanes proposed?

23 MR. ESPINOSA: No, it's already in there.

24 MS. MENENDEZ: That's there already?

25 MR. ESPINOSA: Uh-huh.

1 MS. MENENDEZ: Really?

2 MR. ESPINOSA: Yeah.

3 MS. MENENDEZ: I don't remember two double
4 -- I know that there's one and then there's one
5 that's a combination.

6 MR. ESPINOSA: There's a combination --
7 left -- there's exclusive left, left through
8 and two rights.

9 MS. MENENDEZ: Really?

10 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Ponce and US-1?

11 MS. MENENDEZ: Yeah.

12 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah.

13 MS. MENENDEZ: There's two rights?

14 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Two rights. You've got
15 a left --

16 MS. MENENDEZ: Two rights?

17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes.

18 MS. MENENDEZ: One through?

19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: One left and through
20 and then one left only.

21 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. All right.

22 MS. MENENDEZ: So there's four

23 opportunities at that --

24 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: There are, but you get
25 a bottleneck up at the circle, because three of

1 those lanes --

2 MS. MENENDEZ: There's a bottleneck

3 somewhere, yeah -- they have to merge in --

4 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: One lane, the left lane

5 going through the circle, opens to three lanes.

6 MS. MENENDEZ: Got it. Okay.

7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And because of that,

8 you get a bottleneck created right there.

9 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.

10 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do we know who

11 maintains Grand Avenue at US-1?

12 MS. MENENDEZ: Grand Avenue at US-1?

13 That's City. City.

14 MR. TRIAS: The US-1 right-of-way is

15 maintained by DOT and Grand Avenue is by the

16 County.

17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Grand is by the County?

18 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. And then Ponce de Leon

19 is a City street.

20 MS. MENENDEZ: But the City maintains US-1.

21 I don't know if it's paid or not, but because

22 of the landscaping, they took over --

23 MR. TRIAS: The landscape, yes.

24 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.

25 MR. TRIAS: The traffic is a different

1 story.

2 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.

3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thanks.

4 You're good?

5 MS. MENENDEZ: Yeah.

6 MR. PEREZ: I have a few questions.

7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.

8 MR. PEREZ: So to address the parking

9 concerns of some of the --

10 MR. WU: Please speak into the mike.

11 MR. PEREZ: Oh, I'm sorry.

12 To address some of the concerns of the

13 parking issues addressed by the commercial

14 neighbors a little while ago, out of the 969

15 spaces that are projected to be on-site, I

16 understand I heard earlier that some of those

17 spaces will be earmarked for these neighbors.

18 Do we have an idea how many of those spaces

19 will be for the neighbors, and if so or out of

20 those, how many spaces are going to be

21 managed -- are they reserved? Are you guys

22 going to charge these guys for spaces? How is

23 that going to be addressed?

24 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: In the conversations

25 that we've had with the neighbors, it seems

1 like their need for employee parking is

2 somewhere around 20 spaces. So the idea would

3 be to try to find a way to program those 20

4 spaces within our parking garage.

5 We haven't made any sort of formal

6 agreement or commitment yet, but that's what's

7 been discussed.

8 MR. PEREZ: And those are solely for like

9 kind of the storefront or commercial buildings

10 along Ponce --

11 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Correct.

12 MR. PEREZ: -- that aren't part of Gables

13 Residential?

14 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Correct.

15 MR. PEREZ: Okay. And are those going to

16 be reserved specifically for these? Are they

17 going to be free of charge? Are they going to

18 be paid per month? I just want a better

19 understanding, to make sure that their concerns

20 are being addressed.

21 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: We haven't gotten to the

22 details yet, as far as hours of operation,

23 because there could be times -- if it's going

24 to be employee parking, in the evenings, for

25 example, it might not be used and we would want

1 to utilize them as part of the overall parking

2 pool, but the idea is to try to make them work

3 for the businessowners, both from a functional

4 perspective, as to how often and for how long

5 they can be using them, and also at no charge

6 or minimum charge.

7 MR. PEREZ: And then the off-site

8 improvements, as it relates to the park, et

9 cetera, which I think is very nice, what's the

10 time frame, as far as phasing of the entire

11 project? Is this work going to be done in

12 tandem with the vertical construction of the

13 project? Is it front-ended? I mean, just walk

14 me through that.

15 MR. HERNANDEZ: It's parallel. It's

16 parallel with the construction.

17 MR. PEREZ: Okay.

18 MR. HERNANDEZ: And, obviously, the time

19 sensitivity is to coordinate with the Underline

20 and with the other municipalities.

21 MR. PEREZ: Okay. And who ultimately

22 maintains those parks?

23 MR. HERNANDEZ: They will not -- the park

24 and the Underline will not be maintained by

25 NPI.

1 MR. PEREZ: Will not?
 2 MR. HERNANDEZ: It will be paid for, but
 3 not maintained by NPI.
 4 MR. PEREZ: Okay.
 5 MS. MENENDEZ: Who will maintain it?
 6 MR. HERNANDEZ: Well, the Underline has its
 7 own maintenance program, and the park, which is
 8 given over to the City, will be maintained by
 9 the City or the County. They are not being
 10 maintained by NPI.
 11 MR. PEREZ: So the County or the City
 12 maintains the parks?
 13 MR. HERNANDEZ: It's currently County
 14 lands, with a lease to the City. So it's a
 15 tough coordination project, because it
 16 coordinates the Underline, which is County and
 17 is a non-profit City leased parcels, and then
 18 the County.
 19 MR. BASS: Just briefly. We're going to
 20 have to negotiate a multi-agency agreement on
 21 that, and maintenance, obviously, will be
 22 included in that.
 23 MR. PEREZ: All right. So then the
 24 off-site improvement bond that's being
 25 recommended by the Staff, that bond ultimately

1 is put up with the County, not the City, right?
 2 MR. TRIAS: The attorney explained that
 3 we're still negotiating this issue. What I can
 4 say to you is this, I met with the County
 5 Officials that are working on the Underline,
 6 and they have an Advisory Committee, Professor
 7 Rovira is here, and the issue is that many of
 8 these things, from my perspective, are not
 9 worked out yet in that level of detail. It's
 10 still a conversation. And we have to make --
 11 or you could make the recommendations that you
 12 think are best.
 13 The assumption here is that prior to the
 14 CO, the Applicant will pay and make happen the
 15 construction of the landscape on the Underline.
 16 That is the contribution that they're
 17 committing to.
 18 The future maintenance, the future
 19 management of the Underline, that will be done
 20 by probably some County agency, and I say that,
 21 because the right-of-way is currently managed
 22 by the County, by the Transportation Department
 23 of the County.
 24 But that has not been resolved. I also
 25 have to make that clear. From what I know

1 about the project, those issues are not
 2 resolved yet.
 3 MR. PEREZ: So just for clarity, by the
 4 time this goes to Commission, are those items
 5 going to be resolved or ultimately that's going
 6 to be addressed when the restrictive covenant
 7 is entered into?
 8 MR. TRIAS: I think it will take longer
 9 than the approval at the Commission or the
 10 consideration of the Commission. I think.
 11 MR. PEREZ: Okay.
 12 All right. And then my last question, now
 13 that I have you up here, so just to make sure
 14 that I'm reading your recommendation correctly,
 15 what you're recommending is a maximum height
 16 of -- or what Staff is recommending is a
 17 maximum height of 120 for the entire project?
 18 MR. TRIAS: For the habitable height, the
 19 maximum area at the very top of the top floor,
 20 not for the decorative elements. And the
 21 reason for that is that, in the past, that has
 22 been the policy direction that we have received
 23 from that area, by you and the City Commission.
 24 120 was, as the attorney explained, appropriate
 25 for neighboring areas.

1 Now, every project is different, and I
 2 agree with them, that you should look at it in
 3 detail in some merits, and the request that
 4 they're making is different. So we recommend
 5 approval, true, with conditions, and one of
 6 them is a major policy discussion, which is the
 7 maximum height.
 8 If you want to have that discussion, that
 9 would be appropriate, and, at this point, like
 10 I said, you know, Staff is comfortable with
 11 continuing the current policy direction. And
 12 if you want to propose something different,
 13 this is certainly the opportunity to do that.
 14 MR. PEREZ: So, I mean, the last two
 15 projects of this intensity that were brought
 16 before us, that I could remember, was
 17 Mediterranean Village and Paseo.
 18 Can you remind me what the height approved
 19 at Mediterranean Village was?
 20 MR. TRIAS: Mediterranean Village was a
 21 High-Rise Land Use and that allowed 189 feet
 22 for most of the buildings. Now, the hotel was
 23 allowed to have additional height. I believe
 24 it was 208 feet.
 25 MR. PEREZ: 208 or 280?

1 MR. TRIAS: 208. Was that the right -- do
 2 you remember? 18?
 3 I'm sorry, 218.
 4 And I'm sorry I don't have all of this
 5 memorized at that level of detail, but it's
 6 218.
 7 MR. PEREZ: No, I'm sorry I asked you --
 8 MR. TRIAS: But the main issue is this, in
 9 terms of concept, in the City you can do up to
 10 190 feet, more or less; 190 feet with a
 11 High-Rise Land Use. That's what I would use as
 12 a benchmark, in terms of thinking of the
 13 tallest buildings that you can do.
 14 So what they're requesting is less. I
 15 mean, they're requesting 160 as the tallest
 16 building. So if it was a request for a
 17 High-Rise Land Use, that request, High-Rise,
 18 would allow more than the 160 that they're
 19 proposing.
 20 So that's the context of the discussion,
 21 and that's the upper range, and then the range
 22 that has been approved recently is 120.
 23 The Paseo -- probably Professor Hernandez
 24 may remember exactly the heights that were
 25 finally approved.

1 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah. By the usage of the
 2 PAD, as you might remember, there was a very
 3 active dialog with the Commission, and they
 4 relaxed certain setbacks, but -- to allow us to
 5 arrive at a max height of 126 for the hotel.
 6 MR. TRIAS: And the other buildings?
 7 MR. HERNANDEZ: The apartment building was
 8 110, 112. I can't remember.
 9 MR. TRIAS: I think it was 112.
 10 MR. HERNANDEZ: 112.
 11 MR. TRIAS: It was 112. So we're talking
 12 about 112, 120 is reasonably within the recent
 13 discussion.
 14 MS. MENENDEZ: But let me ask you
 15 something, Ramon. In your Staff Report, you
 16 have here, on Page 7, currently permitted is 99
 17 feet --
 18 MR. TRIAS: Right.
 19 MS. MENENDEZ: -- with Med bonuses.
 20 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 21 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. So where did this 120
 22 come into effect?
 23 MR. TRIAS: That 120 is for the -- there
 24 are two Mixed-Use Districts, okay. If you'll
 25 remember, we originally proposed the 120 for

1 both Mixed-Use Districts, and you decided to
 2 recommend it only for one of them, which is the
 3 one that is right next to this other Mixed-Use
 4 District.
 5 So what happened is that in that Mixed-Use
 6 District, you can do 120 and 10 stories. The
 7 South and the North is the name of the two
 8 districts.
 9 So the North District, the actual -- the
 10 change was to allow 120.
 11 MS. MENENDEZ: And the South was to remain
 12 at 99? Is that it?
 13 MR. TRIAS: Yes. That was your
 14 recommendation and the Commission agreed with
 15 that.
 16 MS. MENENDEZ: And so -- okay. So this
 17 says 99, and I'm trying to figure out, your 120
 18 is --
 19 MR. TRIAS: As I said, in the district that
 20 is right adjacent to this one, it's 120. I'm
 21 speaking, in general terms, in the area.
 22 Currently, 120 is not allowed in this parcel,
 23 okay. It's allowed in the parcel immediately
 24 north of this district.
 25 MS. MENENDEZ: And this is because of the

1 proximity, perhaps, to residential across or
 2 what is the reasoning behind this area being
 3 lower than the other area? Remind me.
 4 MR. TRIAS: That was a policy choice that
 5 you made, and Staff had recommended changing it
 6 to 120 on both districts, to be consistent, and
 7 I think that the issue was that there were no
 8 projects being proposed for the South District,
 9 so there was no real request at the time. The
 10 request had to do with projects on the North
 11 District.
 12 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.
 13 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: To go back to touch on
 14 Albert's question about the Underline, in the
 15 Staff Report and the presentation tonight, it
 16 mentioned doing the Underline prior to the
 17 issuance of the first building permit.
 18 MR. TRIAS: Right. And that's one of the
 19 key conditions that we need to think about, in
 20 the context that the Underline is an idea, an
 21 idea that still doesn't have a very clear
 22 implementation path, as we have described. So
 23 the timing and the conditions have to be done
 24 in such a way that it's realistic.
 25 I think the intent, everybody's intent, is

1 to get this done, and we still need to figure
 2 it out. So we're trying to do it as fast as we
 3 can.
 4 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So whether it's prior
 5 to building permit or concurrent with the
 6 construction or, I've also seen prior to final
 7 CO, that's all influx?
 8 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. Those are key components
 9 of the recommendation, in terms of timing. And
 10 I think that there are three basic -- at least
 11 there's the TCO and the CO, generally those are
 12 the benchmarks that we use.
 13 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.
 14 MR. TRIAS: And the final CO, what happens
 15 is that, that may take a long time. A project
 16 may be built in phases, it may be -- so those
 17 are issues that are important, to have a very
 18 clear idea of what the policy is.
 19 MS. MENENDEZ: Can you -- I'm sorry --
 20 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Albert, did you have
 21 more?
 22 MR. PEREZ: I just have one question, which
 23 relates to traffic. What's the width -- I
 24 mean, that private road that's being proposed,
 25 what's the width of that?

1 back into it.
 2 MR. TRIAS: And having said that, what
 3 Professor Rovira mentioned, in terms of the
 4 design of that road and making it one lane and
 5 so on, is also being discussed. However, if
 6 that were to happens, we need to accommodate
 7 the turning radius of those other trucks.
 8 MR. HERNANDEZ: Of the trucks, yes.
 9 MR. PEREZ: Okay.
 10 MS. MENENDEZ: The dedicated lane, is that
 11 going to be given to the City or is that an
 12 internal road? I mean, I would imagine it will
 13 become part of the right-of-way or an easement.
 14 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: It's actually already
 15 part of the right-of-way. What we refer to as
 16 Gables Station Drive, that road that goes the
 17 entire length of the site, is actually going to
 18 be an easement over County right-of-way, where
 19 the Metrorail right-of-way is.
 20 MS. MENENDEZ: No, I'm referring to the one
 21 on South Dixie Highway, the dedicated lane --
 22 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Okay. Yeah, that's also
 23 going to be dedicated FDOT, the deceleration
 24 lane.
 25 MS. MENENDEZ: Right. Will that be part of

1 MR. TRIAS: It's a two-lane street. I
 2 don't remember the dimension exactly.
 3 MR. HERNANDEZ: It's 23 feet.
 4 MR. PEREZ: So you're proposing loading,
 5 obviously, from a turning radius, with delivery
 6 trucks and --
 7 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes. We've checked that
 8 out with Tim Plummer's Office --
 9 MR. PEREZ: And that's fine?
 10 MR. HERNANDEZ: And it works.
 11 MR. PEREZ: Okay.
 12 MR. HERNANDEZ: Because there are two sizes
 13 of trucks, and two of the three commercial
 14 spaces are envisioned as having the 50-foot
 15 trucks. One of them has a deeper truck. Those
 16 are the ones that are angled.
 17 MR. PEREZ: Even with a two -- it's two
 18 lanes, right, each way?
 19 MR. HERNANDEZ: It's a two-lane.
 20 MR. PEREZ: And even with two lanes, it
 21 still passes radius?
 22 MR. HERNANDEZ: It's backing up into the
 23 space.
 24 MR. PEREZ: Okay.
 25 MR. HERNANDEZ: They bypass the space and

1 the right-of-way at US-1 or is that --
 2 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Yes.
 3 MS. MENENDEZ: That's going to be turned
 4 over to the State or the City or whoever it --
 5 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Correct, FDOT, yeah.
 6 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.
 7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Maria, do you have
 8 more?
 9 All right. Marshall?
 10 MR. BELLIN: Yeah.
 11 I just want to make sure that you comply
 12 with the eight percent commercial space on the
 13 ground. I couldn't figure it, because, you
 14 know, I don't know how the retail space is
 15 broken up.
 16 I took a look at how you determined the
 17 parking, and why didn't you take advantage of
 18 the Mixed-Use parking matrix? It seems to me
 19 like there's a lot more parking provided in
 20 this building than you really need. I mean,
 21 you just went through and assigned the --
 22 MR. HERNANDEZ: We did two separate means.
 23 If there's a third way, we'd be happy to hear
 24 it, but one is the one that you approved
 25 recently, the one for one bedroom -- is this

1 on? Can you hear me -- and the other one is a
2 shared parking study, an independent
3 third-party shared parking study, and they both
4 convened at that point.

5 MR. BELLIN: But it doesn't --

6 MR. WU: Well, what I suggest is, because
7 the peak usage of these uses, the primary uses
8 are at the same time, the hotel peak uses,
9 where cars are in the garage, are at the same
10 peak time uses where the residents' cars are in
11 the garage, so there's not that much of a
12 discount for this Mixed-Use, per se, as opposed
13 to an office use, with a residential component.

14 MR. BELLIN: I'm not so sure about that.
15 You have retail and you have residential. And
16 the retail operates at different times than the
17 people who live in the building. They go to
18 work.

19 MR. WU: I understand that, and I think
20 they have taken that into consideration, the
21 first method of analysis.

22 MR. TRIAS: Now, what I would say is that
23 we still have not finished the review of the
24 parking. The Public Works Staff is still
25 reviewing that, but the submittal originally

1 don't know if you all got a chance to review
2 the new elevations. The scale giving element
3 of the entire project is a sort of screen, an
4 arcade screen, that really represents the area
5 of the parking structure. And when we had a
6 discussion with the Board of Architects, we
7 talked about them as large ventanas de cajas,
8 which is a tropical or caribbean element that
9 comes from the Mediterranean, from the South of
10 Spain.

11 So ventanas de cajas, which is a
12 Mediterranean element, here are reinterpreted
13 as a large scale urban gesture. They typically
14 have a very complicated series of beautifully,
15 almost moorish like woven metalwork, and we're
16 going to design those so that dampers run
17 opposite to the field of view. It's not 100
18 percent detailed yet, but it's one of these
19 architectural ideas that we're going to be
20 revisiting with the Board of Architects, which
21 I think is one of the more interesting parts,
22 because that -- again, we go back, if we put
23 the liners on the parking garage, they fall
24 where the tracks are, if we go to the west
25 side. And if we go to the east side for

1 was taking advantage of the shared parking,
2 and, then, when the parking was calculated
3 again, based on the current changes that have
4 been made recently, in terms of the lesser
5 requirements for apartments, I believe that the
6 number was lowered. So they chose to go that
7 way.

8 MR. HERNANDEZ: Right, and it was just
9 clarified that we are now 30 cars above your
10 new implemented system. That's for the
11 employees that work -- remember earlier you
12 heard there are 20 employees -- there's a need
13 for 20 spaces for employees that work in the
14 current small commercial areas on Ponce? So we
15 have blended all of those needs in. That's
16 where we are now.

17 MR. BELLIN: Okay.

18 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

19 MR. BELLIN: My main question is, there are
20 no liners at all for the parking garages.

21 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes. That's correct.

22 MR. BELLIN: So how do you propose to
23 shield the lights, whatever takes place in the
24 parking garages, from the public?

25 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah. One of the -- I

1 liners, we have retail up for 24 feet on the
2 street. So, really, what we're guarding
3 against, as you say, is the view of the lights,
4 but we're not -- there's no reason for a liner
5 to activate the street. The commercial goes
6 through the whole 175 feet of depth.

7 The real need is to screen the cars, not to
8 line them with functions. Liners were
9 introduced generally, in urban areas, to
10 activate the urban areas when the garages are
11 on the ground floor. There's hardly no garage
12 -- there are no garage. There's a ramp up, and
13 there are no garages until the height of 24
14 feet.

15 MR. BELLIN: Okay. The original
16 requirement for liners in the Code, how do
17 you --

18 MR. HERNANDEZ: Well, I mean, we're
19 asking -- I just explained the techniques of
20 it.

21 MR. BELLIN: No, I understand that, but if
22 the Code says, you have a requirement for a
23 liner --

24 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, but there is no
25 parking on the ground floor.

1 MR. BELLIN: Well, but as you go up,
 2 there's a requirement for the liners.
 3 MR. HERNANDEZ: The parking starts at 24
 4 feet. Is there -- I don't know where Ramon is
 5 -- Ramon, is there a requirement for liners at
 6 all heights or just on the ground floor?
 7 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Bellin, you're very
 8 familiar with the Code. Which section are you
 9 referring to, because I don't recall that there
 10 was a requirement in the Code for liners on
 11 parking garages?
 12 MR. BELLIN: I think it might be in the --
 13 MR. TRIAS: I mean, we have discussed it as
 14 an idea that we wanted to do it on the Downtown
 15 Overlay, but, as of today, that -- I don't
 16 believe that's the case.
 17 MR. BELLIN: Okay.
 18 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I have some
 19 recollection, and I thought we approved
 20 something along those lines or recommended
 21 approval.
 22 MR. WU: For Giralda, we did. You did --
 23 you made a recommendation for the Giralda
 24 Overlay to have front liners in front of
 25 garages.

1 had this morning dealt partially with screens
 2 in those arches that actually are in front of
 3 the parking. And that's a very important
 4 aspect of this design, and that's why the
 5 design that was delivered to you today is very
 6 different than the one that was included in the
 7 package.
 8 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is that the packet that
 9 was at our seats tonight?
 10 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 11 MS. MENENDEZ: It's this one.
 12 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So we haven't had a
 13 chance to analyze that.
 14 MR. TRIAS: If you look at the drawings
 15 there, you will see that many ideas that
 16 Professor Hernandez was describing are detailed
 17 very nicely.
 18 MR. HERNANDEZ: Also, just to answer, the
 19 hotel building, which is the one that faces
 20 southwest, has no parking garages on it. So
 21 there's no need for liners. It is programmed
 22 from the 160 feet of height down to the
 23 sidewalk. And the portion of the project that
 24 faces west -- I mean, Mr. Berkowitz's analogy
 25 of an oasis is an interesting one. The portion

1 MS. MENENDEZ: So that was particular to
 2 that --
 3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Just Giralda.
 4 MR. TRIAS: Right.
 5 MR. WU: Right, just for Giralda.
 6 MR. TRIAS: Yes. That discussion has taken
 7 place, but it has taken place within the very
 8 narrow focus --
 9 MS. MENENDEZ: Specific.
 10 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, certainly not on US-1.
 11 MR. BELLIN: But didn't we require liners
 12 for the Mediterranean Village parking garages?
 13 MR. TRIAS: Well, as conditions of
 14 approval, you did, and certainly -- and the
 15 Commission agreed, as a condition of approval.
 16 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think we need to
 17 remember, while this may front on US-1, we do
 18 have a lot of residences now, I'll say, behind
 19 this, so to the west, and, then, of course, you
 20 have -- you do have the residential district on
 21 the east, across US-1, but this also impacts
 22 the residential district on the west side of Le
 23 Jeune. So we need to be very cognizant about
 24 the impacts on all sides.
 25 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. And the meeting that I

1 of the project that faces west has the foil of
 2 the Metrorail tracks and the cars, so it's
 3 really primarily the remaining US-1 frontage
 4 that's left.
 5 You have the rail station to the west and
 6 you have the one building --
 7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: There's no rail
 8 station.
 9 MR. HERNANDEZ: I mean, not rail station.
 10 The rails to the west --
 11 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Which are relatively --
 12 I mean, you've got a couple of pillars and you
 13 say, thirty feet, whatever it is --
 14 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thirty-five.
 15 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: -- you have a track and
 16 every now and then a car going.
 17 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah. But to put a
 18 residential liner facing the cars and the
 19 tracks is really difficult. Who would want to
 20 live there?
 21 The point of the project that faces the
 22 south, which is -- you know, remember, the
 23 three buildings -- I could use the Site Plan --
 24 I don't know where it is -- but we have the
 25 three buildings.

1 The one building that faces south has no
2 parking whatsoever. So it's 100 percent
3 programmed down to the sidewalk. And then the
4 other two buildings that are left, the long
5 side that faces west has the rail tracks on it.
6 You would not want a liner there. The only
7 side that's left, significant side, because,
8 remember, the buildings are 150 feet deep, is
9 the US-1 frontage, and it has retail up to the
10 height of 24 feet.

11 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, if I could just
12 direct you to the drawings -- yes, exactly.
13 Those drawings.

14 MS. MENENDEZ: Right. I have a question.

15 MR. TRIAS: The parking is this area that
16 has the larger arches, okay, and as you can
17 see, they're detailed very carefully to break
18 down the scale and also screen the parking. So
19 that's what the architect is proposing. And
20 that is an improvement from the one that is
21 included in the package that was delivered to
22 you.

23 Now, the problem with this set of drawings
24 is that it does not include the design for the
25 hotel building, okay. That is yet to be worked

1 on. But I believe that the description of the
2 architect as he has given you is the intent.

3 MS. MENENDEZ: This parking area that you
4 just described, how high is it from the
5 sidewalk? Does anybody know?

6 MR. TRIAS: Do you have dimensions?

7 MR. HERNANDEZ: The base of the large
8 arcade is 35 feet from the sidewalk.

9 MS. MENENDEZ: I'm talking about on top of
10 the -- this is the parking garage area?

11 MR. HERNANDEZ: No. No. The parking
12 garage -- well, can I go up and point?

13 MS. MENENDEZ: Of course.

14 MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay.

15 MS. MENENDEZ: Or if you have a plan.

16 What I'm trying to get at is, I would like
17 to just identify --

18 MR. COLLER: The problem with doing that --

19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We'll show it to the
20 camera. Right.

21 Do me a favor, Mr. Hernandez. Do me a
22 favor, could we just take that to the podium so
23 the camera can get it and then we'll get it
24 back?

25 MS. MENENDEZ: I have a question. Is

1 that --

2 MR. HERNANDEZ: Where do I hold it up?

3 MS. MENENDEZ: Right there.

4 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Hold it up in front of
5 you. I think the camera should be able to get
6 it.

7 MS. MENENDEZ: I think. No? Give it to
8 Ramon. They've got Ramon.

9 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: There we go. Hold on.
10 Here we go. Mr. Hernandez, hold it up.

11 MS. MENENDEZ: They have the camera on
12 Ramon.

13 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Ramon, he had a
14 conversation with a Board Member. Let's just
15 put it on the record just to make sure, please.

16 MR. TRIAS: Right. We do have a detailed
17 image on the PowerPoint that I had, so we can
18 show that on the screen.

19 MS. MENENDEZ: Right, but it's not this
20 one. Does it matter? Is it the same?

21 MR. TRIAS: It's a detail of that, and it's
22 actually a closeup.

23 MS. MENENDEZ: Can we show it, then,
24 because I have a question regarding that, and
25 that's my plan?

1 MR. TRIAS: Can I have like my PowerPoint,
2 like towards the end, one of the last slides?
3 Yes, that one.

4 Okay.

5 Jorge, can you use that to explain?

6 MS. MENENDEZ: Is that parking also on the
7 south or the north side of the building, does
8 it run from south to north?

9 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes. When you say, north
10 to south --

11 MR. COLLER: Why don't you grab the mike?

12 MR. HERNANDEZ: It runs -- the parking runs
13 all across the US-1 frontage, which would be
14 south to north, although there's no true
15 cardinalpoints here.

16 MS. MENENDEZ: Right. How about east to
17 west?

18 MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. On the east to

19 west -- do we have a site -- somebody look -- I
20 think it will be shorter to find the site plan.
21 That's the one. Okay. Perfect.

22 Now, if I hold this up, will the camera
23 pick it up?

24 Okay. So this building has no parking in
25 it. In fact, there's no parking all of the way

1 to the northern limit of the square. So
2 there's no need for a liner here, because it's
3 100 percent habitable program from its
4 height -- from the top of its height to the
5 sidewalk.

6 Then there is parking in the apartment
7 building, which is -- let's call it Building 2,
8 which is the middle building, and Building 1,
9 which is the northern most building, the one
10 closest to Downtown, there is parking here, but
11 the first floor of that parking occurs 24 feet
12 above the sidewalk, which is the height of the
13 commercial.

14 There's a two-story commercial height, 24
15 feet, and that parking goes for another 55
16 feet, and that's what's screened by the
17 feature -- we lost it -- if we can go back to
18 the PowerPoint presentation -- yes -- and I
19 don't know if this is a pointer -- is it a
20 pointer -- yes -- for some reason, it doesn't
21 go on screen. The laser doesn't go on the
22 screen.

23 But it's essentially the arcade that you
24 see, that is the parking structure.

25 MS. MENENDEZ: The reason I'm asking is

1 dependent, we have to lodge the parkings in the
2 body of the building.

3 MS. MENENDEZ: Right.

4 MR. HERNANDEZ: As part of the PAD, in an
5 inspired way of reinterpreting the use of the
6 ground plane and the volumetrics, we have
7 compressed the parking in two-thirds of the
8 site's footprint, under Building 1 and Building
9 2. That's a compression of the parking.

10 I think you heard earlier testimony about
11 the fact that if the parking were spread
12 across, it would be lower, but we've condensed
13 the parking, right. What have we accomplished
14 by doing that? One, we have accomplished that
15 what I call the nose, which is the most visible
16 portion of the site -- this point, as you know,
17 is the most visible portion of the site.

18 That's the southern point -- the nose has no
19 structured parking, right. Building 3, which
20 is the hotel, has no structured parking, which
21 guards all of that area to the south.

22 And then the structured parking, of course,
23 because we are lodging it in two of the three
24 mini blocks, is going to require greater
25 height, but that height occurs at exactly the

1 because, one of the arguments that were given
2 to us earlier for the height was because of the
3 residential, but, in fact, you have parking.
4 So the parking is what's going to be right
5 adjacent to the Metrorail.

6 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It's not residential.
8 I mean, in other words, I'm having a hard time
9 understanding the argument, if, in fact,
10 there's a real big height difference still from
11 where the parking is to where the Metrorail is.

12 MR. HERNANDEZ: Let me try to explain it
13 one more time, maybe I can get it right.

14 MS. MENENDEZ: And I was trying to get some
15 feed, but I don't think we have anything.

16 MR. HERNANDEZ: But it will be useful to
17 have this drawing again.

18 Okay. As a general rule, I think it's
19 good -- I mean, if we did not have to park any
20 cars in structures, which is not able to be
21 done, right, we would have all buildings
22 operate so they're 100 percent habitable from
23 the top floor, right, and that happens in New
24 York, for example, it happens in Chicago, but
25 for newer cities, which are still car

1 height where the cars of the rail are passing
2 through. So they are above the retail and
3 below the first habitable unit.

4 It's exactly where you want them. You want
5 that kind of -- you know, let's call it dead
6 function, of the car parked against or adjacent
7 to the least desirable adjacency, which is the
8 rail.

9 MS. MENENDEZ: But I heard earlier that the
10 rail was at 34 feet and that the stores were at
11 34 feet.

12 MR. HERNANDEZ: I'm sorry, say it again.

13 MS. MENENDEZ: I had heard earlier that the
14 storefronts were at 34 and that the rails were
15 at 34 feet, and that the reason for the height
16 was because you were trying to avoid having the
17 apartments in front of the rail, but yet
18 there's parking above the storefronts or the
19 stores.

20 MR. HERNANDEZ: Right. The stores are not
21 at 34 feet. The stores are from the ground to
22 24 feet.

23 MS. MENENDEZ: And then how high is the
24 parking?

25 MR. HERNANDEZ: The parking starts at that

1 height, which is -- the beginning of the rail
 2 tracks are at 25 feet, okay.
 3 So the car, which is about a nine, ten-foot
 4 car, is passing between 25 feet in height and
 5 35 feet in height. That is the first level of
 6 the parking.
 7 And then there are four additional levels,
 8 raising the first apartment four parking levels
 9 above the car passing by.
 10 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. You know, from the
 11 height perspective and the argument that you're
 12 trying to keep -- I just think, you know, it's
 13 a little bit higher than it needs to be based
 14 on that argument.
 15 MR. HERNANDEZ: I mean, if I had a unit
 16 there, I'd want to take the top unit, because
 17 I'd want my unit as far away as possible from
 18 the car, from the rail car.
 19 MS. MENENDEZ: Right.
 20 MR. HERNANDEZ: Right? So what is the
 21 minimum of that threshold, we're saying it's
 22 four parking levels above the ceiling of the
 23 passing rail car. So 40 feet above the ceiling
 24 of the rail car, of the passing tram, because
 25 it --

1 MS. MENENDEZ: Which would be 65 feet,
 2 because you're saying that the rail car is at
 3 25 feet --
 4 MR. HERNANDEZ: 25 feet. It's 55 feet.
 5 Here are the numbers: Sidewalk is zero, top of
 6 retail is 24, okay. And then there are five
 7 eleven-foot parking levels.
 8 Okay. So the first apartment floor is 40
 9 feet above the ceiling of the car, the ceiling
 10 of the car.
 11 MS. MENENDEZ: So you're just not clearing
 12 the rail, you want to push it up as much as you
 13 can.
 14 MR. HERNANDEZ: No. Well, we have to
 15 distribute a thousand cars.
 16 MS. MENENDEZ: No, I know. There's a lot
 17 of cars, because, you know, there's a lot of
 18 apartments, and there's retail and there's a
 19 whole -- I mean, the more you have, the more
 20 you have to provide.
 21 MR. HERNANDEZ: We'd love to push it up as
 22 far as possible, because I don't think anybody
 23 wants to live close to the rail.
 24 MS. MENENDEZ: I understand.
 25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Where does the hotel

1 stop?
 2 MR. HERNANDEZ: The hotel is the entirety
 3 of Building 1 -- or it's in Building 1. We're
 4 going to need the -- well, I can tell you, it
 5 is the first two floors -- no, the first floor
 6 over the retail, so the retail is zero to 24,
 7 okay. Then the first floor over the retail is
 8 the lobby of the hotel, because it's a sky
 9 lobby, and it's the restaurant and amenity
 10 decks. That's another 24.
 11 That's the area that is right at the rail.
 12 And on the west side -- if you're thinking of
 13 the cross section, on the west side, all of the
 14 program against the rail is the back of house,
 15 laundry, restaurant, kitchens, all of that
 16 stuff, staff. So, again, there are no units on
 17 the west side of that building that are level
 18 with the cars.
 19 MR. BELLIN: Ramon, I'd like to ask you a
 20 question.
 21 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.
 22 MR. BELLIN: What is the policy of the
 23 City? Do we want to have a shield for the
 24 parking or are we just going to provide
 25 screens? Do we want a liner or do we just want

1 screens?
 2 And I think what we determine for this
 3 project, everybody else who does these kinds of
 4 projects should have the same ability. I
 5 personally think that a liner is a much better
 6 way, regardless of what that liner comprises,
 7 than a screen. But if you all decide that a
 8 screen is sufficient to shield the parking,
 9 then make a policy.
 10 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, and that's a very good
 11 point, and clearly the City Commission makes
 12 policy. Staff makes recommendation and so do
 13 you.
 14 What we have said is that in the Downtown,
 15 and, particularly, in the Giralda Overlay, it
 16 would be very beneficial for the pedestrian
 17 live of the area, and also on Ponce de Leon.
 18 Maybe you're recalling the last discussion
 19 we had on that, to have liners, and the reason
 20 is that those are streets that both sides of
 21 the street have buildings that are comparable,
 22 and they work very well together, and so on.
 23 On US-1, I would recommend that the liner
 24 is not going to have the same effect. I would
 25 say that because US-1 is basically a one sided

1 street, in terms of the development.
 2 MR. BELLIN: What about the buildings
 3 across Ponce?
 4 MR. TRIAS: We had a similar condition
 5 there, because of the Underline and --
 6 MR. BELLIN: But the parking garage goes
 7 way above the Metrorail. You're looking at --
 8 MR. TRIAS: Way above, and just to answer
 9 your question, there's one diagram that shows
 10 the Metrorail in section --
 11 MS. MENENDEZ: What page is that?
 12 MR. TRIAS: It's Page Z1.03.
 13 MS. MENENDEZ: Thank you.
 14 MR. TRIAS: And if you're able to find it,
 15 good luck. If you're not, I have it here.
 16 MS. MENENDEZ: I found it.
 17 MR. TRIAS: So, factually, the discussion
 18 is correct. The parking garage is much higher
 19 than the Metrorail existing conditions. It is.
 20 And the Applicant is proposing that this is a
 21 superior design, from the point of view of the
 22 quality of life that happens in the upper
 23 units. That is what they are proposing.
 24 And it's certainly within the range of
 25 discussion, as I said before. They're not

1 Underline, which has a lot landscape. There's
 2 a variety of things that are happening. So I
 3 don't think it's that critical, from purely an
 4 urban design point of view.
 5 Now, if you choose to make it a policy, the
 6 consequence of that is that then the parking
 7 gets taller, because clearly you're taking
 8 parking --
 9 MR. BELLIN: That's right.
 10 MR. TRIAS: So that's the consequence of
 11 that. So the building gets, perhaps, bulkier
 12 also. So I don't think the architectural
 13 outcome is going to be better, from an artistic
 14 point of view.
 15 MR. BELLIN: That's probably true, but all
 16 I'm saying is, it ought to be consistent with
 17 every project. If screens are sufficient to
 18 shield parking, then, okay.
 19 MR. TRIAS: I believe so, and my
 20 recommendation was to require liners in the
 21 Downtown, and this is not included in that
 22 recommendation, this area.
 23 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: On that point, if I may,
 24 on the issue of when liners are required and
 25 when they aren't, I'm looking at the Code right

1 proposing the tallest buildings in the City of
 2 Coral Gables at all. So it's something that is
 3 within the range of Coral Gables building
 4 types.
 5 I think, if it's a good thing in the
 6 Giralda Overlay, why isn't it a good thing
 7 here?
 8 MR. TRIAS: The liner, you mean?
 9 MR. BELLIN: Yes.
 10 MR. TRIAS: As I said before, in Giralda,
 11 we have a 60 feet right-of-way, we have
 12 symmetrical buildings, hopefully, more or less
 13 the same type of development, and there's a lot
 14 of activity in the actual right-of-way. The
 15 cars are actually taking off many times. That
 16 is not likely to happen in US-1.
 17 US-1 is certainly a --
 18 MR. BELLIN: No, but my concern is not
 19 US-1. I agree with you. My concern is the
 20 buildings that are north across Ponce. You've
 21 got all of those residential units, people
 22 sitting on their balconies and looking into
 23 parking garages.
 24 MR. TRIAS: Right, but over there, there's
 25 the right-of-way of Ponce de Leon, plus the

1 now, and in the Mixed-Use District, there's two
 2 different sections requiring -- dealing with
 3 parking garages. One of them provides that
 4 parking garages shall include exterior
 5 architectural treatments compatible with
 6 buildings or structures which occupy the same
 7 development and/or street.
 8 And, from my recollection, pretty much
 9 every other pedestal parking garage property
 10 that we have in the Mixed-Use District does
 11 retain that in the ground floor, but then has
 12 some amount of parking garage above the ground
 13 floor that is exposed.
 14 And I'm being reminded here, also, that the
 15 current Gables Station project, which was
 16 approved a few years back, the one that Mr.
 17 Berkowitz was referring to, apparently has 100
 18 feet, actually, of parking garage that is not
 19 lined.
 20 The other requirement in the Code reads,
 21 ground floor parking that is located and
 22 fronting on a primary street is prohibited.
 23 Ground floor parking is permitted on secondary
 24 streets, shall be fully enclosed within the
 25 structure and shall be surrounded by retail

1 uses. Ground floor parking is permitted on
 2 alley frontages.
 3 Again, that refers to ground floor parking,
 4 and not the parking garage area that we have
 5 here.
 6 MR. BELLIN: The only point I'm making is,
 7 if it's good here, it should be good
 8 everywhere. I mean, I think it's fair.
 9 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Right. And I believe
 10 there are many parking garages where above the
 11 ground floor you have garage and it's screened
 12 somehow to avoid it.
 13 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think, personally, as
 14 far as at least the Site Plan is concerned and
 15 maybe some of the Text Amendments -- well,
 16 maybe not the Text Amendments, but at least as
 17 far as the Site Plan approval, I've heard all
 18 night that things are influx, things haven't
 19 been resolved, things need further detail.
 20 We were given updated drawings as we sat
 21 down tonight, which, I mean, I've scanned as
 22 we've been talking through, but haven't been
 23 able to review them. And so between the
 24 serious concern about the height, I think that
 25 ought to at least be comparable with what is

1 across the way, so that would be Gables Ponce 1
 2 and 2.
 3 I think, that whole area, those are the
 4 tallest buildings at this point that have been
 5 approved, so it would be appropriate to
 6 maintain that compatibility. But even with
 7 that said, there seems to be plenty of other
 8 open items on the Site Plan and Staff's
 9 recommendation -- even with the conditions as
 10 to what should happen, at which point in time,
 11 whether it's prior to building permit or prior
 12 to TCO or CO or what have you, and so I'm --
 13 personally, I think this should go back,
 14 further review, tighten up the plans, and then
 15 I would like to see it come back before us in a
 16 more defined and a more completed state.
 17 MR. PEREZ: Regarding your concern over the
 18 maintenance bond, et cetera, a lot of that is
 19 going to be addressed at the restrictive
 20 covenant phase.
 21 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It will be, but usually
 22 when projects come before us, as you know,
 23 especially larger projects, I mean, we know
 24 there's some stuff that's not resolved, and
 25 it's going to end up finalizing later on down

1 the road, but it seems like almost every point
 2 tonight, as far as Site Plan development is
 3 concerned, I've heard, "Needs to be reviewed
 4 more. Needs to be discussed more. Not
 5 resolved yet. Open for discussion." And
 6 there's too many of those tonight, to make me
 7 comfortable, at least, for the Site Plan
 8 component.
 9 MS. MENENDEZ: Even if you were to move
 10 forward with Staff's recommendation?
 11 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah. Yeah. But I'm
 12 one of four.
 13 MR. PEREZ: What?
 14 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'm only one of four
 15 tonight. And we have -- where is my agenda,
 16 again? We've got five separate items to
 17 approve.
 18 MR. PEREZ: I mean, I personally don't have
 19 an issue with the height. I mean, I think if
 20 you're going to get aggressive with height in
 21 the City, I think that's where height should
 22 go. I mean, hearing now that Mediterranean
 23 Village was granted -- and I forgot -- but they
 24 got 208 --
 25 MR. WU: Sir, you need to speak into the mike.

1 MR. PEREZ: That Mediterranean Village got
 2 208 feet in height, and I forgot that they were
 3 granted that much height, in an area that's a
 4 lot more residential than this, I personally
 5 don't have an issue with the height.
 6 I do agree with you, Jeffrey, that perhaps,
 7 as it relates to the Site Plan, there's some
 8 buttoning up for the Applicant to take care of,
 9 but I just want to go on the record and state
 10 that my concern with the height is okay.
 11 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Sure, thanks.
 12 MR. BELLIN: What did we suggest for Paseo
 13 with respect to the height? I think it was
 14 around 120.
 15 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think it was around
 16 120.
 17 MR. BELLIN: Yeah, and we --
 18 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But that was pretty
 19 buttoned up when it got to us.
 20 MR. BELLIN: Yeah, but that was one of the
 21 requirements that we had, that the building be
 22 lowered to 120 feet, roughly.
 23 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right.
 24 MR WU: And Paseo is immediately close to a
 25 residential neighborhood.

1 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Correct.
 2 MR. WU: So there's a distinct contextual
 3 issue there, and not the same as here.
 4 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But here you've got
 5 buildings basically next door that are 100, 115
 6 feet high.
 7 MR. PEREZ: But, I mean, I would agree with
 8 you if this was located to the north of Gables
 9 Residential, but, once again, considering that
 10 you're abutting US-1, again, I personally don't
 11 have an issue transitioning from a higher
 12 pedestal, you know, and working its way down
 13 towards the north.
 14 I would agree with you if it was located,
 15 once again, on the north side of Gables
 16 Residential, but, again, due to the proximity
 17 of US-1, I actually appreciate the height.
 18 MS. MENENDEZ: But, you know, US-1 gets
 19 clogged every morning. And my concern with all
 20 of these developments along US-1 is just that,
 21 that we continue to really put more and more on
 22 US-1 and the infrastructure is not there, the
 23 roadway is not there. And so the more you
 24 build, the more you put on US-1, in this
 25 location, because every single project is

1 different, you know.
 2 MR. PEREZ: Yeah. No, I mean, I hear you,
 3 and I tend to agree with you, but I think the
 4 traffic engineers hopefully are looking at this
 5 carefully and we need to let them do their job.
 6 MS. MENENDEZ: The project has great
 7 components. I mean, my concern is the height,
 8 because the more height, you know, the more
 9 intensity there is, the more traffic there is,
 10 in a location that I really don't think can
 11 really put up with a lot more.
 12 MR. PEREZ: Yeah.
 13 MS. MENENDEZ: I mean, that's -- I mean, I
 14 know where Jeff is going. This is like not
 15 there yet, but we have a Staff recommendation
 16 that I feel comfortable with, from that
 17 perspective.
 18 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Ramon.
 19 MR. TRIAS: No, if you want to go over the
 20 recommendations, conceptually, we agree, it's
 21 not there. We're giving you the
 22 recommendations to be able to move forward, if
 23 you choose to, okay.
 24 So we've listed all of the things that are
 25 missing. We've given some timelines, in terms

1 of when they should be provided. The Applicant
 2 has a lot of work to do before they get to
 3 Commission, and so on. And so that was the
 4 idea behind the recommendations.
 5 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. And even with
 6 the recommendation and you say, here's the open
 7 items and what needs to be reviewed, I mean,
 8 our charge is to, as far as I see it, review
 9 these applications in as close to final form as
 10 possible and we're not even close to being
 11 there on this one.
 12 MR. TRIAS: Absolutely. Exactly. And
 13 that's your decision. You have the tools to
 14 make whatever decision you want at this point.
 15 MR. BELLIN: Ramon, if we move this
 16 forward, it goes to Commission. The Commission
 17 then has the right to review it and send it
 18 back to us.
 19 MR. WU: Yes, they can.
 20 MR. BELLIN: All right.
 21 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.
 22 MR. BELLIN: And I think that's the way we
 23 ought to approach this, to hear what the
 24 Commission feels is appropriate. If we move it
 25 forward with Staff's recommendations, let the

1 Commission, you know, have their chance to put
 2 input --
 3 MR. TRIAS: I think the role of the
 4 Planning and Zoning Board is to advice the
 5 Commission, to give a recommendation about what
 6 you believe is the right way to develop this
 7 property. If you feel that you're comfortable
 8 enough with the information you have to do
 9 that, you should do that. If you don't, then
 10 you certainly could vote not to do it.
 11 But I think we're all giving
 12 recommendations to the body that is going to
 13 make the policy decisions.
 14 MR. BELLIN: I would like to see this move
 15 forward to the Commission, because I think
 16 they're going to kick it back to us anyway.
 17 MR. WU: Mr. Chair, can we clarify one
 18 thing about the employee parking? Whether the
 19 Applicant will agree to a condition to have
 20 employee parking in the garage as stated into
 21 the record, the adjacent employee parking?
 22 MR. BASS: We agree.
 23 MR. WU: Just make sure, if you make a
 24 motion, to include that as part of the motion.
 25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Ramon --

1 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 2 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: -- one of your
 3 recommendations is what you call, gateway
 4 landmarks. "The project shall provide gateway
 5 landmarks on-site at US-1 and Grand Avenue and
 6 at US-1 and Ponce."
 7 MR. TRIAS: Yes. What page are you looking
 8 at, exactly?
 9 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Page 38.
 10 MR. TRIAS: Okay.
 11 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Item AA. What are we
 12 talking about with gateway landmarks?
 13 MR. TRIAS: Some of the design of the area
 14 around Grand Avenue already does that with the
 15 art and the plaza, and we also felt that a
 16 similar high level design could be done at
 17 Ponce de Leon, at the other end of the project.
 18 Those are minor site planning recommendations.
 19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So is this ellipse or
 20 whatever we're going to call it at the south
 21 end, is that what's planned or is that a just
 22 placeholder?
 23 MR. TRIAS: In my perspective, it's a
 24 placeholder, yes, and it really it, because it
 25 has to be reviewed by the different Boards, and

1 any kind of artistic -- any kind of art that is
 2 located there. So it is a placeholder.
 3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Ramon, I'm on
 4 Page 40 of your Rec. 7-A, traffic calming --
 5 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: -- says the Applicant
 7 or at the Applicant's expense, traffic calming
 8 studies within a year after the TCO is issued.
 9 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 10 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It's only bounded on
 11 the west by Le Jeune Road.
 12 MR. TRIAS: Okay.
 13 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I would suggest that
 14 needs to go to at least Riviera. Traffic
 15 already backs up, sometimes halfway or all of
 16 the way to Riviera in the mornings.
 17 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. That certainly is a good
 18 idea.
 19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think that whole area
 20 -- yeah, at least there. Bird is probably
 21 okay. You may even want to go further than
 22 Ponce on the east.
 23 MR. TRIAS: Okay.
 24 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Has there been any
 25 discussion about the Underline improvements

1 going to Granada versus stopping at Le Jeune?
 2 That's a very difficult intersection right
 3 there at Le Jeune.
 4 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 5 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right where the gas
 6 station is, also. And I think if you stop the
 7 Underline improvements there, you've created a
 8 path to nowhere.
 9 MR. TRIAS: Are you thinking in terms of
 10 the intersections of the streets being the
 11 priority of improvements?
 12 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, I think that if
 13 this is an opportunity to create the continuity
 14 from the Ponce roundabout and get it down past
 15 Le Jeune and over the canal --
 16 MR. TRIAS: Okay.
 17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: -- that's a very good
 18 opportunity to create the connectivity for the
 19 future, because getting across Le Jeune right
 20 there -- coming to a dead end right there, I
 21 think, does nothing.
 22 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. Absolutely. One of the
 23 main issues is to enhance the crosswalks and
 24 the pedestrian ability to cross US-1, Le Jeune,
 25 all of that. So Granada is perfectly fine, in

1 terms of an area for study.
 2 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Any further
 3 discussion or does somebody want to make
 4 a motion? We have five items. We need to take
 5 them separately.
 6 MR. BELLIN: I'll make a motion to approve
 7 with Staff recommendations, starting with
 8 Number 5.
 9 MR. COLLER: Well, I think we should go --
 10 we need to go one by one through the items.
 11 MS. MENENDEZ: Can I make a friendly
 12 request? If you could also add to Staff
 13 recommendation eliminating the access on Ponce
 14 that we talked about, if you feel comfortable
 15 with that.
 16 MR. BELLIN: Sure.
 17 MS. MENENDEZ: And -- that's it.
 18 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Which access on Ponce?
 19 MS. MENENDEZ: The one that cuts through
 20 the linear park.
 21 MR. TRIAS: The automobile access.
 22 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But now we're going to
 23 have everything on Grand, which clearly cannot
 24 handle it, and then Ponce by the circle.
 25 MS. MENENDEZ: But we heard from the

1 traffic engineer that they didn't need it.
 2 That's why I asked them.
 3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.
 4 MS. MENENDEZ: Just I'm concerned with more
 5 traffic on that Ponce, which is not really, you
 6 know, I just -- and then the whole -- like it
 7 was explained, you know, the pedestrians, the
 8 cyclist and then cars waiting, you know, and
 9 people might use that as a primary access
 10 point, and that would be a concern for me with
 11 a 900-plus car garage.
 12 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I agree with that, but,
 13 to me, closing it off creates -- so if you're
 14 coming up Ponce, you could turn in there and
 15 not impact the latter half of northerly Ponce
 16 or the roundabout trying to then get in.
 17 MS. MENENDEZ: Can't you go down, turn into
 18 Grand, and then turn into the development?
 19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I don't think the plans
 20 are laid out that you can do that. Hold on.
 21 Maybe Mr. Hernandez --
 22 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.
 23 MS. MENENDEZ: I thought that the traffic
 24 engineer had explained that, that there was an
 25 ability to go in.

1 MR. HERNANDEZ: The best way I could answer
 2 it tonight is by saying, if that's the
 3 intention in the motion, we're willing to study
 4 it and if all of the traffic engineering
 5 science bears out that it has no negative
 6 impact to eliminate it, then it helps the
 7 linear park and it helps the connectivity of
 8 the Underline. On the other hand, if we need
 9 it for some traffic purpose, then we would come
 10 back or through Staff say, "We need it and
 11 here's the traffic study."
 12 MS. MENENDEZ: My only concern would be
 13 that that becomes the primary access, because
 14 it's clogged on South Dixie, people are trying
 15 to get into the development, and, boom, that
 16 becomes like the main way of getting into the
 17 development, and that would be concerning,
 18 because it would be constantly interfering with
 19 the activities in the park.
 20 But, you know, that was a suggestion. You
 21 don't have to accept it, if you don't want to.
 22 MR. TRIAS: And then Staff is uncomfortable
 23 with this location, also, in the sense that
 24 this is here only because it was approved for a
 25 prior project.

1 MS. MENENDEZ: I know, that's -- if it's
 2 not needed, then we shouldn't encourage it.
 3 But if it's needed, I understand your concern.
 4 MR. PEREZ: Just to be clear, you're having
 5 the issue with that one, right?
 6 MS. MENENDEZ: That one, yes.
 7 MR. PEREZ: Okay. All right.
 8 MR. TRIAS: What I would advice is that
 9 perhaps you phrase it as to study the necessity
 10 of that connection.
 11 MS. MENENDEZ: Study the possibility of
 12 eliminating the access on Ponce parallel to
 13 South Dixie Highway. I mean, the Ponce that's
 14 parallel. Is that acceptable?
 15 MR. BELLIN: Yes.
 16 MS. MENENDEZ: Thank you, sir.
 17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can I ask? Ramon, if
 18 you're coming eastbound on Grand, can you turn
 19 into the project at the hotel?
 20 MR. TRIAS: From here, yes.
 21 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No, eastbound on Grand?
 22 MR. TRIAS: This way?
 23 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes.
 24 MS. MENENDEZ: No, I don't think so.
 25 MR. TRIAS: I think so, yes. It is two

1 ways right now.
 2 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No, that's the right
 3 turn only exit that your pen just dragged
 4 across, I believe.
 5 MR. TRIAS: Well, but it could be designed,
 6 if you'd prefer to have both --
 7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think, in reality,
 8 unless it's the middle of the day, it's never
 9 going to happen with the way traffic backs up
 10 both ways, the conflicts are going to be
 11 tremendous, but I think that needs to be
 12 researched greater.
 13 MR. TRIAS: Yes, and what I would tell you
 14 is that the review of the traffic operations
 15 and the traffic study is still incomplete, so
 16 certainly your recommendations are going to be
 17 taken by the Public Works staff and by their
 18 consultants and we'll come back to the
 19 Commission with more precise ideas.
 20 MR. BELLIN: So I've made a motion to
 21 approve with Staff recommendation --
 22 MR. WU: Mr. Chair, the first three
 23 motions, the first one is Comp Plan Map change.
 24 There are no conditions.
 25 The second one is the Zoning Code Map

1 change. There are no conditions.
 2 The third one is a Zoning Code Text, there
 3 are no conditions.
 4 If you can get that out of the way, then we
 5 can deal with the conditions for Number 4 and
 6 Number 5, please.
 7 MR. TRIAS: The only issue, to follow Mr.
 8 Wu's very good advice, is that the Zoning Code
 9 Text Amendment is the one about the height.
 10 Okay. So that one has a particular --
 11 MS. MENENDEZ: That's Number 3, right?
 12 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. That has a particular
 13 number, so whatever you want to recommend --
 14 MS. MENENDEZ: That's Number 3, right?
 15 MR. TRIAS: Yes, that's Number 3.
 16 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. So, Marshall,
 17 you are recommending approval of Item Number 5
 18 in our Agenda, which is the change to the Comp
 19 Plan Text and Map Amendments from Industrial
 20 Land Use to Mixed-Use?
 21 MR. BELLIN: Yes.
 22 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Anybody want to second?
 23 MS. MENENDEZ: Oh, I'll second it.
 24 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Motion and a second.
 25 Any further discussion on Agenda Item Number 5?

1 recommendations at this point.
 2 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's the Amendment to
 3 the Zoning Map from -- change the Zoning from
 4 Industrial to Commercial and removing the South
 5 Industrial Mixed-Use District.
 6 MR. BELLIN: Yes.
 7 MR. COLLER: And you said that was in
 8 accordance with Staff recommendations, correct?
 9 MR. TRIAS: Right.
 10 MR. PEREZ: I'll second.
 11 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Motion and a second.
 12 Any further discussion?
 13 Jill, if you'll call the roll, please.
 14 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?
 15 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.
 16 THE SECRETARY: Alberto Perez?
 17 MR. PEREZ: Yes.
 18 THE SECRETARY: Marshall Bellin?
 19 MR. BELLIN: Yes.
 20 THE SECRETARY: Jeff Flanagan?
 21 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes.
 22 Agenda Item Number 7.
 23 MR. COLLER: I just want to make sure we're
 24 clear, on 6, there were findings of fact as
 25 part of the Department's recommendations, which

1 Jill, if you'll call the roll, please?
 2 THE SECRETARY: Marshall Bellin?
 3 MR. BELLIN: Yes.
 4 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?
 5 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.
 6 THE SECRETARY: Alberto Perez?
 7 MR. PEREZ: Yes.
 8 THE SECRETARY: Jeff Flanagan?
 9 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes.
 10 MS. MENENDEZ: So you're going backwards?
 11 You're going backwards? You're doing Number 5
 12 first?
 13 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'm going by the
 14 agenda.
 15 MS. MENENDEZ: Oh, okay.
 16 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Agenda Item Number 5.
 17 MR. COLLER: Okay. That was the Comp Plan.
 18 MR. WU: Yes, that was the Comp Plan.
 19 MR. TRIAS: It's the Comp Plan to
 20 Mixed-Use, with regards to the change to
 21 Mixed-Use.
 22 MR. COLLER: Right. Now we're going to
 23 Number 6.
 24 MR. BELLIN: I'll make a motion to approve
 25 Number 6, with -- well, there's no Staff

1 by making it in accordance with the
 2 Department's recommendation, you've adopted
 3 those findings of fact.
 4 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Correct.
 5 MR. COLLER: Okay. So that's clear on that
 6 motion.
 7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So Agenda Item Number
 8 7, which is what Staff is calling Request 3,
 9 the Zoning Code Text Change.
 10 MR. BELLIN: This one deals with the height
 11 issue.
 12 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, and this is important,
 13 because the Mixed-Use doesn't have height or
 14 FAR attached to it, unlike every other Land
 15 Use. So you have to adopt something.
 16 MR. BELLIN: Okay. So I'll make a motion
 17 to approve with Staff's recommendation.
 18 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.
 19 MR. WU: And that is of 120 foot.
 20 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So Staff's
 21 recommendation is 120 feet and maintain the
 22 setback at Grand Avenue.
 23 MR. BELLIN: Yes.
 24 MR. TRIAS: And the 3.5 FAR.
 25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We have a motion.

1 Anybody want to second?
 2 MS. MENENDEZ: I'll second it.
 3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: A motion and a second.
 4 Any further discussion? Hearing none, Jill,
 5 can you call the roll, please?
 6 THE SECRETARY: Alberto Perez?
 7 MR. PEREZ: Yes.
 8 THE SECRETARY: Marshall Bellin?
 9 MR. BELLIN: Yes.
 10 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?
 11 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.
 12 THE SECRETARY: Jeff Flanagan?
 13 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes.
 14 All right. Next item is Agenda Item Number
 15 8.
 16 MR. COLLER: Excuse me for one minute,
 17 Mr. Chairman. Just a housekeeping measure. On
 18 5, apparently there is a Department
 19 recommendation with findings of fact. Is that
 20 correct? So that motion that was made was
 21 approval in accordance with the Department's
 22 recommendation.
 23 MS. MENENDEZ: Yeah, that's how he made it.
 24 MR. TRIAS: Including the findings of fact.
 25 MR. COLLER: Including the findings of

1 fact.
 2 MS. MENENDEZ: He made it like that.
 3 MR. COLLER: He did make it like that?
 4 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.
 5 MR. COLLER: Okay. Very good.
 6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Agenda Item Number 8,
 7 which is Staff's Request Number 4, it's the
 8 Planned Area Development approval.
 9 MR. BELLIN: Again, I'll make a motion to
 10 approve with Staff's recommendations.
 11 MR. WU: And just to clarify whether we're
 12 including the research to eliminate Ponce
 13 access? Does that reside in this ordinance,
 14 Ramon?
 15 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, and also the Mixed-Use, yes.
 16 MR. WU: And to include the employee
 17 parking provision the Applicant suggested in
 18 the record.
 19 MR. BELLIN: Is that really an issue that
 20 we should be concerned with? I mean, it's
 21 their building and the neighbors are across the
 22 street --
 23 MR. WU: Yes, it is, because they might
 24 have to provide additional parking in the
 25 garage.

1 MR. TRIAS: It's a significant issue as it
 2 relates to the design of the Underline. Some
 3 of the parking that has been described here as
 4 public parking is actually in the Underline.
 5 So the idea is that some of that parking could
 6 be relocated into their project, and then have
 7 some kind of management process by which people
 8 can use it.
 9 The Applicant agreed to it, so I think it's
 10 a very good condition.
 11 MR. BELLIN: Okay.
 12 MR. WU: And your motion includes findings
 13 of fact by the Staff report.
 14 MR. BELLIN: Yes.
 15 MS. MENENDEZ: I'll second it.
 16 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We have a motion and
 17 second.
 18 Further discussion?
 19 Jill, call the roll, please.
 20 THE SECRETARY: Marshall Bellin?
 21 MR. BELLIN: Yes.
 22 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?
 23 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.
 24 THE SECRETARY: Alberto Perez?
 25 MR. PEREZ: Yes.

1 THE SECRETARY: Jeff Flanagan?
 2 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No.
 3 Next item is Agenda Item Number 9. This is
 4 the Site Plan review for the MXD, Staff's
 5 Request Number 5.
 6 MR. BELLIN: I'll make a motion to approve
 7 with Staff recommendations.
 8 MR. WU: Including findings of fact.
 9 MR. BELLIN: Yes.
 10 MR. PEREZ: I'll second.
 11 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: A motion and a second.
 12 Any discussion? Hearing none, Jill.
 13 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?
 14 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.
 15 THE SECRETARY: Alberto Perez?
 16 MR. PEREZ: Yes.
 17 THE SECRETARY: Marshall Bellin?
 18 MR. BELLIN: Yes.
 19 THE SECRETARY: Jeff Flanagan?
 20 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No.
 21 All right. Thank you.
 22 MR. TRIAS: Thank you very much.
 23 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We're all done?
 24 MR. TRIAS: That's it. We're done.
 25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Thank you

1 all.
 2 (Thereupon, the hearing was concluded at
 3 8:55 p.m.)
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

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 25th day of May, 2016.
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21 SIGNATURE ON FILE
 22 _____
 23 NIEVES SANCHEZ
 24
 25

Attendance/Speaker Sign In Sheet – May 17, 2016

Planning & Zoning Board Meeting re: Gables Station

	Name	Mailing Address or Email	Phone	(If you wish to speak, please check the box below)
1.	Dr. Brad Richter	4565 Ponce de Leon Blvd	305 667 5821	✓ ①
2.	Jeff Belkowitz	160 Edgewood Tr	305 854 2800	✓ ②
3.	Leona Cooper-Baker	201 Wash. Drive	305-445-6662	✓ ③
4.	Judith J. Davis	236 Washington Dr.	786 449-7211	✓ ④
5.	Roberto Rovina	1107 Lisbon St.	305-588-1276	✓ ⑤
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				
16.				
17.				



Via Email Only: RTrias@CoralGables.com

May 17, 2016

Mr. Ramon Trias
Planning and Zoning Director
The City of Coral Gables
427 Biltmore Way
Coral Gables, Florida 33134

Re: Gables Station

Dear Mr. Trias:

Bahamian Village, LLC (a public-private joint venture with Redevo Grand, LLC and the LBW Homeowners, Inc.) is the owner of 280 South Dixie Highway. Our property is directly across U.S.1 from the proposed Gables Station project.

Gables Station will revitalize the area with its retail, residential units and commitment to the Underline. Most importantly, it will provide a much needed hotel in this area. We do not object to the proposed height. It will not negatively impact our property or our proposed project.

We wholeheartedly support Gables Station.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me.

Sincerely,



Debra Sinkle-Kolsky,
Manager, Redevo Grand LLC
Managing Member, Bahamian Village, LLC

R e d e v c o
11098 Biscayne Blvd
First Floor, Suite 103
Miami, FL 33161
Phone: (305) 981-4500
Fax: (305) 891-0003



LOLA B. WALKER HOMEOWNERS' ASSOCIATION

To the members of the Planning and Zoning Board:

We, the undersigned residents of the MacFarlane Homestead and Lola B. Walker neighborhoods have reviewed the plans for the project known as "Gables Station" and support it.

Name	Address	Email/Phone
Debra Lewis	4710 Jefferson St	3/978-7520
Alory H. Smith	249 Washington Dr	Mary 975 1st bl south net
Elizabeth Russell	224 WASHINGTON DR	305-444-9834
Jaqueline Dixon	220 Washington Dr.	305-446-9219
Andrew S. Tullum	237 WASHINGTON DR.	305-322-7602
Gregory Hawran	234 Washington Dr.	786-348-5528
Leslie H. Cooper	216 Washington Dr ^{Coral Gables FL} 33133	305.529.8801
Frank T. Lundy	208 Jefferson Ave	305-562-0465
Mrs. W. Thomas	208 Jefferson Dr.	305 447 0610
Loretta Stone	216 Jefferson Dr	305-498-5087
Louise Johnson	231 Jefferson Dr	305-202-1396
ADA MARSHALL	235 JEFFERSON DR.	305-444-4278
Willie Mae Williams	200 Jefferson Dr	786-484-4790
Marsha Williams	221 Jefferson Dr	786-257-4600
Brenda Smith	104 Frow Ave	305-444-8550



LOLA B. WALKER HOMEOWNERS' ASSOCIATION

To the members of the Planning and Zoning Board:

We, the undersigned residents of the MacFarlane Homestead and Lola B. Walker neighborhoods have reviewed the plans for the project known as "Gables Station" and support it.

Name	Address	Email/Phone
Shirley Samuel	205 Fla ave	786-277-3224
Mary K. Pyle	221 Florida Ave	786-234-7916
Francina Perry	217 FLA Avenue	786 558 8485
Cynthia Smiley	138 FLORIDA AVE	305-244-1198
April Ingram	118 Florida Ave	786 230 7550
Betty Washington	118 Florida Ave	305-750-7050
Alexander J. Miller	114 Frow Ave	305-767-9791
REGINA SMITH	118 Frow Ave	786-286-8889
Calvin Colton	118 FROW AVE	
Melba Koon	133 Florida Ave	305-443-1324
Ella Collins	156 Frow Ave	305-444-2649
Breanna	156 Frow Ave	305-444-2649
Chelsey H	156 Frow Ave	305-444-2649
Fancy	4706 Jefferson St	305-443-5112
Kash J	145 Frow Ave	786 769-9950



LOLA B. WALKER HOMEOWNERS' ASSOCIATION

To the members of the Planning and Zoning Board:

We, the undersigned residents of the MacFarlane Homestead and Lola B. Walker neighborhoods have reviewed the plans for the project known as "Gables Station" and support it.

Name	Address	Email/Phone
Evelyn Proplet	138 Oak Ave	786-200-1920
Charles Cratit Springer	134 OAK AVE	
Austin Paul Flores	130 OAK AVE	austin paul co@gmail.com
Sonya Young	135 George Allen Ave	786-284-2609
Laurine Davis	130 George Allen Ave	
Barbara Theodore	131 George Allen Ave	
Charles Cratit	4610 BROOKER ST	305-443-8671
MARKET LUNDY	206 JEFFERSON DR	305-562-0465
Mark Mitchell	4716 Brooker Street	305-496-0402



LOLA B. WALKER HOMEOWNERS' ASSOCIATION

To the members of the Planning and Zoning Board:

We, the undersigned residents of the MacFarlane Homestead and Lola B. Walker neighborhoods have reviewed the plans for the project known as "Gables Station" and support it.

Name	Address	Email/Phone
Alexis Davis	236 Washington Drive	(786) 449-7211
Judith Davis	236 Washington Dr	davis_jd@yahoo.com



City of Coral Gables Planning and Zoning Staff Update Memo

Property: Gables Station (215 and 251 South Dixie Highway)

Applicant: NP International, USA

Application: Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment, Zoning Code Map Amendment, Zoning Code Text Amendment, Planned Area Development, Mixed-Use Site Plan

Public Hearing: Planning and Zoning Board / Local Planning Agency

Date & Time: **May 17, 2016, 6:00 – 9:00 p.m.**

Location: City Commission Chambers, City Hall,
405 Biltmore Way, Coral Gables, Florida, 33134

1. APPLICATION UPDATE

Additional material for has been provided for the Gables Station application since the Planning and Zoning Board Staff Report and application packages were distributed on May 12, 2016. The material includes updated architectural design provided by Jorge L. Hernandez, Architect and Underline Design Advisory Committee comments on the site plan and proposed Underline improvements.

These additional materials reflect staff recommendations and conditions of approval included in the Staff Report. Staff supports the general direction of these additional materials, and these materials will be integrated into the record for future public hearings on this application.

2. ATTACHMENTS

- A. Updated building design provided by Jorge L. Hernandez, Architect.
- B. Underline Design Advisory Committee comments dated 16 May, 2016.


Please visit the City's webpage at www.coralgables.com to view all application materials. The complete application also is on file and available for examination during business hours at the Planning Division, 427 Biltmore Way, Suite 201, Coral Gables, Florida, 33134.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. Trias', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Ramon Trias
Director of Planning and Zoning
City of Coral Gables, Florida

Attachment A



US I ELEVATION OF RESIDENCES

1/32" = 1'-0"

These drawings and drawings are the copyrighted property of Jorge L. Hernandez/Architect, P.A. and may not be reproduced or copy in any specific manner without the written consent of the architect. The contractor must check and verify all dimensions of the job and be responsible for any discrepancies in the architect's drawings, communications or work. These drawings are to be used for informational purposes only.

DRAWING
REVISIONS
DATE
BY
SHEET A-1

REVISIONS



JORGE L. HERNANDEZ
Architect
117 Palermo Avenue, Coral Gables, Florida 33134 (305) 774-4022


Gensler
801 First Street, Suite 2000
Miami, FL 33130
305.360.7000

PROJECT:
CONSULTANT:
DATE:
SCALE:
NO.

These drawings and drawings are the copyrighted property of Jorge L. Hernandez y Hernandez, Architect, P.A., and may not be reproduced except with specific written consent of the architect. The contractor must check and verify all dimensions of the job and be responsible for any discrepancies in the architect's communications work. There may not be a scale.

1/16" = 1'-0"

US I ELEVATION OF RESIDENCES



SHEET A-1
DRAWING
REVISIONS
DATE
BY

REVISIONS

▽
▽
▽

JORGE L. HERNANDEZ
Architect
177 Phoenix Avenue, Coral Gables, Florida 33134 (305) 274-0422


Gensler
300 North Dearborn Street
Chicago, IL 60610
312.222.2000

PROJECT
CONSULTANT
ARCHITECT
NO.

These designs and drawings are the copyrighted property of Jorge L. Hernandez, Architect. P.A. and may not be reproduced except with specific written consent of the architect. The contractor shall verify all dimensions of the job and be responsible for any omissions, discrepancies, or errors appearing on drawings or documents in the architect before commencing work. There may need to be work.

1/32" = 1'-0"

NORTH ELEVATION OF RESIDENCES



DRAWING
DATE
11/11/2016
REVISIONS
NO. DATE
SHEET A-1


REVISIONS

JORGE L. HERNANDEZ
Architect
117 Polanco Avenue, Coral Gables, Florida 33174 (305) 774-0022

Gensler
081881840, 200-770-
7000, 11/11/2016
02, 02/02/09

PROJECT
CONSULTANTS
ARCHITECT
GENERAL CONTRACTOR
NO.

PROJECT: CURTAIN WALL AND GLAZING SYSTEM	Gensler 1011 15th Avenue, Suite 2000 New York, NY 10019 Tel: 212 512 2000 Fax: 212 512 2000	117 Palmetto Avenue, Coral Gables, Florida 33134 (PH) 7744022	JORGE L. HERNANDEZ Architect	DRAWING: PLAN NO. 04 DATE: REVISIONS:	SHEET A-1
					DATE:




PLAN OF BRIDGE AND SQUARE

3/32" = 1'-0"

These drawings and drawings are the copyrighted property of Jorge L. Hernandez Architect P.C. and may not be reproduced except with specific written consent of the architect. The contractor must check and verify all dimensions of the job and be responsible for any reporting any discrepancies to the architect before commencing work. Please see one of the notes.

These drawings and drawings are the copyrighted property of Jorge L. Hernandez / Architect. It is not to be reproduced, copied, or used in any way without the written consent of the architect. The contractor must check and verify all dimensions of the job and be responsible for errors, omissions and discrepancies in the architect's drawings commencing work. Drawing not to be used.

SECTION THRU SQUARE, FACING RESIDENTIAL BUILDING
3/32" = 1'-0"



DRAWING
DATE
BY
CHECKED BY
REVISIONS

REVISIONS
▽
▽
▽
▽

JORGE L. HERNANDEZ
Architect
177 Dianna Avenue, Coral Gables, Florida 33134 (305) 774-4022

GENSLER
300 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10017
212.279.7000

PROJECT
DATE
BY
CHECKED BY
REVISIONS


PROJECT
NO. 004
DATE 11/15/11
DRAWING NO. 021
GENTLER ARCHITECTS
1111 Broadway, Suite 2100
New York, NY 10018
GENSLER
100 W. 40th Street
New York, NY 10018
TEL: 212.677.2000
WWW.GENSLER.COM

NO. 004
DATE 11/15/11
DRAWING NO. 021

117 Palumbo Avenue, Card Cobble, Bronx, NY 10474 (319) 774-6211
JORGE L. HERNANDEZ
Architect

REVISIONS
DATE
DRAWING NO.

SHEET A-1
DATE
DRAWING NO.




CROSS SECTION THRU SQUARE, FACING US 1

3/32" = 1'-0"

These drawings and drawings are the copyrighted property of Jorge L. Hernandez Architects, P.A. and may not be reproduced except with specific written consent of the architect. The contractor shall check and verify all dimensions of the job and be responsible for any discrepancies in the architect before commencing work. Nothing said in the work.

DRAWING DATE 11.13.19 11.13.19 11.13.19	SHEET A-1	REVISIONS
		PROJECT CONSULTANTS XXX COURTESY XXX COURTESY NO.



US 1 ELEVATION OF BRIDGE


1/8" = 1'-0"

These designs and drawings are the copyrighted property of Jorge L. Hernandez Architects, P.A., and may not be reproduced, copied, or used in any manner without the written consent of the architect. The contractor must check and verify all dimensions of the job and be responsible for any omissions, errors, discrepancies, or omissions in the architect's drawings, statements, or work. Design not to be worked.

JORGE L. HERNANDEZ
 Architect
 117 Palermo Avenue, Coral Gables, Florida 33134 (305) 774-4023

Gensler
 Miami, FL 33130
 2012 W. 15th St.
 Suite 200
 Miami, FL 33130

FACADE STUDY NEW ELEVATION



DRAFT



MEMO

16 May 2016

TO: The Underline: Design Advisory Committee

FROM: Roberto Rovira, DAC Chair

SUBJECT: The Underline Design Advisory Committee Comments on NPI's Gables Station (215 and 251 South Dixie Highway)

Studio Roberto Rovira
Roberto Rovira Incorporated
P. O. Box 140472
Coral Gables, FL 33114

T 786.529.7112
C 305.588.1276
studio@robertorovira.com

www.robertorovira.com

The following comments are submitted on behalf of The Underline (UL) Design Advisory Committee (DAC) re: the subject property.

1. PROJECT INFORMATION: Gables Station is located in the South Industrial Mixed-Use District, adjacent to Gables Ponce I and II, and close to the Village of Merrick Park and the Douglas Metrorail Station. The mixed-use project encompasses an entire city block and includes hotel, residential, and ground floor commercial uses. Site Area: 1 City Block: 4.46 Acres or 194,223 sf (Appendix A).
2. BACKGROUND:
 - Members of the Underline DAC and Friends of the Underline met with NPI's Brent Reynolds on 04APR2016 to review plans for Gables Station.
 - Comments provided herein reflect DAC's assessment of the subject property's consistency with DAC's Goals, Vision and Mission, noted below in Appendix B.
 - DAC is in the process of establishing a comprehensive Underline Development Review Manual whose goal is to provide clear design guidelines that will more specifically inform the design of the subject project.
3. OVERALL ASSESSMENT: The Underline's Design Advisory Committee considers that the design of the Gables Station project **is consistent** with the goals and vision of The Underline and offers the following comments and recommendations vis-à-vis The Underline DAC's Design Criteria listed below:
 1. *The project is consistent with the DAC Goals, Mission & Vision: **Consistent:***
 - i. The addition of 2 acres of publicly accessible plazas, courtyards, arcades and paseos and 4 acres of public open space as part of The Underline project will enhance a highly visible section of The Underline and set a valuable precedent for development that is mutually complementary to The Underline's Goals, Mission & Vision.
 2. *Is consistent with the UL Master Plan: **Consistent:***
 - i. The project's connections to bike and pedestrian facilities, landscape improvements, and protected pedestrian arcades throughout are consistent with the pedestrian, bike-friendly enhancements outlined in the Masterplan.

- ii. *Note:* The Underline Master Plan categorizes the adjacent intersection as “Major” which indicates considering “*grade separated crossings*” [per Appendix C]. US1 Pedestrian and Bicycle Mobility Improvements will require review by FDOT and further assessment by UL DAC.
- 3. *Promotes connectivity and public access to the Underline:* **Partially Consistent:**
 - i. While the project provides opportunities to reduce the traffic in the area by encouraging residents and visitors to walk, bike or ride transit, the DAC submits the following issues for consideration:
 - 1. Significant Surface Parking lots in areas immediately adjacent to The Underline:
 - a. Consider landscape and material strategies to mitigate storm water runoff and negative visual impact of an uninterrupted surface lot
 - b. Consider developing a remote shared parking agreement to reduce surface parking in areas adjacent to The Underline
 - 2. Distance/Separation between project’s ground level mixed-use facilities and The Underline’s pedestrian paths:
 - a. Consider routing pedestrian paths as close to ground level mixed-use as possible to maximize visibility, awareness and commerce
 - b. Consider situating UL pedestrian paths closer if not adjacent to Gables Station with generous, shaded sidewalks (as opposed to locating these adjacent to Ponce de Leon).
 - 3. Vehicular Circulation and Footprint:
 - a. Consider minimizing the vehicular right-of-way footprint by implementing one-way southbound traffic and using the subsequently added area for a more generous shaded walkway adjacent to the proposed Gables Station buildings
 - b. Consider implementing “woonerf” techniques for traffic calming, low speed, shared street space that does not separate users.
 - 4. Traffic conflicts with vehicular crossings and curb cuts across The Underline:
 - a. Consider minimizing if not entirely eliminating vehicular crossings and curb cuts across The UL right-of-way
 - b. Ensure best practices for signalization, visibility and crossing awareness of users to minimize vehicular conflicts
 - 5. Loading Zones:
 - a. Minimize visual and acoustic impact on users through visual screening and scheduling that minimizes conflicts
- 4. *Enhances the natural environment:* **Consistent**
 - i. The project proposes adding new landscape, natural features and tree canopy coverage to an area that is currently developed and zoned industrial.
- 5. *Enhances and responds to the urban context:* **Consistent**
 - i. The project proposes adding new landscape, natural features and tree canopy coverage to an area that is currently developed and zoned industrial.

MEMO




Studio Roberto Rovira
Roberto Rovira Incorporated
P. O. Box 140472
Coral Gables, FL 33114

T 786.529.7112
C 305.588.1276
studio@robertorovira.com


www.robertorovira.com

6. *Will not compromise public health, safety and welfare:* **Consistent**
7. *Surrounding property, persons, and neighborhood values will be enhanced:* **Consistent**
8. *The applicant has the necessary skills and resources to execute the project:* **Consistent**
9. *Promotes health and wellbeing:* **Consistent**
 - i. The project will contribute 4 acres of publicly accessible open space to encourage pedestrian and bicycle mobility
10. *Maximizes impact and value within the UL masterplan:* **Consistent**
 - i. The highly visible and significant addition of publicly accessible open space will establish a valuable precedent for The Underline and provide an equally important complementary use.
11. *Promotes cultural enhancement and civic engagement:* **Consistent**
 - i. The applicant proposes providing a contribution to the Art in Public Places Fund in compliance with Zoning Code regulations

Block, Lot and Section Location Map



Existing Zoning Map



MEMO



APPENDIX B

GOALS of DAC:

- To advocate for great design that achieves the vision and the opportunity of The Underline
- To safeguard the design integrity of The Underline
- To ensure a complementary and unified vision for The Underline and its adjacent urban corridor
- To serve as a valuable resource for entities with jurisdiction and/or interests in building and planning in and around The Underline

Studio Roberto Rovira
Roberto Rovira Incorporated
P. O. Box 140472
Coral Gables, FL 33114

T 786.529.7112
C 305.588.1276
studio@robertorovira.com

www.robertorovira.com

VISION and MISSION of DAC:

- **VISION:** The Design Advisory Committee will be an essential resource to The Underline by providing valuable design direction that maximizes the opportunities and vision of the project and its contributions to this vital urban corridor.
- **MISSION:** Our mission is to provide design clarity and to facilitate an informed design process that is a resource to The Underline and to entities with jurisdiction and/or interest in The Underline for the betterment of the local and regional community.

DESIGN CRITERIA:

1. The project is consistent with the DAC Goals, Mission & Vision
2. Is consistent with the UL Master Plan
3. Promotes connectivity and public access to the Underline
4. Enhances the natural environment
5. Enhances and responds to the urban context
6. Will not compromise public health, safety and welfare
7. Surrounding property, persons, and neighborhood values will be enhanced
8. The applicant has the necessary skills and resources to execute the project
9. Promotes health and wellbeing
10. Maximizes impact and value within the UL masterplan
11. Promotes cultural enhancement and civic engagement


APPENDIX C

INTERSECTIONS CATEGORIES OF IMPROVEMENTS

The Underline crosses a number of arterial, state and local roads. At each intersection, there are varying degrees of safety and traffic issues to resolve. While each intersection has its unique nuances in terms of geometry and traffic organization, the Framework Plus seeks to develop an order of magnitude approach by categorizing the intersections into those that require minor, medium and major improvements.

ESTABLISH THREE TYPES OF INTERSECTION APPROACHES:

- + **MAJOR IMPROVEMENTS - 5 INTERSECTIONS**
CONSIDER GRADE SEPARATED CROSSINGS
- + **MEDIUM IMPROVEMENTS - 7 INTERSECTIONS**
CONSIDER TABLED CROSSINGS
- + **MINOR IMPROVEMENTS (BEST PRACTICES FOR THE ENTIRE CORRIDOR) - 14 INTERSECTIONS**
CONSIDER PATH REALIGNMENT & WIDER CROSSWALKS



MEMO



APPENDIX D


Studio Roberto Rovira
Roberto Rovira Incorporated
P. O. Box 140472
Coral Gables, FL 33114

T 786.529.7112
C 305.588.1276
studio@robertorovira.com

www.robertorovira.com

DAC COMMITTEE Members:



1. Roberto Rovira, DAC Chair, Associate Professor FIU LAEUD & Principal Studio Roberto Rovira (studio@robertorovira.com)
2. Rodolphe elKhoury, DAC Co-Chair, Professor & Dean UM School of Architecture (relkhoury@miami.edu)
3. Grace Perdomo, Senior Urban Designer, Zyscovich Architects (gperdomo@zyscovich.com)
4. Marsh Kriplen, Principal MAKWork Landscape Architecture / Architecture (marsh@makwork.com)
5. Gianni Feoli: Director of Landscape Urbanism, Calvin Giordano & Associates; FIU Landscape Architecture + EUD Faculty (GFeoli@cgasolutions.com)
6. Josemaria de Churtichaga, University of Miami School of Architecture, Associate Dean and Associate Professor of Architecture; Director, Master of Architecture Program (jmchurtichaga@miami.edu)
7. Henry Rueda: FIU Architecture Faculty, Director of Rueda & Vera Arquitectos (rueadahenry@gmail.com)
8. Irene Hegedus, City of Miami Chief of Transit Enhancements (formerly Zoning Administrator for the City of Miami) (ihgedus@miamidade.gov)
9. Rocco Ceo, UM Professor of Architecture (rceo@miami.edu)
10. Subcommittee Liaison: Maria Nardi, Chief of Planning and Research at Miami-Dade County Miami-Dade Parks Department.







Gables Station



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP AMENDMENT
ZONING MAP AMENDMENT
ZONING CODE TEXT AMENDMENT
PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT
MIXED USE SITE PLAN

215 AND 251 S. DIXIE HIGHWAY
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
MAY 17, 2016










REQUEST #1:
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP AMENDMENT



REQUEST #2:
ZONING CODE MAP AMENDMENT



REQUEST #3:
ZONING CODE TEXT AMENDMENT

REQUEST #4:
PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT

REQUEST #5:
MIXED USE SITE PLAN








REVIEW TIMELINE	
1	DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE: 01.29.16 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP, ZONING MAP, ZONING TEXT, PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT, MIXED-USE SITE PLAN
2	BOARD OF ARCHITECTS: 04.28.16 PRELIMINARY DESIGN AND MEDITERRANEAN BONUS
3	NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING: 04.27.16 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP, ZONING MAP, ZONING TEXT, PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT, MIXED-USE SITE PLAN
4	PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD: 05.17.16 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP, ZONING MAP, ZONING TEXT, PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT, MIXED-USE SITE PLAN


STAFF REVIEW			
DEPARTMENT	DRC 01.29.16	STAFF MEETING 05.09.16	COMMENTS PROVIDED?
HISTORICAL	X	X	YES
PARKING	X	X	YES
LANDSCAPE	X	X	YES
CONCURRENCY	X	X	YES
POLICE	X		YES
FIRE		X	YES
PUBLIC WORKS	X	X	YES
ZONING	X	X	YES
BOA		X	YES
PLANNING	X	X	YES
BUILDING	X	X	YES
ECONOMIC		X	YES

LETTERS TO PROPERTY OWNERS (1,500 FT)



PUBLIC NOTIFICATION	
2 TIMES	LETTERS TO PROPERTY OWNERS NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING, PZB
3 TIMES	PROPERTY POSTING DRC, BOA, PZB
3 TIMES	WEBSITE POSTING DRC, BOA, PZB
1 TIMES	NEWSPAPER ADVERTISEMENT PZB

REQUEST #1: COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP



19

REQUEST #1: COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP

FINDINGS OF FACT: (SEE STAFF REPORT FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS)

STANDARD	STAFF EVALUATION
WHETHER IT SPECIFICALLY ADVANCES ANY OBJECTIVE OR POLICY OF THE COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE PLAN.	COMPLIES.
WHETHER IT IS INTERNALLY CONSISTENT WITH COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE PLAN.	COMPLIES.
ITS EFFECT ON THE LEVEL OF SERVICE OF PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE.	COMPLIES.
ITS EFFECT ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES.	COMPLIES.
ITS EFFECT ON THE AVAILABILITY OF HOUSING THAT IS AFFORDABLE TO PEOPLE WHO LIVE OR WORK IN THE CITY OF CORAL GABLES.	COMPLIES.
ANY OTHER EFFECT THAT THE CITY DETERMINES IS RELEVANT TO THE CITY COMMISSION'S DECISION ON THE APPLICATION.	COMPLIES.

20


REQUEST #1: COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

STAFF RECOMMENDS APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP AMENDMENT.

THE STANDARDS IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 3-1506 FOR THE PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP AMENDMENT ARE SATISFIED.

REQUEST #2: ZONING MAP



REQUEST #2: ZONING MAP

FINDINGS OF FACT: (SEE STAFF REPORT FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS)

STANDARD	STAFF EVALUATION
IT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.	COMPLIES.
IMPROVE MOBILITY BY REDUCING VEHICLE MILES TRAVELLED FOR NEARBY RESIDENTS.	COMPLIES.
PROMOTE HIGH-QUALITY DEVELOPMENT OR REDEVELOPMENT IN AN AREA THAT IS EXPERIENCING DECLINING OR FLAT PROPERTY VALUES.	COMPLIES.
CREATE AFFORDABLE HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PEOPLE WHO LIVE OR WORK IN THE CITY OF CORAL GABLES.	COMPLIES.
IT IMPLEMENTS THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.	COMPLIES.
WILL NOT DECREASE THE VALUE OF ADJACENT PROPERTIES.	COMPLIES.

23

REQUEST #2: ZONING MAP

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

STAFF RECOMMENDS APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED ZONING MAP AMENDMENT.

THE STANDARDS IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 3-1404 FOR THE PROPOSED ZONING MAP AMENDMENT ARE SATISFIED.

24

REQUEST #3: ZONING CODE TEXT

THE REQUESTED ZONING CODE TEXT AMENDMENT IS SHOWN BELOW WITH PROPOSED CHANGES IN STRIKETHROUGH/UNDERLINE FORMAT.

Section A-66 – MacFarlane Homestead.

C. Height of buildings.

1. No commercial, residential, or mixed use buildings and/or structures shall be erected or altered on the following described property to exceed ~~six (6) stories or seventy two (72)~~ one hundred and sixty (160) feet in height, whichever is less:

MacFarlane Homestead and St. Albans Park.

a. Tracts A and B, Block 5.

b. Tract 1.

E. Setbacks-Minimum front.

~~On all building sites abutting Grand Avenue Twenty (20) feet from Grand Avenue.~~

25

REQUEST #3: ZONING CODE TEXT

THE REQUESTED ZONING CODE TEXT AMENDMENT IS SHOWN BELOW WITH PROPOSED CHANGES IN STRIKETHRU/UNDERLINE FORMAT.

G. Floor area ratio (FAR) Provisions for mixed use buildings.

Maximum floor area ratio (FAR) for mixed use buildings on the following described property shall not exceed 3.5

MacFarlane Homestead and St. Albans Park.

a. Tracts A and B, Block 5.

b. Tract 1.

H. Density Requirements.

The density for mixed use buildings on the following described property shall not exceed 104 units per acre.

MacFarlane Homestead and St. Albans Park.

a. Tracts A and B, Block 5.

b. Tract 1.

26

REQUEST #3: ZONING CODE TEXT

FINDINGS OF FACT: (SEE STAFF REPORT FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS)

STANDARD	STAFF EVALUATION
PROMOTES THE PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE.	MAY COMPLY.
DOES NOT PERMIT USES THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN PROHIBITS IN THE AREA AFFECTED BY THE DISTRICT BOUNDARY CHANGE OR TEXT AMENDMENT.	COMPLIES.
DOES NOT ALLOW DENSITIES OR INTENSITIES IN EXCESS OF THE DENSITIES AND INTENSITIES WHICH ARE PERMITTED BY THE FUTURE LAND USE CATEGORIES OF THE AFFECTED PROPERTY.	COMPLIES.
WILL NOT CAUSE A DECLINE IN THE LEVEL OF SERVICE FOR PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE WHICH IS THE SUBJECT OF A CONCURRENCY REQUIREMENT TO A LEVEL OF SERVICE WHICH IS LESS THAN THE MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.	COMPLIES.
DOES NOT DIRECTLY CONFLICT WITH AN OBJECTIVE OR POLICY OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.	COMPLIES.

REQUEST #3: ZONING CODE TEXT

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

STAFF RECOMMENDS APPROVAL WITH MODIFICATIONS OF THE PROPOSED ZONING CODE TEXT AMENDMENT.

THE STANDARDS IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 3-1405 FOR THE PROPOSED ZONING CODE TEXT AMENDMENT MAY BE SATISFIED, WITH MODIFICATIONS:


1. BUILDING SETBACKS

THE REQUEST TO REMOVE SETBACK REQUIREMENTS ON GRAND AVENUE SHOULD BE OMITTED.

2. BUILDING HEIGHT

MAXIMUM HABITABLE BUILDING HEIGHT SHOULD BE 120 FEET.

REQUEST #4: PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT



REQUEST #4: PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT

Site Area

- 4.46 acres (194,223 sf)

Floor Area (FAR)

- 3.5 FAR (679,758 sf)

Height

Building A

- 13 Stories
- 160' Habitable Height

Building B and C

- 12 Stories
- 148' Habitable Height

Program

- 57,374 sf Ground floor retail
- 147 Hotel Rooms
- 16 Studio Units
- 276 One-bedroom Units
- 120 Two-bedroom Units
- 48 Three-bedroom Units
- 2 acres on-site open space
- 4 acres of Underline open space improvements

Parking

- 969 spaces

REQUEST #4: PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT

PUBLIC BENEFITS

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Approximately two (2) acres of publicly-accessible open space on the project site, in the form of plazas, courtyards, arcades, and paseos. 2. Funding, Design, and Construction of approximately four (4) acres of public open space along the adjacent Metrorail right-of-way, as part of the Underline project, including connections to a regional bike and pedestrian facility. 3. Contributions to the Coral Gables trolley system to fund capital investments and operations of a trolley extension from Douglas Metrorail Station to the University of Miami campus, for a period of twenty (20) years. 4. Mobility improvements along US1, including additional crosswalks, subject to FDOT approval. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Improved public parking options around the site, including parallel parking along the internal driveway and potential public parking spaces within the parking garage. 6. Improved landscape and pedestrian realm along US1. 7. Bicycle parking and bicycle support facilities. 8. Reserved space for future bicycle sharing and car sharing facilities. 9. Electric car-charging stations. 10. LEED Silver or equivalent green building certification. 11. Covered, protected pedestrian arcades throughout the project, along all streets and fronting the courtyard and the internal driveway. |
|---|--|

31

REQUEST #4: PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT

FINDINGS OF FACT: (SEE STAFF REPORT FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS)

STANDARD	STAFF EVALUATION
IN WHAT RESPECTS THE PROPOSED PLAN IS OR IS NOT CONSISTENT WITH THE STATED PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE PAD REGULATIONS.	COMPLIES.
THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE PROPOSED PLAN DEPARTS FROM THE ZONING AND SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS OTHERWISE APPLICABLE TO THE SUBJECT PROPERTY.	COMPLIES.
THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE PROPOSED PLAN MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS AND STANDARDS OF THE PAD REGULATIONS.	COMPLIES.
THE PHYSICAL DESIGN OF THE PROPOSED PAD AND THE MANNER IN WHICH SAID DESIGN DOES OR DOES NOT MAKE ADEQUATE PROVISION FOR PUBLIC SERVICES, VEHICULAR TRAFFIC, DESIGNATED COMMON OPEN AREAS, AND ACCESS TO LIGHT AND AIR, RECREATION AND VISUAL ENJOYMENT.	COMPLIES.

32

REQUEST #4: PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT

FINDINGS OF FACT: (SEE STAFF REPORT FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS)

STANDARD	STAFF EVALUATION
THE COMPATIBILITY OF THE PROPOSED PAD WITH THE ADJACENT PROPERTIES AND NEIGHBORHOOD AS WELL AS THE CURRENT NEIGHBORHOOD CONTEXT INCLUDING CURRENT USES.	COMPLIES.
THE DESIRABILITY OF THE PROPOSED PAD TO PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE ENTIRE COMMUNITY.	COMPLIES.
THE CONFORMITY OF THE PROPOSED PAD WITH THE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES AND FUTURE LAND USE MAPS OF THE CITY OF CORAL GABLES COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.	COMPLIES.

33

REQUEST #4: PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:


STAFF RECOMMENDS APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS OF THE PROPOSED PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT.

THE STANDARDS IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 3-503 FOR THE PROPOSED PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT ARE SATISFIED, SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL.

34

REQUEST #5: MIXED USE SITE PLAN

Perspective of Gables Station, Looking North on US1



REQUEST #5: MIXED USE SITE PLAN

FINDINGS OF FACT: (SEE STAFF REPORT FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS)

STANDARD	STAFF EVALUATION
THE PROPOSED CONDITIONAL USE IS CONSISTENT WITH AND FURTHERS THE GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES OF THE COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE PLAN AND FURTHERS THE PURPOSES OF THESE REGULATIONS AND OTHER CITY ORDINANCES AND ACTIONS DESIGNED TO IMPLEMENT THE PLAN.	COMPLIES.
THE AVAILABLE USE TO WHICH THE PROPERTY MAY BE PUT IS APPROPRIATE TO THE PROPERTY THAT IS SUBJECT TO THE PROPOSED CONDITIONAL USE AND COMPATIBLE WITH EXISTING AND PLANNED USES IN THE AREA.	COMPLIES.
THE PROPOSED CONDITIONAL USE DOES NOT CONFLICT WITH THE NEEDS AND CHARACTER OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD AND THE CITY.	COMPLIES.
THE PROPOSED CONDITIONAL USE WILL NOT ADVERSELY OR UNREASONABLY AFFECT THE USE OF OTHER PROPERTY IN THE AREA.	COMPLIES.

REQUEST #5: MIXED USE SITE PLAN

FINDINGS OF FACT: (SEE STAFF REPORT FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS)

STANDARD	STAFF EVALUATION
THE PROPOSED USE IS COMPATIBLE WITH ADJACENT USES, BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES AND WILL NOT ADVERSELY AFFECT THE ADJACENT USES, BUILDINGS OR STRUCTURES.	COMPLIES.
THE PARCEL PROPOSED FOR DEVELOPMENT IS ADEQUATE IN SIZE FOR ALL DEVELOPMENT FEATURES.	COMPLIES.
THE NATURE OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT IS NOT DETRIMENTAL TO THE HEALTH, SAFETY AND GENERAL WELFARE OF THE COMMUNITY.	COMPLIES.
THE DESIGN OF THE PROPOSED DRIVEWAYS, CIRCULATION PATTERNS AND PARKING IS WELL DEFINED TO PROMOTE VEHICULAR AND PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION.	COMPLIES.
THE PROPOSED CONDITIONAL USE SATISFIES THE CONCURRENCY STANDARDS OF ARTICLE 3, DIVISION 13.	COMPLIES.

37

REQUEST #5: MIXED USE SITE PLAN

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

STAFF RECOMMENDS APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS OF THE PROPOSED MIXED USE SITE PLAN.

THE STANDARDS IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 3-408 FOR THE PROPOSED CONDITIONAL USE SITE PLAN ARE SATISFIED, SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL.

38

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CONSISTENCY

Staff's determination is that this application is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan Goals, Objectives and Policies.


CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. To be completed prior to City Commission 1st Reading:

- a. Building Height. Revise the project to have a maximum habitable building height of 120 feet.
- b. Public Works Review. Public Works, and other State and County agencies, shall review and approve the Traffic Impact Study and the Civil Engineering Plans.
- c. Landscape Plans. Complete Landscape and Tree Mitigation Plans shall be provided for staff review and approval.
- d. Architectural Plans – Dimensions. Provide dimensions and property lines on all floor plans, sections and elevations.
- e. Architectural Plans – Elevations. Provide the south elevation of Building C and the north elevation of Building B.


CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

Building Height: Building A



CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

Building Height: Building B and C




CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

5. Prior to issuance of the first Building Permit:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Mobility Contribution b. US1 Pedestrian Improvements c. Emergency Vehicle Signal Preemption Contribution d. Underline Improvements e. On Street Parking f. Additional City Reviews g. Peer Reviews and Inspections h. Landscape Plan i. Signage j. Building Height k. Parking Garage Design l. Ground Floor Design m. Loading and Service | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> n. Garage Pedestrian Access o. Paseos p. Pedestrian Circulation q. Construction Staging Plan r. Traffic Improvements s. Encroachment Plan t. Encroachment Agreement u. Bond to Restore Property v. Bond for Offsite Improvements w. Construction Notices x. Bicycle Amenities y. Car Sharing Facilities z. Electric Car Charging Facilities aa. Gateway Landmarks |
|--|--|


CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

Underline Improvements



CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:


US1 Pedestrian Improvements




CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

6. Prior to issuance of the first Certificate of Occupancy:
 - a. Underground Utilities
 - b. Art in Public Places
 - c. Employee Parking Plan
 - d. Traffic Improvements and Study
 - e. Bicycle / Pedestrian Plan
 - f. Valet Operations Plan
 - g. Taxi Management Plan
 - h. Traffic Flow Modifications
 - i. Right-of-Way and Public Realm Improvements
 - j. Underground Utilities
 - k. Utility Upgrades
 - l. Publicly Accessible Open Spaces Easement
 - m. LEED

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:
Publicly Accessible Open Spaces



DESIGN UPDATES: 05.17.16





Gables Station

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP AMENDMENT
ZONING MAP AMENDMENT
ZONING CODE TEXT AMENDMENT
PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT
MIXED USE SITE PLAN

215 AND 251 S. DIXIE HIGHWAY
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
MAY 17, 2016



