

1 of the meeting that was held on September 11,
 2 2019.
 3 MS. ANDERSON: I'll second it.
 4 MR. BEHAR: Any comments, any
 5 clarifications to be made?
 6 MR. MURAI: Yes, I do. Page 179, Line --
 7 you don't have to look at it, it's nothing --
 8 Line 5, the secretary called my brother rather
 9 than me. So I want that changed to Rene,
 10 rather than Andy, please.
 11 THE SECRETARY: Yes.
 12 MR. MURAI: Thank you.
 13 MS. VELEZ: And I have, on Page 87, line
 14 12, I think that should have been "detail" not
 15 "retail."
 16 MR. BEHAR: Any additional changes? If
 17 not, we'll call a motion for approval. We have
 18 a motion and a second. Call the roll, please.
 19 THE SECRETARY: Rene Murai?
 20 MR. MURAI: Rene, yes.
 21 THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?
 22 MR. TORRE: Yes.
 23 THE SECRETARY: Maria Velez?
 24 MS. VELEZ: Yes.
 25 THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?

1 first Ordinance.
 2 MR. COLLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
 3 Item E-1, an Ordinance of the City
 4 Commission of Coral Gables, Florida providing
 5 for text amendments to the City of Coral Gables
 6 Official Zoning Code, Article 5, "Development
 7 Standards," Division 8, "Docks, Wharves,
 8 Mooring Piles and Watercraft Moorings,"
 9 updating side setback requirements and allowing
 10 multi-level docks below established grade,
 11 providing for a repealer provision, providing
 12 for a severability clause, codification, and
 13 providing for an effective date. Item E-1,
 14 public hearing.
 15 MR. CEJAS: Good evening, Devon Cejas,
 16 Deputy Development Services Director and Zoning
 17 Official. E-1 is some minor cleanup language,
 18 as it relates to docks, to further the intent
 19 that was cleaned up about a year ago, to create
 20 some additional flexibility via the Board of
 21 Architects' review and approval for side
 22 setbacks of docks and also to clarify the
 23 intent of double-decker docks, that that means
 24 anything above grade, to not affect what needs
 25 to occur, we need to set some of these higher

1 MR. WITHERS: Yes.
 2 THE SECRETARY: Rhonda Anderson?
 3 MS. ANDERSON: Yes.
 4 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?
 5 MR. BEHAR: Yes.
 6 Next is, we already made the changes to the
 7 agenda.
 8 We're going to start the public hearing.
 9 Do we have any members of the audience that
 10 would like to speak tonight? If so, could you
 11 please stand up --
 12 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman -- yes, go ahead.
 13 MR. BEHAR: Can you come up, please, a
 14 second so we could hear you, for the record?
 15 MS. REGISTER: I do want to speak later,
 16 but that's on the Zoning, the last three items.
 17 So do you want me to speak now or I can just
 18 wait --
 19 MR. BEHAR: No, we're going to swear you
 20 in.
 21 MS. REGISTER: Oh, swear me in? Okay.
 22 (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.)
 23 MR. BEHAR: Thank you.
 24 Mr. Trias.
 25 MR. TRIAS: The attorney will read the

1 elevations that these docks exist, and if there
 2 are any questions.
 3 MR. BEHAR: Any questions?
 4 MR. MURAI: This change will not permit the
 5 boat to extend beyond the side of the house?
 6 MR. CEJAS: Right. So today the side
 7 setbacks for docks are equivalent to the
 8 building side setbacks. So what we're doing
 9 is, allowing a little bit more flexibility on
 10 the side. Sometimes there's impediments along
 11 the shoreline of residential properties, but
 12 essentially nothing beyond five feet.
 13 So you can go from the side setbacks of a
 14 building to five feet, so long as DERM has
 15 approved those plans, meaning that it needs to
 16 go to the County and the additional alleviation
 17 has to go to the Board of Architects.
 18 MR. MURAI: So there still would be a
 19 five-foot setback?
 20 MR. CEJAS: Correct. Correct. There
 21 still will be a setback.
 22 MR. BEHAR: At minimum five feet.
 23 MR. CEJAS: At minimum five feet. It could
 24 be greater, depending if the Board of --
 25 MS. VELEZ: But that's not specified here.

1 It doesn't say five feet anywhere, at least I
 2 didn't see that.
 3 MR. CEJAS: Yeah, it was my impression that
 4 the five-foot was there.
 5 MS. VELEZ: It would make sense, but it's
 6 not here.
 7 MR. TORRE: It would be A.
 8 MR. CEJAS: Yeah, A.
 9 MS. VELEZ: Oh, there it is. Outward from
 10 the bank.
 11 MR. TORRE: Yeah, it's Section A.
 12 MR. BEHAR: But Section A says, five feet
 13 outward --
 14 MS. VELEZ: Outward from the bank.
 15 MR. MURAI: Not from the side.
 16 MS. ANDERSON: How about from the sides?
 17 MS. VELEZ: Maybe add some language there.
 18 MR. CEJAS: We'll take care of that.
 19 MR. WITHERS: So I just have a general
 20 question.
 21 MR. CEJAS: Sure.
 22 MR. WITHERS: So when you say, just little
 23 cleanup here and there, does this then go for
 24 actual legislative action by the City
 25 Commission? Or is this just, you're cleaning

1 Attorney?
 2 MR. TRIAS: One more reading.
 3 MR. WITHERS: For this final Second
 4 Reading?
 5 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 6 MR. BEHAR: Then, Mr. Cejas, please make
 7 sure you that you do specify the minimum
 8 setback, to make sure that everybody is clear
 9 of that.
 10 MR. CEJAS: Absolutely.
 11 MR. MURAI: I guess I just have one
 12 question. You know, if you have a very large
 13 yacht, I wonder whether that's obstructing the
 14 enjoyment of the views from adjoining
 15 neighbors, you know, when -- I mean, I think
 16 when you let it go all of the way to five feet,
 17 you know. I mean, it's okay for a small boat,
 18 but if you have a huge -- one of these huge
 19 boats --
 20 MR. CEJAS: A larger vessel today can
 21 extend beyond the deck. So the deck doesn't
 22 constrain the boat. That's limited by,
 23 obviously, DERM approval. So when they go to
 24 DERM, DERM also reviews the vessel. If they
 25 purchase a vessel after the fact, that's

1 up? I mean, I can see where there's
 2 inconsistencies.
 3 MR. CEJAS: There are some inconsistencies.
 4 MR. WITHERS: You know, and I guess that
 5 just is taken care of without legislative
 6 action, but the actual changes like this
 7 actually go to the Commission?
 8 MR. CEJAS: Of course, yes. This has to go
 9 to the City Commission for a change to the
 10 Zoning Ordinance.
 11 MS. VELEZ: It says on Page 2 that these
 12 amendments were already approved at First
 13 Reading. So I guess they have to go back.
 14 MR. CEJAS: Yes, it does have to go back.
 15 MR. WITHERS: That was my question. Okay.
 16 That was going to be my next question. Because
 17 if it has already been read, why are we seeing
 18 it, if it's already --
 19 MR. CEJAS: It was First Reading for title
 20 and there were some issues with the deadlines,
 21 but it definitely does have to go back for
 22 Final Reading, Second Reading, on these text
 23 amendments.
 24 MR. WITHERS: So for two more readings or
 25 just one more reading? Do you know, Mr. City

1 something that we can look at from an
 2 enforcement standpoint.
 3 MR. MURAI: No, but my point is that if the
 4 vessel a very large vessel, in height and
 5 whatever, and you're going to take it all of
 6 the way to five feet, I mean, I'm just
 7 wondering whether you're obstructing the
 8 neighbors.
 9 MR. BEHAR: What are currently the
 10 requirements today?
 11 MR. CEJAS: For a vessel itself -- there is
 12 no requirements for the vessels unless -- the
 13 only requirements that I know that exist for
 14 vessels is that it must park parallel to the
 15 dock.
 16 MR. MURAI: But you can go -- I'm sorry.
 17 MR. BEHAR: But you're right. You're
 18 getting to the point.
 19 MR. MURAI: Yeah. I mean, today you can't
 20 go beyond the setbacks of the main structure of
 21 the buildings, right?
 22 MR. CEJAS: For the dock. For the dock.
 23 MR. MURAI: Only for the dock. The vessel
 24 can be whatever?
 25 MR. CEJAS: Yeah. My understanding, there

1 is no regulation for a vessel, that I'm aware
 2 of. I can look further into it.
 3 MR. BEHAR: To his point, we had a case
 4 some years ago where the vessel extended and
 5 blocked --
 6 MR. MURAI: Yeah, I know. I know.
 7 MR. BEHAR: -- the enjoyment of the
 8 adjacent. I think, at that time --
 9 MR. MURAI: Yes, I remember that case.
 10 MR. BEHAR: -- there was like a 45 degree
 11 or some angle that prevented the boat from
 12 going beyond that point. I don't know if that
 13 went away or not, but I think that could be
 14 something to look into to make sure.
 15 MR. CEJAS: We could definitely look into
 16 it. This is the first I hear of these issues
 17 as it pertains to the length of a vessel. We
 18 could take a look at it. I'll meet with our
 19 Planning Staff to make certain that if there
 20 are some regulatory actions that we can take,
 21 that we can look into it.
 22 MR. COLLER: Excuse me. This item only
 23 addresses the docks, and the scope of the title
 24 of this would only address the docks. The
 25 issue of the size of the vessel would probably

1 this says.
 2 MR. BEHAR: Okay.
 3 MR. COLLER: So if you don't want that
 4 option, to have DERM or potentially the Board
 5 of Architects to otherwise extend it, then you
 6 may not want this particular Ordinance. Or you
 7 may want to recommend --
 8 MR. MURAI: I'm trying to understand what
 9 the Ordinance does. I mean, this says that --
 10 Paragraph E says that it cannot extend beyond
 11 the side setbacks to the main structure, unless
 12 otherwise permitted by DERM?
 13 MR. CEJAS: Can you read that again?
 14 MR. MURAI: I'm trying to understand what
 15 we're doing. That's all.
 16 MR. CEJAS: Okay.
 17 MR. TRIAS: Yes. That's what it says, yes.
 18 MR. MURAI: Paragraph E of Article --
 19 division 8, whatever, "All moorings, docks," et
 20 cetera, "shall maintain the same minimum side
 21 setback from the -- as established for the main
 22 structure, unless otherwise permitted by DERM."
 23 MR. CEJAS: All right. So as it stands
 24 today, the main structure setbacks are what
 25 apply to the dock. The text amendment, what it

1 need to be a separate Ordinance, because it's
 2 not really encompassed within this particular
 3 item, which only address the docks. I just
 4 want to double-check --
 5 MR. BEHAR: But in a way, it does, because
 6 if you allow the dock to go larger, you know,
 7 longer, and your boat could go to the extent of
 8 the -- you know, the length of the dock, you
 9 are essentially allowing the boat to go closer,
 10 right?
 11 MR. COLLER: Right. But the regulation as
 12 it's framed today doesn't even -- you're right,
 13 that's an impact. That's a potential impact,
 14 and you may not wish to recommend approval of
 15 this item, although, from what I'm seeing, and
 16 I want to -- I think this was a clarification
 17 of the side setbacks.
 18 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, if you look at the actual
 19 underlined language, it simply says, "Unless
 20 otherwise permitted Miami-Dade County
 21 Department of Regulatory and Economic
 22 Resources, DERM" -- so basically what it says
 23 is, if you got an approval, then it can be
 24 reviewed by the Board of Architects and then it
 25 could be approved by the City. That's what

1 will do is, if DERM can allow for further
 2 alleviations to the side setbacks that we
 3 further restrict, then we would be okay with
 4 it, so long as you go to the Board of
 5 Architects afterwards, where today the docks
 6 are approved administratively through the City
 7 Architect, and don't necessarily have to go to
 8 the Board of Architects.
 9 They all have to go to DERM, but we further
 10 restrict the restrictions that DERM regulates.
 11 MR. MURAI: So basically we would allow
 12 whatever DERM allows?
 13 MR. CEJAS: So long as it's approved by the
 14 Board of Architects.
 15 MR. MURAI: I'm not sure that this is a
 16 good thing, frankly.
 17 MS. ANDERSON: I have a problem with it, as
 18 well, because you're essentially handing over
 19 to DERM the right to allow a larger structure
 20 than the size the property permits. That's the
 21 way this language reads.
 22 MR. MURAI: Yeah.
 23 MR. COLLER: All right. My understanding,
 24 I think the word, "side," that's new in there,
 25 is really a clarification. I believe the

1 Department has always interpreted setbacks to
 2 mean side setbacks, but I think you put,
 3 "side," in there just to make that clear.
 4 MR. CEJAS: Right. "Side" is clarification.
 5 MR. COLLER: The new element is the
 6 potential of the expansion of the dock as
 7 approved by DERM and the Board of Architects.
 8 It has to be by both bodies.
 9 MS. VELEZ: So, therefore, we wouldn't need
 10 any additional language, such as five feet,
 11 because that would not even come into play,
 12 because the setbacks -- the side setbacks would
 13 remain as the side setbacks of the main
 14 structure.
 15 MR. COLLER: Right. And it never really
 16 needed to have the "five feet," because it was
 17 always restricted to the side setback, but
 18 what's new in this Ordinance, I think, is the
 19 ability for a further enlargement of the dock.
 20 MR. MURAI: We're basically saying, okay,
 21 we're going to leave it up to DERM to decide
 22 whether they can go all of the way to the
 23 property line, for example.
 24 MS. VELEZ: Yeah, DERM and the Board of
 25 Architects, right.

1 alleviance (phonetic) on one end of the
 2 property line and not the other.
 3 MS. VELEZ: But you could have a historic
 4 property that has less than a five feet setback
 5 on the side.
 6 MR. CEJAS: At that point, if you go beyond
 7 the five, you would have to go through a
 8 variance and that would go through Historic, if
 9 that would even be allowed. I'll defer that to
 10 the Historic Preservation Officer.
 11 MS. VELEZ: Okay.
 12 MR. COLLER: So I want to make sure I
 13 understand, because this is a little different
 14 than when I first looked at this. Are you
 15 saying that even though it says, "Unless
 16 extended by DERM and the Board of Architects,"
 17 they cannot extend it any more than the
 18 five-foot side setbacks?
 19 MR. MURAI: If we make that change now. In
 20 other words, this would read --
 21 MR. COLLER: That would be the amendment to
 22 this?
 23 MR. MURAI: But in no event more than --
 24 MR. COLLER: No event more than the five
 25 feet.

1 MR. CEJAS: But never the property line.
 2 You still have to have the minimum five foot,
 3 which even for side setbacks for buildings, you
 4 still have to provide a minimum five foot
 5 setback.
 6 MR. MURAI: And why do you say that? This
 7 doesn't say that.
 8 MR. CEJAS: We already put on the record
 9 that that was the intent and we're just adding
 10 that language.
 11 MR. MURAI: A minimum of five feet?
 12 MR. CEJAS: Yes.
 13 MS. VELEZ: But I don't know that we would
 14 even need to have that, because the --
 15 MS. ANDERSON: Yes, you would.
 16 MR. CEJAS: It's good to clarify it.
 17 MR. COLLER: Yeah, I think you would need
 18 to clarify that.
 19 MR. CEJAS: I don't think anyone has an
 20 issue with adding that language.
 21 MS. VELEZ: Minimum side setback no less
 22 than five feet.
 23 MR. CEJAS: And at the Board of Architects
 24 we hold them to a higher aesthetic standard.
 25 And, again, there might be a need to have

1 MR. BEHAR: Now, let me ask you, I
 2 understand -- from what I understood you said,
 3 that this is to make it easier, facilitate, in
 4 some cases. Do you want to leave it open that
 5 they could go to five feet on both sides of the
 6 deck?
 7 MS. VELEZ: Yeah.
 8 MR. TORRE: Yeah.
 9 MR. BEHAR: Because this is allowing to do
 10 that.
 11 MR. CEJAS: So there's times, from my
 12 knowledge of reviewing plans that have to do
 13 with docks, many times it's not a large level,
 14 but they'll want an area on one side to be able
 15 to have maybe a kayak, recreational equipment,
 16 to come in and out, and want to be able to
 17 navigate around the vessel that they have
 18 docked. So that's one example that we've seen.
 19 And, then, obviously, when you have some of
 20 the topography challenges that we have along
 21 the Gables waterway, you have to also allow
 22 some room for the landings and to come down,
 23 and up and down from grade. So there have been
 24 cases where individuals have had some
 25 constraints. And from our end, we were looking

1 at ways, if there was a possibility to have the
 2 possibility of allowing for some alleviance,
 3 through proper channels, to allow for some
 4 deviations.
 5 Now, with DERM, DERM applies their
 6 standards, which is their extension beyond the
 7 property line, the triangle, which, at the very
 8 least, you're not going beyond the five-foot,
 9 unless you go through a cumbersome process on
 10 their end.
 11 But I think it's wise to have the
 12 five-foot, and, again, this is open to your
 13 review and decision.
 14 MS. VELEZ: So right now who makes the
 15 decision?
 16 MR. CEJAS: Right now, as it stands, it
 17 goes through a building permit process. So all
 18 applicable disciplines will review the project,
 19 and the Zoning Ordinance applies, which are the
 20 setbacks. It still has to go to DERM. So DERM
 21 still reviews these projects.
 22 And with the process as it pertains to the
 23 Board of Architects, per the Code, it goes
 24 through an administrative process. The City
 25 Architect can choose to tender to the Board or

1 feet of dock?
 2 MR. MURAI: Yeah.
 3 MR. TORRE: I mean, I'm not saying -- I'm
 4 asking the question.
 5 MR. CEJAS: My understanding, it's just
 6 limited by the setbacks.
 7 MR. TORRE: You can go the full length of
 8 your property?
 9 MR. CEJAS: So long as you meet your side
 10 setbacks.
 11 MR. BEHAR: Okay. Any other question? If
 12 not, we're going to open it up to the public.
 13 MR. WITHERS: Are we sure this doesn't have
 14 to go back to a First Reading and then a Second
 15 Reading?
 16 MR. COLLER: It would only have to go back
 17 to a First Reading if the title was narrower
 18 than what the proposal is. In this case, we're
 19 actually, I think, narrowing the language a
 20 little bit beyond what was originally on First
 21 Reading. So I don't believe it has to go back
 22 to First Reading.
 23 Obviously, it's ultimately up to the City
 24 Attorney, if she feels that way, but I would
 25 say, I don't believe it should.

1 not. So what we're doing is making certain
 2 that anything beyond it at least has to go by
 3 mandate to the Board of Architects.
 4 MR. MURAI: Does DERM care at all as to how
 5 long the vessel is?
 6 MR. CEJAS: DERM has their --
 7 MR. MURAI: Or they only care as to how far
 8 into the canal they are?
 9 MR. CEJAS: Both. They do have concerns.
 10 So they apply -- I don't know if any of you
 11 have ever seen, they apply a triangle, which
 12 extends at the center point of the property
 13 line 25 feet and extends outward. So then
 14 depending on the frontage length, that would
 15 dictate, once you apply that triangle, what
 16 that side setback is. So depending on your
 17 frontage length, it might be seven feet, it
 18 might be six feet, might never get to five
 19 feet. On a 50-foot or 60-foot frontage, it
 20 might be five feet.
 21 MR. TORRE: I have a question. It's a
 22 little different. Is there a restriction on
 23 maximum length or allowed dockage? For
 24 example, if you have 200, 300 feet, which I've
 25 seen many properties do, you can do 200, 300

1 MR. WITHERS: Okay.
 2 MS. VELEZ: Right.
 3 MR. WITHERS: Thank you.
 4 MR. BEHAR: Thank you.
 5 Do we have anybody from the public that
 6 wants to speak on this item?
 7 Seeing none, we'll close it and bring it
 8 back to the Board.
 9 Is there a motion for the item moving
 10 forward?
 11 MR. TORRE: I can move it.
 12 MR. WITHERS: I'll second it.
 13 MS. VELEZ: With the amendment of the
 14 additional language as to the five feet?
 15 MR. TORRE: Maximum five feet. With DERM
 16 approval, it can only go up to five feet.
 17 MR. BEHAR: So we have a motion and a
 18 second, with the amendment of five feet. Can
 19 you please call the roll?
 20 THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?
 21 MR. TORRE: Yes.
 22 THE SECRETARY: Maria Velez?
 23 MS. VELEZ: Yes.
 24 THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?
 25 MR. WITHERS: Yes.

Page 29

1 THE SECRETARY: Rhonda Anderson?
 2 MS. ANDERSON: Yes.
 3 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?
 4 MR. BEHAR: Yes.
 5 THE SECRETARY: Rene Murai?
 6 MR. MURAI: No.
 7 THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?
 8 You said, yes.
 9 MR. BEHAR: Mr. Attorney, can you read Item
 10 Number 2, please?
 11 MR. COLLER: Yes.
 12 Item E-2, an Ordinance of the City
 13 Commission of Coral Gables, Florida providing
 14 for a text amendment to the City of Coral
 15 Gables Official Zoning Code by amending Article
 16 4, "Zoning Districts," Section 4-101,
 17 Single-Family Residential District, and Section
 18 4-102, "Multi-Family 1 Duplex (MF1) District,"
 19 to modify and clarify provisions relating to
 20 driveways; providing for severability,
 21 repealer, codification, and an effective date.
 22 Item E-2, public hearing.
 23 MR. BEHAR: Mr. Cejas, can you start?
 24 MR. CEJAS: Item Number 2 is a text
 25 amendment that relates to driveways in

Page 31

1 and a hundred, not allow a second, but just an
 2 additional flexibility if you do have that
 3 existing condition along that property, to be
 4 able to have the ability to have two cars to
 5 come in and out.
 6 MR. TORRE: To clarify, did you just say
 7 this, if you have two entries, they cannot both
 8 be over the 11? In other words, it's only one,
 9 right?
 10 MR. CEJAS: As it stands right now, for
 11 lots that are less than a hundred foot
 12 frontage, you're only allowed one entrance and
 13 it has to be at 11 feet.
 14 MR. TORRE: But if you have a large lot and
 15 you have two cutouts, can you increase both of
 16 them?
 17 MR. CEJAS: It's still 11-foot, in my
 18 understanding. I'll defer to Staff.
 19 MR. TORRE: Let's clarify that.
 20 MR. TRIAS: Are you thinking, for a
 21 circular driveway, if you have more than a
 22 hundred feet --
 23 MR. TORRE: Right. So you have a lot that
 24 comes in and then goes out the other side,
 25 which is a dual entrance or whatever. I would

Page 30

1 Single-Family residences. The intent here is
 2 to provide a bit of alleviation when a natural
 3 or existing condition exists on a property to
 4 allow the driveway ingress to go from 11 feet
 5 to, I believe, 18 feet.
 6 And as you all know, today, and for lots
 7 less than a hundred feet, properties are only
 8 allowed driveways to have one ingress up to 11
 9 feet. So the issue here is existing homes that
 10 may only have a lot depth of 25 feet. And as
 11 we all know, the driveway has to go into a
 12 garage or carport. At that time, that distance
 13 may create an issue, when a car has to come in
 14 and out and flange into the property to try to
 15 bottleneck itself out of that 11 foot criteria.
 16 So some of the issues that we've been
 17 seeing are vehicles going through that edge of
 18 that driveway, eating up the lawn, parking on
 19 the swale, since they don't want to have that
 20 obstruction in the morning, having to move one
 21 car out of the way to get the other car out.
 22 And I believe at one time we allowed a
 23 driveway a bit wider, but it was in association
 24 with a circular driveway. So this would still
 25 not allow the circular driveway for lots less

Page 32

1 say that those should remain at 11, because
 2 those conditions should allow you to not have
 3 that problem?
 4 MR. TRIAS: Right. In the larger lots,
 5 there is no foreseeable problem.
 6 MR. TORRE: That doesn't apply? This is
 7 applying to the hundred foot lot only?
 8 MR. CEJAS: For the lots that are less than
 9 a hundred foot.
 10 MR. TRIAS: It applies for Single-Family
 11 and Duplex.
 12 MR. WITHERS: What about corner lots that
 13 are less than a hundred feet and they want to
 14 do a driveway where it enters one street and
 15 exits the other?
 16 MR. CEJAS: You have the issue with the
 17 multiple ingress and egress there still, and
 18 the driveway still has to be associated with a
 19 garage.
 20 MR. WITHERS: It does?
 21 MR. CEJAS: Right. So that's how the
 22 language reads today.
 23 MR. MURAI: I'm sorry, I'm trying to
 24 understand. What is this amendment doing?
 25 MR. CEJAS: This amendment -- if I could

1 maybe follow up with an example. Let's say you
 2 have a lot that has a frontage of 75 feet or 60
 3 feet. Mainly these are issues that happen I
 4 think in the northern quadrant. You maybe have
 5 an existing driveways that's maybe the ribbons.
 6 I think we all know those.
 7 MR. MURAI: What kind?
 8 MR. CEJAS: The ribbons. Just those
 9 concrete strips that go into a garage.
 10 MR. MURAI: Sure.
 11 MR. CEJAS: And individuals want to modify
 12 their driveway. Today, the way the Zoning
 13 Ordinance reads, the driveway that you're
 14 allowed to replace those ribbons with, at the
 15 entrance, will only allow an ingress width of
 16 11 feet. So if you have a shallow condition,
 17 as far as where your property sits or the
 18 garage sits, at times it may be difficult for a
 19 second car maybe to come in, where you're
 20 allowed to pave a little bit more on the
 21 inside, but there is an impediment to come in
 22 and out, because the approach is limited, it's
 23 only 11 feet.
 24 MR. MURAI: This doesn't apply to lots of a
 25 hundred feet or more?

1 in, then to back out we're going to create a
 2 problem, a hardship for that resident, because
 3 if you have 11 feet going in and you have a
 4 two-car garage, which the cars are going to be
 5 side by side, you know, that's a problem.
 6 MR. TORRE: But that's what they want you
 7 to do with this, allow you to get a little
 8 more --
 9 MR. BEHAR: No, but you're limited to 11
 10 feet.
 11 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, this is exactly
 12 what this is fixing, because it allows you to
 13 go to 18.
 14 MS. ANDERSON: Right.
 15 MR. CEJAS: So the way it reads today,
 16 you're limited to 11 feet. What this does, if
 17 you do have that hardship, if you do have that
 18 existing condition that may cause that
 19 impediment --
 20 MR. BEHAR: Through the Board of
 21 Architects, you exceed to 18 feet.
 22 MR. CEJAS: Through the Board of Architect
 23 they'll be able to go beyond the 11 feet, up to
 24 18.
 25 MR. TORRE: But I think you're hitting

1 MR. CEJAS: No. A hundred feet or more are
 2 allowed a second ingress and egress.
 3 MR. MURAI: But in lots of a hundred feet
 4 or more, there's no limitation on how big the
 5 curb cut can be?
 6 MR. CEJAS: No. I believe, and I'll double
 7 check, but I believe that language still
 8 applies for -- it's still 11 feet, but you are
 9 allowed a secondary ingress and egress, and,
 10 generally, in lots that are larger than a
 11 hundred feet, you don't have those depth
 12 constraints.
 13 MR. MURAI: No, but, I mean, you see it all
 14 over the place, that driveways are wider than
 15 11 feet and still have the curb cut.
 16 MR. BEHAR: You know, I see a problem with
 17 this, because lots -- and there's a lot of lots
 18 that are under a hundred feet that today have a
 19 circular driveway to begin with. That would
 20 not be allowed anymore.
 21 MR. CEJAS: It's not permitted today.
 22 MR. BEHAR: Okay. Well, there is a lot of
 23 lots that do have it, so make sure those lots
 24 are not -- and, Secondly, if you have a two-car
 25 garage and you allow only an 11-foot way to get

1 something that should be noted, that if you
 2 have a hundred feet or less and you do two
 3 entrances, you should not be allowed to have
 4 the waiver. If it's a hundred feet or less --
 5 MR. CEJAS: If it's a hundred feet or
 6 less --
 7 MR. TORRE: -- and it has two entrances --
 8 MR. CEJAS: You're not allowed to have --
 9 oh, an existing condition.
 10 MR. TORRE: Yes. If you want in and out,
 11 and it's a hundred foot lot or even a 90-foot
 12 lot, whatever it is, you should not be able to
 13 widen those entrances more than 11 feet.
 14 MR. CEJAS: It might be an existing
 15 nonconformity.
 16 MR. TORRE: It could be that they're even
 17 there already.
 18 MR. TORRE: Well, if they're there, they're
 19 illegal non-conforming.
 20 MR. CEJAS: That would be an existing
 21 non-conformity and then that will fall under
 22 the expansions of non-conformity rules, which
 23 will prevent that from happening.
 24 MS. ANDERSON: I think this solves some
 25 problems.

1 MR. TRIAS: I think it does. I think it
 2 provides more flexibility for existing
 3 conditions. So that is why it's before you.
 4 MR. BEHAR: Any comments, so we can close
 5 it to the Board?
 6 Any comments from the public? Seeing none --
 7 MR. COLLER: Wait.
 8 You can't speak from there, ma'am. If you
 9 could come up to the microphone and put your
 10 name into the record. We know you said your
 11 name earlier today, but for the court reporter.
 12 MS. REGISTER: I'm Debra Register and I
 13 didn't realize what this encompassed, okay, and
 14 now that I listen to you, I do, and I have one
 15 thing to say.
 16 I have a 70-foot lot and I have a circular
 17 drive and all of our neighborhood -- if you
 18 take that away, you're going to have some many
 19 cars on our street. And we're a small
 20 residential. We don't have a big road. You're
 21 going to force people -- you're going to have
 22 people on the roadway and in the swales, I can
 23 tell you, because we have a lot of children,
 24 you know, teenagers that are driving, and they
 25 have four and five cars in our neighborhood,

1 driveway, and she wanted for some reason just
 2 to expand the width of the driveway in the
 3 right-of-way, this would be prohibited if there
 4 were two entrances already existing?
 5 MR. CEJAS: Right.
 6 MR. TORRE: Now, you couldn't widen it?
 7 MR. CEJAS: I think that the issue there is
 8 a little greater, where a circular driveway was
 9 legally built at one time. Today, the Zoning
 10 Ordinance, the way it reads, doesn't permit
 11 circular driveways in lots that were 70-foot
 12 and I think that was changed about three years
 13 ago.
 14 So what changed was that now they took one
 15 of the ins and outs away and only allowed for
 16 one. And when that was done, that one that now
 17 you're allowed to have can only be 11-foot
 18 wide. So what we're doing now is recognizing
 19 that because we took that other one away from
 20 people who have driveways like you do, we now
 21 pigeonholed them into an 11-foot entrance, and
 22 what we're doing now is just trying to say,
 23 well, we're not going to allow two anymore, but
 24 at least let's try to get a double, so we can
 25 at least allow two or three cars in there.

1 and you're going to have them all along our
 2 street.
 3 So think twice, because if you take my
 4 circular away -- if someone was to remodel, and
 5 I try to keep that, and you tell me, no, or
 6 anybody there, that we couldn't have a circular
 7 drive, you're going to see cars on the street.
 8 MR. BEHAR: But if you have it -- that's
 9 why I asked -- if you have a legal -- today you
 10 have it, it's a legal non-conforming, but you
 11 would not -- correct me if I'm wrong, you are
 12 not going to lose your right, they will not
 13 make you take that away.
 14 MR. COLLER: But this item does not address
 15 circular drive.
 16 MS. REGISTER: It sort of does, in that --
 17 MS. VELEZ: No, it doesn't.
 18 MS. ANDERSON: Just the entrance.
 19 MS. REGISTER: It does, and I'm just
 20 telling you, even when somebody is
 21 redeveloping --
 22 MR. COLLER: She can't take in stereo. She
 23 has to have one person speak at a time.
 24 MR. TORRE: I think what I was trying to
 25 ask, if that exists currently, a circular

1 So we're allowing some more flexibility,
 2 but yet not going back to how it used to be
 3 allowed. So we're finding middle ground.
 4 MS. REGISTER: Okay. Because there's a lot
 5 of houses that are being redeveloped and I'm
 6 seeing more and more cars on the street and now
 7 I know why. They're not being able to park, so
 8 they're parking on the swale, because they have
 9 multiple cars, because they have multiple
 10 family members that are there.
 11 So now I understand, if it was changed
 12 since I got mine, and they can't put circular
 13 drives in, and as new families come in, us
 14 older ones who don't have children --
 15 MR. BEHAR: I think this is clear. We're
 16 going from 11 to 18.
 17 MR. CEJAS: That was one of the concerns
 18 that we heard from the public, as well. It's
 19 individuals who are parking on the swales and
 20 on the street.
 21 MS. REGISTER: Yeah, it's creating --
 22 because now people can't put in a circular
 23 drive if they wish, because they're under 75
 24 feet, and so therefore we have more and more
 25 cars on the street.

Page 41

1 MR. MURAI: But if that is your concern, as
 2 well as your neighbors', you have to bring it
 3 up to the City and try to see if you can change
 4 that.
 5 MS. REGISTER: Okay. That's why I'm here
 6 to trying to learn more.
 7 MR. BEHAR: Thank you.
 8 MS. ANDERSON: Thank you.
 9 MR. BEHAR: We'll close it to the public.
 10 No other speaker. We'll bring it back to the
 11 Board.
 12 MR. MURAI: I move the amendments.
 13 MS. VELEZ: Second.
 14 MR. BEHAR: Can you call the roll, please?
 15 THE SECRETARY: Maria Velez?
 16 MS. VELEZ: Yes.
 17 THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?
 18 MR. WITHERS: Yes.
 19 THE SECRETARY: Rhonda Anderson?
 20 MS. ANDERSON: Yes.
 21 THE SECRETARY: Rene Murai?
 22 MR. MURAI: Yes.
 23 THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?
 24 MR. TORRE: Yes.
 25 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?

Page 43

1 MS. VELEZ: So we are narrowing the
 2 existing language?
 3 MR. CEJAS: We are allowing additional
 4 flexibility for the development of these larger
 5 projects that have been approved to be able to
 6 have and mobilize a construction trailer for
 7 purposes of constructing the building for these
 8 larger projects.
 9 MS. VELEZ: Okay.
 10 MR. CEJAS: That today is not allowed
 11 within Residential Districts and MFSA is
 12 considered Residential District, but in MFSA we
 13 allow for, if you have enough land, larger
 14 developments.
 15 MS. VELEZ: So we're expanding?
 16 MR. CEJAS: Right.
 17 MS. VELEZ: Okay.
 18 MR. BEHAR: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Cejas.
 19 Let me open it up to the Board.
 20 MR. TORRE: I do have some, because I try
 21 to use trailers sometimes and I get shutdown.
 22 So you're asking for sanitary provisions. I
 23 get that.
 24 In some cases, these projects are not
 25 necessarily large and trailers that we try to

Page 42

1 MR. BEHAR: Yes.
 2 Thank you.
 3 Next item, E-3.
 4 MR. COLLER: Item E-3, an Ordinance of the
 5 City Commission of Coral Gables, Florida
 6 providing for a text amendment to the City of
 7 Coral Gables Official Zoning Code by amending
 8 Article 5, "Development Standards," Division
 9 21, "Temporary Uses," Section 5-2107,
 10 "Temporary use of construction office" to allow
 11 temporary construction office for multi-family
 12 projects in Multi-Family 2 (MF2) and
 13 Multi-Family Special Area (MFSA) Districts;
 14 providing for severability, repealer,
 15 codification, and an effective date. Item E-3,
 16 public hearing.
 17 MR. CEJAS: E-3 is, in essence, aligning
 18 language that already exists in the subsequent
 19 section for sales offices and allowing that
 20 alleviance for construction trailers only
 21 within Residential Districts, more in line with
 22 MFSA and MF2 and only for lots and projects
 23 that are over 20,000 square feet in land area
 24 and more than 12 units, the same language that
 25 exists today for allowance of sales offices.

Page 44

1 seek are the ones that just get plopped down.
 2 They're basically containers. They're offices.
 3 And we have trouble being able to use those.
 4 They're just basically containers with windows
 5 and they have air conditioning. Those are some
 6 simple types of containers -- or offices, but
 7 here I guess the clutch is, you have to have
 8 sanitary facilities.
 9 MR. CEJAS: The language is the same
 10 language that would be allowed for temporary
 11 structures --
 12 MR. TORRE: I understand.
 13 MR. CEJAS: -- whether it's a sales office
 14 or even a construction trailer in a Commercial
 15 District.
 16 MR. TORRE: I'm trying to see if I can find
 17 a way to open it up a little bit more, but I
 18 guess that's something different.
 19 MR. CEJAS: Yeah, we're not touching any of
 20 those mandates. That would generally be
 21 directed by Ordinance, and, also, at the time
 22 when they submit their staging plan. At the
 23 time of the staging plan, we'll look for the
 24 tie-downs, accessibility, safety, everything
 25 that exists today. So it's just allowing for

Page 45

1 the possibility of an additional structure to
 2 house the needs of a construction office for
 3 the large projects.
 4 MR. MURAI: This will be allowed, where?
 5 MR. CEJAS: Today it's allowed in the
 6 Commercial District, Commercial Limited
 7 District, Industrial Districts and there's a
 8 provision in that Ordinance that says, not
 9 allowed in Residential Districts.
 10 The subsequent language allows for larger
 11 type projects in limited Residential Districts,
 12 which will be your MF2s and your MFSAs.
 13 MR. MURAI: What are those, MF2 and MFSAs?
 14 MR. CEJAS: That would be, I guess, the
 15 area right here behind the David Williams.
 16 That's an MFSA district, that you're able to
 17 go, if you have the right amount of land, up to
 18 150 feet.
 19 MR. MURAI: This is not in areas where
 20 there's Single-Family residences?
 21 MR. CEJAS: No, this not Single-Family.
 22 MR. MURAI: It has to be multi-family.
 23 MR. CEJAS: Right. You have to have more
 24 than 20,000 square feet of land and you have to
 25 be building more than 12 units.

Page 47

1 generally the construction trailer's need ends
 2 when the sales office comes in. Maybe there's
 3 a time frame when that overlap happens. As you
 4 know, sometimes there's a need for both.
 5 MR. BEHAR: Most of the time, on a project
 6 that I see, you have the construction trailer
 7 on site. Typically you don't have the sales
 8 center, because you don't want to bring the
 9 public into that environment. It's not safe.
 10 So typically this only, I've only seen it, for
 11 construction offices, and I think it's good,
 12 because especially at the beginning, you're
 13 going to keep the site a little bit more
 14 organized, cleaner, but I would prefer if
 15 there's a time, that at a certain point we move
 16 it inside the structure and get rid of it.
 17 MS. ANDERSON: What time limit do you think
 18 would be reasonable?
 19 MR. TORRE: You have to have electricity
 20 inside the space, otherwise you basically can't
 21 get anything.
 22 MR. BEHAR: No, you have temporary power.
 23 You know, you're going to have temporary power
 24 on the site to feed the trailer.
 25 MR. TORRE: That's true.

Page 46

1 MR. BEHAR: I personally think this is a
 2 good idea, because you're going to keep the
 3 site more organized. My only concern or
 4 suggestion is that we put a time limit. The
 5 moment that the structure is safe for the
 6 contractor -- because this is construction
 7 office -- is able to move the office inside the
 8 structure, maybe we take this out, the trailer
 9 comes out, because in a lot of the construction
 10 sites you see that the contractor will use an
 11 office inside the structure, which would, in my
 12 opinion, you know, allow for this to come out.
 13 MR. CEJAS: That's a very good suggestion.
 14 MS. ANDERSON: I like that.
 15 MR. COLLER: Mr. Chairman, just one
 16 question on that issue to Staff. As I
 17 understand it, they're already permitted to
 18 have a sales office.
 19 MR. CEJAS: Correct.
 20 MR. COLLER: So if it's not a construction
 21 office, in theory it could be used in a
 22 different section of the Code as a sales
 23 office; is that right?
 24 MR. CEJAS: I think where the Chair is
 25 headed is that there might be overlap, and

Page 48

1 MR. MURAI: That has to be studied, I
 2 think, the length of time.
 3 MS. VELEZ: Subparagraph F deals with the
 4 removal. It says that the office shall be
 5 removed by the contractor prior to the approval
 6 of the final building inspection and to the
 7 issuance of the CO.
 8 MR. BEHAR: But that's all of the way at
 9 the end.
 10 MS. VELEZ: Or whenever, in the opinion of
 11 the Building Official, it has been completed to
 12 the point where the building's final inspection
 13 would be approved.
 14 MR. BEHAR: And part of the reason I'm
 15 saying it, because typically you're going to
 16 put this on the setback, adjacent to your
 17 neighbor's property. So, you know, you're
 18 going to create a little bit of, you know, a
 19 nuisance for them, so let's try to minimize
 20 that impact to a time.
 21 MR. COLLER: So let me just say, on the
 22 language, it says -- under E, it says,
 23 "Offices, if such construction office is deemed
 24 necessary and compatible by the Building
 25 Official," but -- I think you want to add, but

Page 49

1 no later than a particular time.
 2 MS. ANDERSON: Can you define that by dry
 3 in or something like that?
 4 MR. BEHAR: Venny, you're the contractor
 5 here.
 6 MR. TORRE: Yeah, but once you start doing
 7 site prep for landscaping, you know, stuccoing,
 8 you still need it. I mean, you've got a lot of
 9 outside work going on.
 10 MR. MURAI: But you could have language
 11 that says, until such time as the Building
 12 Official determines that the construction
 13 office can be moved inside the building.
 14 MR. TORRE: I find it kind of subjective.
 15 MR. MURAI: It is subjective, but --
 16 MR. TORRE: Some properties, you know, have
 17 six, eight, ten months -- you think it's
 18 moving, but if the inside is rough as could be,
 19 you know, the outside can look --
 20 MR. MURAI: The Building Official should be
 21 able to see that it's rough, but to put an
 22 arbitrary time --
 23 MR. BEHAR: No, you can't.
 24 MR. MURAI: -- when landscaping begins --
 25 MR. BEHAR: I think it has to be determined

Page 51

1 the establishment, and then could say, "And for
 2 a period of time as deemed necessary as
 3 determined by the Building Official." I mean,
 4 it's going to be vague anyway.
 5 MR. TORRE: I think that's a fair way of
 6 doing it.
 7 MR. MURAI: I was going to say, until such
 8 time as the Building Official determines that
 9 it is no longer necessary.
 10 MS. VELEZ: Why don't we amend Subparagraph
 11 F to deal with that? "Whenever, in the opinion
 12 of the Building Official, it is no longer
 13 necessary," as opposed to saying --
 14 MR. MURAI: "And the activities therein may
 15 be moved to" --
 16 MS. VELEZ: I would clean up in Paragraph
 17 F, "After, in the opinion of the Building
 18 Official." I think that would be better.
 19 MR. CEJAS: And just for understanding,
 20 generally when these projects come in, it comes
 21 with a staging plan and the Building Official
 22 already takes account for when the sales office
 23 comes in or when construction trailers come in,
 24 if it's in an allowable zone, and all of that
 25 is outlined at the very beginning. So any

Page 50

1 by somebody that goes in and finds that it's
 2 safe.
 3 MR. MURAI: You want to give some
 4 flexibility to the Building Official, to say,
 5 "Okay, enough is enough. You've had it here
 6 for a long time and you can move inside."
 7 MS. ANDERSON: Well, I mean, plus leaving
 8 these trailers out there, I always worry about
 9 storm season. I wouldn't want to have property
 10 right next door to it.
 11 MR. MURAI: Let me ask you a question, why
 12 are the words "Or field office" removed?
 13 MR. CEJAS: Removed or added?
 14 MR. MURAI: Deleted.
 15 MS. VELEZ: Deleted.
 16 MR. COLLER: Yes, it was deleted because I
 17 think the problem was, we didn't have really a
 18 definition of a field office. Nobody really
 19 knew what a field office was. So it was
 20 designed to simplify the language.
 21 MR. MURAI: Okay.
 22 MR. COLLER: I would suggest, if you do
 23 want to add to this, it says, "If such
 24 construction offices are deemed necessary and
 25 compatible by the Building Official," that's in

Page 52

1 further language definitely assists, but the
 2 Building Official, per the Building Code, does
 3 have the ultimate authority.
 4 MR. MURAI: But it gives some power to the
 5 Building Official to say, "Okay. Enough.
 6 You've had it there" --
 7 MR. BEHAR: "For two years," you know --
 8 MR. MURAI: And you don't need it.
 9 MR. TORRE: Or there's a storm coming and
 10 you really want to get it out of there.
 11 MR. MURAI: Yeah. You don't need it.
 12 MR. BEHAR: There's a provision in the Code
 13 for that already.
 14 MR. CEJAS: That already exists.
 15 MR. TORRE: But it adds weight to it.
 16 MR. MURAI: Those things are unsightly --
 17 MS. ANDERSON: They can finish off a
 18 section in the building and get it out of the
 19 way.
 20 MR. MURAI: I would say, until such time as
 21 the Building Official determines that the
 22 activities conducted in the construction office
 23 may be moved inside the structure safely.
 24 MR. CEJAS: That sounds reasonable.
 25 MS. ANDERSON: And I would second that.

1 MR. COLLER: So I think it would come at
 2 the end of F.
 3 MR. MURAI: You can put it wherever you
 4 want.
 5 MR. BEHAR: You know what we want.
 6 MS. ANDERSON: Look at E, but if it's in
 7 here somewhere --
 8 MR. COLLER: Just the sense of it, F does
 9 talk about when it gets removed. E really
 10 talks about the establishment.
 11 MR. MURAI: Listen, you get paid the big
 12 bucks. You figure it out.
 13 MR. COLLER: Okay. We'll put it in F, with
 14 something to the effect of, as provided,
 15 however, the Building Official may require the
 16 removal of the trailer earlier when it's
 17 determined that the activities can be moved
 18 inside the building, something to that effect.
 19 MS. VELEZ: I would even leave it more
 20 open, because the activities moving inside
 21 wouldn't deal with a hurricane. So, when in
 22 the opinion of the Building Inspector, it
 23 becomes necessary or adequate to remove --
 24 MR. MURAI: No. When, in the opinion of
 25 the Building Official, the activities conducted

1 sizing of advertisement for construction
 2 entities and then it has to be in association
 3 with pictorials of the City of Coral Gables and
 4 that has a limited amount of space.
 5 So as far as the trailers are concerned,
 6 today there isn't any language that exists.
 7 It's not allowed.
 8 MR. WITHERS: Does it say, it's a
 9 structure, it's not allowed? Does it
 10 specifically say that?
 11 MR. CEJAS: Signage on structures, signage
 12 is limited to the frontage and the screens, and
 13 so there's specific language on construction
 14 sites where signage isn't allowed, and it's not
 15 allowed on trailers.
 16 MR. WITHERS: So there's no signage allowed
 17 on this structure?
 18 MR. CEJAS: But if there's a concern to the
 19 color of a trailer that might appear, I think
 20 it should be discussed, because -- I haven't
 21 seen a red trailer, but that doesn't mean that
 22 not one exists.
 23 MR. WITHERS: I mean, as far as condition,
 24 you know, it is supposed to be kept up?
 25 MR. CEJAS: Definitely. That's part of the

1 in the construction office can safely be moved
 2 inside the structure.
 3 MR. TORRE: You have to give an alternative
 4 of moving.
 5 MR. MURAI: I move --
 6 MR. BEHAR: Before you do that, let me open
 7 it up to the public. Any public input?
 8 MR. WITHERS: Can I ask one question before
 9 you do that?
 10 MR. BEHAR: Sure.
 11 MR. WITHERS: Is there discussion about
 12 signage on these things?
 13 MR. CEJAS: No discussion on signage.
 14 There's already provisions on signage within
 15 our Zoning Ordinance, and I believe the City
 16 Code, on signage.
 17 MR. WITHERS: So does this fall under a
 18 building, a structure? Do we want to have a
 19 bland color instead of a red or a green? Do we
 20 want to go ahead and make it as inconspicuous,
 21 without signage on it, or what is the City's --
 22 MR. CEJAS: Signage right now on a trailer
 23 is not allowed. So signage for construction
 24 sites are only allowed along the construction
 25 fence, and by Ordinance you're limited in the

1 staging plan.
 2 MR. BEHAR: Any other question for Staff?
 3 Seeing none, we're going to open it up to the
 4 public.
 5 Any input from the public? Seeing none, we
 6 will close the public hearing and bring it back
 7 to the Board.
 8 Any motion for approval?
 9 MR. MURAI: I propose an amendment to the
 10 proposed amendment, and my amendment, as I
 11 stated before, that there's a provision in this
 12 amendment that allows the Building Official to
 13 require that the construction office -- the
 14 construction office be removed at such time as
 15 the activities conducted therein can be safety
 16 moved inside the structure.
 17 MR. BEHAR: We have a motion. Can we get a
 18 second?
 19 MS. ANDERSON: Second.
 20 MR. BEHAR: Second. We have a motion and a
 21 second. The attorney will finalize specific
 22 language to address our concerns. With that in
 23 mind, can we call the roll please?
 24 THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?
 25 MR. WITHERS: Yes.

Page 57

1 THE SECRETARY: Rhonda Anderson?
 2 MS. ANDERSON: Yes.
 3 THE SECRETARY: Rene Murai?
 4 MR. MURAI: Yes.
 5 THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?
 6 MR. TORRE: Yes.
 7 THE SECRETARY: Maria Velez?
 8 MS. VELEZ: Yes.
 9 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?
 10 MR. BEHAR: Yes.
 11 MR. MURAI: I'm going to then move the
 12 actual amendment. Mine was an amendment -- I
 13 guess not. Okay. Forget it.
 14 MR. TORRE: It's redundant.
 15 MR. BEHAR: Okay. We deferred Item E-4.
 16 Let's jump into E-5. Mr. Attorney, can you
 17 read that one, please?
 18 MR. COLLER: Yes.
 19 Item E-5, an Ordinance of the City
 20 Commission of Coral Gables, Florida providing
 21 for text amendments to the City of Coral Gables
 22 Official Zoning Code Article 2, "Decision
 23 Making and Administrative Bodies," Division 3,
 24 "Board of Architects," Section 2-302,
 25 "Membership; Terms; Vacancies; Removal"

Page 59

1 MR. TRIAS: Right. That will have to be
 2 cleaned up.
 3 MR. MURAI: It's unnecessary.
 4 MS. ANDERSON: Yeah, that's a little
 5 redundant.
 6 MR. TRIAS: We'll clean this up. Thank you
 7 very much.
 8 MR. TORRE: What is the impetus to do this?
 9 MR. TRIAS: It provides flexibility to the
 10 City Manager to appoint persons that he
 11 believes are doing a good job. It's simply at
 12 the discretion of the City Manager.
 13 MR. BEHAR: And not only that, I tell you,
 14 having served on the Board of Architects in the
 15 past, sometimes it's difficult to get new Board
 16 Members that, One, want to do it. It's once a
 17 week, and sometimes it could take, you know,
 18 four or five hours a day. So, unfortunately,
 19 there is not a lot of people willing to do it.
 20 So I think this gives a little more flexibility
 21 to the Manager to keep, you know, seven Board
 22 Members at all times.
 23 MR. MURAI: Are you thinking there should
 24 be no limit at all?
 25 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. This Board is unique, in

Page 58

1 removing the term limitations for members of
 2 the Board of Architects; providing for
 3 severability, repealer, codification, and an
 4 effective date. Item E-5, public hearing.
 5 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, it's a very minor
 6 amendment. That currently, as you know, the
 7 City Manager appoints the members for a
 8 two-year term and there's a maximum of eight
 9 years that they can serve. So the removal is
 10 simply the maximum of the eight years.
 11 Therefore, the City Manager may appoint
 12 somebody for two years and reappoint them or
 13 not later on regardless of the time served.
 14 MR. BEHAR: What you're eliminating is the
 15 maximum of eight years?
 16 MR. TRIAS: Just that. That's the only
 17 thing that is eliminated. The term remains two
 18 years, and then the option to reappoint is
 19 always there.
 20 MR. MURAI: So you can serve for life?
 21 MR. TRIAS: In theory, I supposed, yes.
 22 MS. ANDERSON: Under Paragraph C, the
 23 second sentence, it says, "Appointments to
 24 unexpired terms shall not count as part of the
 25 term limit."

Page 60

1 the sense that it's appointed by the City
 2 Manager, and as the Chair explained, it's a
 3 very, very demanding Board. It's not a
 4 political Board. It's really a technical
 5 Board. And that was the thinking, if we have
 6 somebody who wants to serve and has the time,
 7 they should.
 8 MS. VELEZ: I would be more comfortable if
 9 we had a limit of some sort, even if we were to
 10 extend this limit. I don't like to take away a
 11 term limit, if one is in existence. I
 12 understand the rationale, but I think eight
 13 years is a long time, and it's consecutive. So
 14 someone could be off for two years and then
 15 come back.
 16 MR. TRIAS: What I would say is that the
 17 practical challenge that we have is that we
 18 haven't been able to find new people.
 19 MR. BEHAR: There's a lot of requirements.
 20 You have to be a registered landscape architect
 21 or a register architect.
 22 MR. TRIAS: Ten years of experience in
 23 Coral Gables.
 24 MS. VELEZ: And you must reside in the
 25 Gables?