

Page 93

1 THE SECRETARY: Frank Rodriguez?  
 2 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.  
 3 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  
 4 MR. BEHAR: Yes.  
 5 THE SECRETARY: Marshall Bellin?  
 6 MR. BELLIN: Yes.  
 7 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell?  
 8 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.  
 9 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?  
 10 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.  
 11 THE SECRETARY: Jeff Flanagan?  
 12 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.  
 13 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Thank you very much.  
 14 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you, Mario.  
 15 Thank you to the applicant.  
 16 MR. BEHAR: Only took two years, Mario, but  
 17 you did it.  
 18 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Two years that we were  
 19 here. Four in total.  
 20 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Items 8 through 15 are  
 21 related. I guess we'll read them into the  
 22 record, and then take action separately, if we  
 23 get there. And, also, just so everybody knows,  
 24 Member Rodriguez needs to leave at 8:15.  
 25 MS. MENENDEZ: 8:50?

Page 94

1 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: 8:15. He has a flight  
 2 tonight.  
 3 MR. BEHAR: And I have to leave just about  
 4 the same time, as well.  
 5 MS. MENENDEZ: Well, I have a very simple  
 6 question.  
 7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: One second. Thank you,  
 8 everybody.  
 9 MS. MENENDEZ: I have a question of the  
 10 Staff that might end this whole thing.  
 11 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Once --  
 12 MS. MENENDEZ: Or at least defer it.  
 13 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Ramon, Maria has a  
 14 question.  
 15 MR. TRIAS: Yes.  
 16 MS. MENENDEZ: The portion that we  
 17 discussed in length the last time and we even  
 18 heard testimony from the public regarding the  
 19 infill portion, Staff was going to take a look  
 20 at a larger area, or at least study it.  
 21 MR. TRIAS: Yes.  
 22 MS. MENENDEZ: Has that been done?  
 23 MR. TRIAS: Yes.  
 24 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. I didn't see the  
 25 results in this report. Do we have something

Page 95

1 separate or --  
 2 MR. TRIAS: Megan is going to make that  
 3 presentation. She did an analysis of the whole  
 4 area, of each of the buildings, so --  
 5 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. All right.  
 6 MR. TRIAS: -- I think it's sufficient for  
 7 you to -- but if you need more, certainly we  
 8 can do more.  
 9 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.  
 10 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.  
 11 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I need to read these  
 12 in, right?  
 13 MR. COLLER: Yeah, I think you should read  
 14 them in.  
 15 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. We'll be a  
 16 while.  
 17 Item Number 8 -- and it looks like we have  
 18 seven items -- an Ordinance of the City  
 19 Commission of Coral Gables, Florida requesting  
 20 an amendment to the Future Land Use Map of the  
 21 City of Coral Gables Comprehensive Plan  
 22 pursuant to Zoning Code Article 3, "Development  
 23 Review," Division 15, "Comprehensive Plan Text  
 24 and Map Amendments," and Small Scale Amendment  
 25 procedures, Section 163.3187, Florida Statutes,

Page 96

1 providing for the "North Ponce de Leon  
 2 Boulevard Mixed-Use Overlay District;"  
 3 providing for severability, repealer and an  
 4 effective date. Legal description is on file  
 5 with the City. That's under Local Planning  
 6 Agency review.  
 7 Item 9 is an Ordinance of the City  
 8 Commission of Coral Gables, Florida requesting  
 9 an amendment to the text of the City of Coral  
 10 Gables Comprehensive Plan, Future Land Use  
 11 Element, Policy FLU-1.1.3, "Table FLU-4, called  
 12 Mixed-Use Land Use," pursuant to expedited  
 13 State review procedures, Section 163.3184,  
 14 Florida Statutes, and Zoning Code Article 3,  
 15 "Development Review," Division 15,  
 16 "Comprehensive Plan Text and Map Amendments;"  
 17 amending the "MXOD, Mixed-Use Overly Districts"  
 18 Land Use Classification to provide that a  
 19 Mixed-Use Overlay District may be permitted as  
 20 an overlay in the Multi-Family Medium Density  
 21 and the Multi-Family High Density Land Uses;  
 22 providing for severability, repealer and an  
 23 effective date. That's also Local Planning  
 24 Agency review.  
 25 Item 10 is an Ordinance of the City

1 Commission of Coral Gables, Florida requesting  
 2 an amendment to the Zoning Map pursuant to  
 3 Zoning Code Article 3, "Development Review",  
 4 Division 14, "Zoning Code Text and Map  
 5 Amendments", to create the "North Ponce de Leon  
 6 Boulevard Mixed Use District" for portions of  
 7 the Douglas Section, Section K, and Section L,  
 8 Coral Gables, Florida; providing for  
 9 severability, repealer and an effective date.  
 10 Legal description is on file with the City.

11 Item 11 is an Ordinance of the City  
 12 Commission of Coral Gables, Florida providing  
 13 for text amendments to the City of Coral Gables  
 14 Official Zoning Code, by amending Article 4,  
 15 "Zoning Districts," Section 4-201, "Mixed Use  
 16 District" to allow an MXD Overlay District to  
 17 be assigned in a Multi-Family 2 Zoning District  
 18 under certain conditions, and to include  
 19 provisions for the "North Ponce de Leon Mixed  
 20 Use District" to modify and supplement the  
 21 existing Commercial and Multi-Family 2  
 22 standards and criteria to allow appropriate  
 23 redevelopment that promotes walkability,  
 24 enhances Ponce de Leon Boulevard, provides a  
 25 transition to the North Ponce Neighborhood

1 Conservation District; providing for a repealer  
 2 provision, providing for a severability clause,  
 3 codification, and providing for an effective  
 4 date.

5 Number 12, an Ordinance of the City  
 6 Commission of Coral Gables, Florida providing  
 7 for text amendments to the City of Coral Gables  
 8 Official Zoning Code, by amending Article 3,  
 9 "Development Review," Division 10, "Transfer of  
 10 Development Rights" to modify criteria for  
 11 sending sites north of Navarre Avenue, and to  
 12 allow for Commercial zoned properties within  
 13 the "North Ponce Mixed Use District" overlay to  
 14 be receiving sites subject to certain criteria;  
 15 providing for a repealer provision, providing  
 16 for a severability clause, codification, and  
 17 providing for an effective date.

18 Number 13 is an Ordinance of the City  
 19 Commission of Coral Gables, Florida requesting  
 20 an amendment to the text of the City of Coral  
 21 Gables Comprehensive Plan, Future Land Use  
 22 Element, Policy FLU-1.1.3, "Table FLU-1,  
 23 Residential Land Uses," pursuant to expedited  
 24 State review procedures, Section 163.3184,  
 25 Florida Statutes, and Zoning Code Article 3,

1 "Development Review," Division 15,  
 2 "Comprehensive Plan Text and Map Amendments;"  
 3 amending the "Multi-Family Medium Density" Land  
 4 Use Classification to provide that a maximum  
 5 density of 60 units an acre, or 75 units an  
 6 acre with architectural incentives per the  
 7 Zoning Code, shall be permitted for development  
 8 within the designated Residential Infill  
 9 Districts; providing for severability, repealer  
 10 and an effective date. That's Local Planning  
 11 Agency review.

12 Number 14, an Ordinance of the City  
 13 Commission of Coral Gables, Florida requesting  
 14 an amendment to the Zoning Map pursuant to  
 15 Zoning Code Article 3, "Development Review",  
 16 Division 14, "Zoning Code Text and Map  
 17 Amendments", to create the "East Ponce de Leon  
 18 Boulevard Residential Infill District" for  
 19 portions of the Douglas Section, Coral Gables,  
 20 Florida; providing for severability, repealer  
 21 and an effective date. Legal description is on  
 22 file with the City.

23 Finally, the last one, Number 15, an  
 24 Ordinance of the City Commission of Coral  
 25 Gables, Florida providing for text amendments

1 to the City of Coral Gables Official Zoning  
 2 Code, by amending Article 4, "Zoning  
 3 Districts," adding Section 4-208, called the  
 4 "East Ponce de Leon Boulevard Residential  
 5 Infill District" to modify and supplement the  
 6 existing Multi-Family 2 standards and criteria  
 7 to allow appropriate redevelopment that  
 8 promotes walkability, enhances East Ponce de  
 9 Leon Boulevard, and provides a visual  
 10 connection between the Douglas Entrance and  
 11 Ponce de Leon Boulevard; providing for a  
 12 repealer provision, providing for a  
 13 severability clause, codification and providing  
 14 for an effective date.

15 Mr. Trias.

16 MR. TRIAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That  
 17 was quite a performance there, reading all of  
 18 that, but all of it is really related to one  
 19 issue.

20 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We need shorter titles  
 21 from now on.

22 MR. COLLER: I was going to ask you if you  
 23 needed a break at this point.

24 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I need a cup of water.

25 MR. TRIAS: Thank you very much.

1 The issue is what to do, what to do along  
 2 the corridor on North Ponce that goes along  
 3 Ponce de Leon Boulevard and some areas  
 4 immediately next to it today. That's really  
 5 what we're talking about today. It is one of  
 6 several issues that we're dealing with in North  
 7 Ponce.

8 And I would like to say that having  
 9 listened to Professor Gelabert Navia's  
 10 critique, I think that this amendment gives you  
 11 the opportunity to provide some of that  
 12 affordable housing, some of that smaller unit  
 13 housing, that could be very beneficial for the  
 14 future of the City.

15 So we do have some opportunities to work on  
 16 those issues. I think that his critique is  
 17 very valid, and I think that the answer to that  
 18 is the work that you have been doing so far, so  
 19 diligently, on North Ponce.

20 Now, I am not going to make the  
 21 presentation tonight. I'm going to ask Megan  
 22 McLaughlin to make the presentation, because  
 23 she has been doing most of the work on this  
 24 amendment, and also because she's going to  
 25 leave the City of Coral Gables. Now, hopefully

1 MR. TRIAS: So thank you very much. And  
 2 without further ado, Megan.

3 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Ramon.  
 4 Members of the Board, my name is Megan  
 5 McLaughlin, City Planner for the City of Coral  
 6 Gables.

7 May I have the PowerPoint, please?

8 I'll present to you the North Ponce  
 9 Mixed-Use District tonight. We do have some  
 10 updates, based on your feedback from the  
 11 November meeting, and those are outlined at the  
 12 very beginning of the Staff report, if you want  
 13 to look, on the first page.

14 At the last meeting, you asked us to  
 15 provide the vision report that was produced in  
 16 2015 --

17 MS. MENENDEZ: Right.

18 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: -- so that's in Attachment  
 19 F, and that really reinforces a lot of the  
 20 recommendations that we're making in the Zoning  
 21 Code changes for the Mixed-Use District. So  
 22 I'll go through that later in the presentation,  
 23 but you'll find that that Community Visioning  
 24 report is where we got the first ideas for the  
 25 paseos, for the transitions from the tall

1 she will continue to work with us in the  
 2 future, but she's leaving at the end of the  
 3 month, and I would like for her to be able to  
 4 explain to you, in great depth and in great  
 5 detail --

6 MR. BEHAR: Why she's living?

7 MR. TRIAS: I think that she can explain  
 8 that, if she wants to, but I think it's going  
 9 to be very good. And, again --

10 MR. GRABIEL: What did you do?

11 MS. MENENDEZ: It's not because of you,  
 12 Ramon, right?

13 MR. TRIAS: I keep hoping that it's not  
 14 because of me, but what I would say, though, is  
 15 that I do anticipate that she will continue to  
 16 work with us as a consultant and so on. So  
 17 that will be great. She is absolutely one of  
 18 the best and most professional people that I  
 19 have had a chance to work with, and I think  
 20 she's certainly very qualified to advice you on  
 21 this topic and give you the details, and she  
 22 did all of the research, Ms. Menendez, that you  
 23 requested.

24 MS. MENENDEZ: I saw that. I saw it. It's  
 25 in here.

1 buildings on Ponce, down to the lower scale  
 2 buildings in the residential neighborhood, and  
 3 many other recommendations. So it's very  
 4 consistent with the public input we received,  
 5 and the recommendations we got from our  
 6 consultant.

7 And, then, in Attachment G, we did do the  
 8 analysis of the Residential Infill District on  
 9 how these proposed changes would affect the  
 10 development potential in that area of the City.

11 So, again, this Zoning Code Text Amendment  
 12 has gone through extensive public input  
 13 process. There's been a number of public  
 14 meetings. We do have a North Ponce website  
 15 that is on the Planning and Zoning web page,  
 16 and that's where anyone from the public, anyone  
 17 watching at home, and certainly anyone involved  
 18 in this review process, can stay up-to-date on  
 19 every meeting that we have, the documents that  
 20 are produced, and how the document is being  
 21 revised through the process.

22 And here you see, in Attachment G -- or,  
 23 excuse me, Attachment F, the Visioning Report,  
 24 where there were a number of recommended action  
 25 steps at the end of that report, and those are

1 -- we've been very diligent over the last year  
 2 and a half in implementing those, and we're  
 3 nearly complete, actually, with many of those  
 4 recommendations that we received.  
 5 So just very briefly, I'll go through,  
 6 there's -- I pulled a few quotes, where you see  
 7 that we've actually directly implemented those.  
 8 The very first is controlling the map. We've  
 9 talked about the fact that there's commercial  
 10 encroachment into the residential areas on  
 11 North Ponce. That was a recommendation that  
 12 we're trying to be proactive about through the  
 13 Mix-Used Overlay, which defines how deep we  
 14 would allow these more commercial, larger scale  
 15 developments to go into the neighborhood.  
 16 The next talks about, we want to require  
 17 real buildings facing North Ponce, and, you  
 18 know, having faces, windows, balconies fronting  
 19 North Ponce de Leon Boulevard, and that's  
 20 something we're accomplishing.  
 21 Excuse me.  
 22 The next is creating a transition between  
 23 Ponce and the residential streets through step  
 24 back requirements, setback requirements and  
 25 landscape and frontage, fronting the

1 neighborhood with liveable space, not just  
 2 fronting a parking garage very close to  
 3 residential, which we heard, in the last  
 4 meeting, there were some residents that were  
 5 concerned about the kind of development that's  
 6 currently under construction, and that they  
 7 don't want to see that happen again. So that's  
 8 something we're trying to address.  
 9 And, finally, this idea of providing these  
 10 mid block landscaped, open air paseos that are  
 11 going to be, you know, the gold standard for  
 12 paseos in Coral Gables, that will really  
 13 enhance this part of the City.  
 14 The purpose here, you see the map, the  
 15 proposed map, there is, along North Ponce, the  
 16 Mixed-Use District, and then along East Ponce  
 17 de Leon Boulevard, we are proposing the  
 18 Residential Infill District, and there's been  
 19 some discussion on what that boundary will be  
 20 and we'll talk about that a bit later.  
 21 So for the Mixed-Use District, last month  
 22 we had a diagram showing the different  
 23 potential development projects that might  
 24 result from these updated provisions, based on  
 25 the amount of property a developer might have

1 assembled, and you'll see -- we updated the  
 2 dimensions on your feedback for the liners. So  
 3 previously you'll see that we were proposing a  
 4 thirty-foot deep liner, with a twenty-foot  
 5 paseo, and that was a very deliberate -- based  
 6 on a deliberate study, going for like the  
 7 optimal garage floor plate, so the typical bays  
 8 of sixty feet, to try to get a hundred and  
 9 twenty foot bay, and then, how can we work that  
 10 into the different lot increments you might  
 11 have, and how can we fit in, you know, a good  
 12 liner, a good paseo and that sort of thing.  
 13 So when we did update the liner dimensions,  
 14 we found that for a 150-foot deep lot, you  
 15 would get a 110-foot parking garage dimension,  
 16 and, then, for the 200-foot deep lot, you would  
 17 get 140-foot deep parking garage. So, you  
 18 know, I think it's worth discussing a little  
 19 bit whether that's a worthwhile dimension, if  
 20 there's a gain from that, and maybe there's  
 21 other scenarios where that might -- where there  
 22 might be benefit.  
 23 MR. BELLIN: Megan, let me ask you a  
 24 question. Where do you have lots of that  
 25 depth?

1 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: We did do a study of  
 2 potential sites that might be able to redevelop  
 3 under this, and we did find three to four sites  
 4 currently that, you know, are possible, and,  
 5 you know, otherwise it would be a matter of  
 6 someone assembling a larger --  
 7 MR. BELLIN: Assembling part of the MF-2  
 8 properties.  
 9 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Right.  
 10 MR. BELLIN: Okay.  
 11 MR. BEHAR: You know, that depth of 110 is  
 12 neither here nor there. 120, or thereabout, is  
 13 the optimal for a garage.  
 14 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Right.  
 15 MR. BEHAR: And I see, when sites are  
 16 30,000 square foot building sites, it has the  
 17 same depth of paseo as a buffer to the  
 18 residential. That, you know, is the only one  
 19 that I see that may not work as good. And,  
 20 then, maybe where sites are 30,000 or less,  
 21 maybe there's a little modification.  
 22 I think, everywhere else, it works good. I  
 23 think you're doing a great job. Size over  
 24 30,000, for example, the 40,000, you have --  
 25 abutting as a buffer to the residential, you

Page 109

1 have a 20-foot paseo, you have a liner, and  
 2 then you have a depth where you show  
 3 graphically 140 feet, gives you more than  
 4 plenty to work on a garage.  
 5 I think that, you know, under 20,000, it's  
 6 very difficult, so what you have is correct. I  
 7 think, over 40,000 -- and 7,000 works good. I  
 8 think the 30,000 is the one that maybe there's  
 9 a potential to make a slight modification to  
 10 that one.  
 11 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: And that may happen just  
 12 through the developer's choice. You know, they  
 13 may find that it's not worth their while to  
 14 shrink the liner in that case and we may work  
 15 with them.  
 16 May I have the PowerPoint?  
 17 This diagram goes over the building form,  
 18 the building massing, which we discussed the  
 19 last time, and the building setbacks, which,  
 20 you know, it's a very tailored building  
 21 setback, because we're talking about larger  
 22 scale buildings and we are trying to work that  
 23 transition in. So you do see that there's a  
 24 different setback along the side street, as you  
 25 get into the Neighborhood Conservation

Page 110

1 District, and we're doing that in order to kind  
 2 of match the frontage on these east-west  
 3 avenues, so that as you are next door to some  
 4 of these two and three-story Historic apartment  
 5 buildings, that the frontage on the backs of  
 6 these buildings would match.  
 7 Another aspect of the regulations, that was  
 8 updated based on your feedback, we looked at  
 9 the way the liners are in the building, and I  
 10 did want to get your feedback, also, on this,  
 11 where previously, with the 30-foot liner, it  
 12 lined up pretty well with the 30-foot step back  
 13 for the building and the tower on Ponce de Leon  
 14 Boulevard. Now those are a little bit  
 15 different, and, you know, I don't know if the  
 16 architects in the group might want to provide  
 17 some feedback on if it's worthwhile having  
 18 those align -- the tower would align with the  
 19 edge of the garage, or if it's okay to step  
 20 back a little bit, and we can discuss that  
 21 later.  
 22 The parking areas have not changed too  
 23 much. This is the Comprehensive Plan Map  
 24 Amendments. The underlying Land Use  
 25 Classifications have not changed. The

Page 111

1 Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment, we did  
 2 update that language. We removed references to  
 3 the Multi-Family High Density, because that's  
 4 not relevant to the North Ponce area, and that  
 5 was one of your comments.  
 6 The Zoning Map has not changed. The  
 7 underlying Zoning still remains. And then,  
 8 with the North Ponce Zoning Code Text Amendment  
 9 for the MXD, again, you know, this is a pretty  
 10 extensive set of revisions, and mostly it is  
 11 dealing with the building form, architectural  
 12 standards and public benefits, public open  
 13 space, like the paseos, making sure that the  
 14 frontage on heavily trafficked streets, like  
 15 Ponce, do not have any driveways, no loading,  
 16 no serving, and that sort of thing. So we're  
 17 really trying to control the public realm and  
 18 how buildings front the street.  
 19 Okay. Request Number 5 is the transfer of  
 20 development rights, and what this does is, it  
 21 allows commercial properties on Ponce de Leon  
 22 Boulevard to be both, sending sites for  
 23 transfers of development rights, and receiving  
 24 sites. And currently that's not allowed.  
 25 So, as a sending site, right now the only

Page 112

1 sending sites in the City are in the Central  
 2 Business District or in the North Ponce area,  
 3 but MF-2. So we're basically expanding that  
 4 North Ponce sending area to include the  
 5 commercial, also.  
 6 And, then, as a receiving site, this allows  
 7 all of the commercially zoned properties facing  
 8 Ponce de Leon Boulevard to bonus up to 4.375  
 9 FAR. And that was a recommendation directly  
 10 from the North Ponce report in 2015.  
 11 And, finally, the East Ponce Residential  
 12 Infill District, now this idea came from  
 13 looking at the configuration of East Ponce de  
 14 Leon Boulevard, which is a very special place  
 15 in sort of the urban design, the street layout  
 16 of the City. It really connects the Douglas  
 17 Entrance to Ponce de Leon Boulevard, to Ponce  
 18 Park, which is that triangular park at the  
 19 bottom center of the photo, and we did find,  
 20 looking at old maps, actually the previous  
 21 version of the Zoning Map, I believe, in 2005,  
 22 at that time, there were different provisions  
 23 for Multi-Family buildings that would front  
 24 East Ponce de Leon Boulevard, and you'll see --  
 25 if you see, in this photo, close to where the

1 Douglas Entrance buildings are, there's a very  
2 tall apartment building. It's fourteen stories  
3 tall. And that was permitted under the  
4 previous version of the Zoning Code. So there  
5 was a little bit more, perhaps a more vision  
6 for taller buildings fronting that boulevard,  
7 and creating, perhaps, more of a gateway, and  
8 that is not in the Code currently and that's  
9 not in our Map currently, so that was sort of  
10 the idea of making something different for this  
11 spur.

12 And in this Map, you can see that our  
13 Staff's original proposal for the Residential  
14 Infill District encompassed Blocks 12, 13 and  
15 16, and you did see in our meeting last month  
16 that there was a request to study Blocks 3 and  
17 8, as well, to see if those might be  
18 appropriate for this District.

19 So what this entails is a Comprehensive  
20 Plan Text Amendment to allow increased density  
21 in these especially designated Residential  
22 Infill Districts of 60 units per acre or 75  
23 units per acre with Mediterranean bonus.

24 And here you see the Map. This is the  
25 Zoning Code Map Amendment request. And on

1 these -- the next few slides, I'm going to sort  
2 of walk you through the analysis that we did,  
3 that's in your report. It's in Attachment G.

4 So starting with Block 16, which is the  
5 southern most block, what we did is an analysis  
6 of what is currently there, in terms of  
7 density, FAR and height, and what could  
8 potentially be re-developed under these  
9 regulations, and there is a very good gain from  
10 the Zoning Code amendment and the different  
11 amendments.

12 You see that there's a potential of four  
13 times the existing floor area ratio to point  
14 five times the density and four times the  
15 height, and these are pictures of what is  
16 currently there. These are mostly mid Century  
17 1940s and '50s apartment buildings, walk up,  
18 you know, no parking on site, with the  
19 landscaped courtyards and front yards.

20 MS. MENENDEZ: Can I ask a question? That  
21 particular site, why does it have such an odd  
22 shape? Why isn't it squared off?

23 MR. BEHAR: Thank you.

24 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: So this particular block,  
25 it's not squared off, because it's abutting the

1 Mixed-Use District. So the other properties on  
2 this block are a part of the Mixed-Use Overlay.  
3 And it's just a result of the ownership and --

4 MR. BEHAR: Yeah, but -- go ahead, finish.

5 MS. MENENDEZ: No, I was just going to say,  
6 wouldn't it make sense, as in other areas, the  
7 Mixed-Use would just be squared off, and then  
8 the rest of it is the Infill, if, in fact,  
9 you're looking to create that density on the  
10 other side? It just looks odd. Is that one  
11 owner? Is that one property owner?

12 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: No.

13 MS. MENENDEZ: No?

14 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: I don't believe so.

15 MS. MENENDEZ: You looked at areas --

16 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes, we looked at all of  
17 the property ownership. I don't remember this  
18 being one owner.

19 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. So there's no  
20 proposed projects, per se?

21 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: No.

22 MS. MENENDEZ: No? The City just came in  
23 and started analyzing this idea of the Infill?

24 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes. I mean, this was  
25 really drawn when we were looking at how to

1 front East Ponce in a special way, and these  
2 are the properties fronting East Ponce on this  
3 block.

4 MR. BEHAR: You know, to that point, I  
5 looked at the Map, and I looked at what a Land  
6 Use Map should look like, and the idea, my  
7 interpretation, the intent is to have a clear,  
8 straight boundary definition, where one starts  
9 and the other one.

10 That block particularly, which I marked as  
11 one of my comments to you is, why is that  
12 happening there? And, then, that same  
13 rationale will happen on other blocks, such as  
14 24, 39, and the other side of Ponce, on 40,  
15 which, you know, it seems like that line is  
16 zigzagging and we should try to maintain a  
17 straight line, so it's cleanly defined.

18 And that block, particularly, 16, at an  
19 earlier -- you know, I went back. I did a  
20 little bit of homework, so tonight I would be  
21 able to -- and I'm not going to take too long,  
22 because I know he has to go, but I went back,  
23 and that block, at one point, was part of the  
24 North Ponce boundary, a corridor. Then it was  
25 taken out, right?

1 I remember having a plan, that particular  
2 area was inclusive in the corridor, and then it  
3 was taken out.

4 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: I would have to look back.  
5 We've had numerous iterations of the Map.

6 MR. BEHAR: I want to say it's like three  
7 of four generations ago.

8 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes. Yes. Yes.

9 MR. BEHAR: So that was there. It was  
10 taken. Same thing as Block Number 24. When  
11 you look at it, you know, which I think may  
12 come up, there's no clear definition on those  
13 two blocks. I recommend -- and I also went  
14 back, since you touched on the 75 units per  
15 acre, where that came about, and I think I went  
16 back to a draft that I want to say  
17 Plater-Zyberk, DPZ, a study they did, which --  
18 analyzed a lot of 50 by a hundred.

19 From the 50 to 100, they stipulated to get  
20 to a big lot, and that's what resulted in the  
21 75 units per acre, but that really, it has, in  
22 my opinion, not a lot of basis, because it  
23 doesn't -- it may work on a small lot that they  
24 used that rationale to get 80 units on that 50  
25 by a hundred lot, but may not work, and that

1 benefit the East Ponce corridor and the way it  
2 fronts the corridor.

3 Currently, when you take this whole area  
4 combined, because of the vacant lot, there's  
5 potential for seven times the current building  
6 area, because obviously there's not much there,  
7 four times the current density and four times  
8 the current height. And these are photos of  
9 the existing buildings that are in that  
10 location.

11 And then the two other blocks that are  
12 under consideration are Block 8. Here you see  
13 Block 8. This is located right behind, I  
14 believe, the American Airlines building that's  
15 on Ponce. So it does include part of their  
16 parking area. And here you have a potential  
17 for five times the current building area, two  
18 and a half times the density and four times the  
19 height, and these are the buildings that are  
20 currently in that location.

21 And then the last block is Block 3. This  
22 is the back side of Southwest Eighth Street,  
23 and you have Douglas Entrance just to the east.  
24 And here, again, very similar to other blocks,  
25 there's a similar increase in density and

1 just carried over, and I think that we're not  
2 doing justice to what potential it could be by  
3 keeping, you know, that number. And that  
4 number, again, came from a study of a 50 by a  
5 hundred lot, and then it was taken over.

6 So if you have a lot that is not 5,000, but  
7 it's 20,000, you're been penalized because of  
8 that.

9 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Okay. Thank you. We will  
10 continue to look at this.

11 The next block that we looked at was Block  
12 13, which is at the northeastern most edge.  
13 This is right across the street from the  
14 Douglas Entrance. And this is an area that is  
15 actually mostly built out. The building area  
16 is currently met, based of what we're  
17 proposing. It is half the density of what  
18 we're proposing, and the height is met. This  
19 is where the 14-story apartment building is  
20 located, and this is a photo of the two  
21 buildings that were built in this location.

22 And then Block 12 is the third block that  
23 we were originally proposing. It is a vacant  
24 lot. It is a site that is, you know, ready for  
25 re-development, that could really, you know,

1 height and FAR.

2 And, then, the Zoning Code Text Amendment  
3 that we are proposing for this location, it  
4 deals with an FAR increase of up to --  
5 currently MF-2 is a sliding scale, between 1.0  
6 and 2.0. This would establish a 2.0 FAR, with  
7 an ability to bonus up to 2.25, and then the  
8 density is increased by way of the  
9 Comprehensive Plan Amendment and potentially a  
10 height increase here of up to 97 feet.

11 It does establish standards for building  
12 frontage, and standards for the way the front  
13 yards would be designed, trying to minimize the  
14 amount of pavement. We used a lot of the  
15 standards taken from the Neighborhood  
16 Conservation District. So really trying to put  
17 cars, loading, driveways in their proper place,  
18 and make sure that those front yards reflect  
19 the open landscape feel that's currently in the  
20 North Ponce area.

21 So there has been ongoing discussion on how  
22 this Zoning Code Text Amendment might evolve,  
23 and, again, you know, there was a presentation  
24 earlier tonight about Workforce Housing. This  
25 could be an opportunity to incorporate

1 Workforce Housing or perhaps more open space  
2 requirements, and we certainly look forward to  
3 your input on that.

4 We did the Comprehensive Plan Findings of  
5 Fact. We found that these comply. We found  
6 that the Zoning Code Findings of Fact comply,  
7 and we do recommend approval.

8 Thank you.

9 MS. MENENDEZ: Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.

11 MR. COLLER: Mr. Chairman, one sort of  
12 tweak to the language would be to clarify with  
13 the Site Specifics that if you develop -- if  
14 you don't develop -- if you develop in  
15 accordance with the underlying Zoning and not  
16 take advantage of the Overlay, that you would  
17 keep the Site Specifics, whereas if you chose  
18 to develop in the Overlay, only under those  
19 circumstances would you lose the opportunity to  
20 utilize the Site Specifics. So it would be an  
21 optional --

22 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. But I think --

23 MR. COLLER: And so we have some suggestive  
24 language that we'll propose to amend, to make  
25 sure that that's clear.

1 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. I thought I  
2 recall reading something to that effect in the  
3 language in our packet.

4 MR. COLLER: Right. Well --

5 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That said, if you  
6 utilize the Infill, then it negates the Site  
7 Specifics.

8 MR. COLLER: Right. I think the concern  
9 was that it might be interpreted that under any  
10 circumstances you lost the Site Specifics.  
11 That's not the intent.

12 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.

13 MR. COLLER: And it's really the  
14 applicability language that occurs in two  
15 places. One is on Page 15, for the Mixed-Use,  
16 and then the residential Overlay is on Page 31,  
17 and you want to address that?

18 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, Craig. I think the  
19 Chairman is correct. The language is already  
20 there in the Mixed-Use. It's just that our  
21 attorney was suggesting to clarify, to make it  
22 very, very clear, that that was the intent.

23 MR. COLLER: Yes.

24 MR. TRIAS: But it is already in place, and  
25 we don't intend to change it.

1 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.

2 MR. COLLER: That's correct. It's really  
3 more just to make it absolutely clear.

4 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.

5 MR. COLLER: Because, you know, lawyers  
6 will look at the same language and come up with  
7 different opinions.

8 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: At this point, we'll  
9 open up the public hearing for public comment.

10 MR. BELLIN: I'd like a clarification.

11 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.

12 MR. BELLIN: My concern always was that if  
13 the Site Specifics went away, the small lots  
14 would then lose their development rights. So  
15 why don't we just leave the Site Specifics the  
16 way they are?

17 MR. COLLER: Well, I think that's what the  
18 proposal is, is that if you were to utilize the  
19 Overlay District benefits, only under those  
20 circumstances would the Site Specifics not be  
21 there. If you choose to just develop in  
22 accordance with the underlying regulations, you  
23 get the Site Specifics.

24 MR. TRIAS: Yes. That's the answer. We  
25 are doing exactly what you're saying. We're

1 leaving them in place, and if you want to do  
2 the MXD, you can, also.

3 MR. BELLIN: Okay. Okay.

4 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. The  
5 public --

6 MR. WU: Mr. Chair, should we get Board  
7 Member Rodriguez before we lose him?

8 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'm sorry?

9 MR. WU: Should we get Board Member  
10 Rodriguez's comments before we lose him?

11 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Frank, do you have  
12 anything to add before you have to leave?

13 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I have nothing to add.

14 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: The public hearing is  
15 open. Jill, do we have any cards?

16 THE SECRETARY: Randall Sousa.

17 MS. MENENDEZ: How many cards do we have?

18 THE SECRETARY: We have three.

19 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.

20 MR. SOUZA: Randall Souza, 2920 District  
21 Avenue, Fairfax, Virginia. I'm here as the  
22 officer and owner-operator of 115 Calabria. I  
23 just want to put forth my support for the  
24 inclusion of Block 3 and 8 as part of the  
25 Infill District, the request that was made.



1 As a member of that community and the owner  
 2 and operator there for many years, I'm  
 3 concerned with the development of that property  
 4 over there in the Gables District, the Douglas  
 5 Entrance, and I just ask this Board to take  
 6 their time and have forward -- you know, engage  
 7 in forward thinking, as far as what the  
 8 development is going to be. I'm concerned  
 9 about -- that the Inlay District only applies  
 10 to certain properties, and it's a Site  
 11 Specific, rather than legislative, especially  
 12 the property entering Galiano and Ponce.

13 So just -- that's all. I'm just trying to  
 14 get a bearing on what's going on, and I  
 15 appreciate the information today. Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.

17 THE SECRETARY: Mario Garcia-Serra.

18 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Good evening, Mr. Chair,  
 19 Members of the Board. Mario Garcia-Serra, with  
 20 offices at 600 Brickell Avenue, representing  
 21 Alliance Starlight, LLC. They're the owner of  
 22 the 40,000 square foot site at 100 Calabria.  
 23 It's the vacant site that you saw in Megan's  
 24 presentation, at the corner of Calabria and  
 25 East Ponce.

1 That site has been vacant for over fifteen  
 2 years, and I think that speaks for itself.  
 3 Despite the upward swings in real estate during  
 4 that time, the entitlements on this property  
 5 have not been sufficient to motivate  
 6 redevelopment, and I think we can all agree  
 7 that the North Ponce is an area where we need  
 8 to preserve certain aspects of the garden style  
 9 sort of neighborhood and apartments, and that  
 10 scale, which is unique, and something that  
 11 characterizes and is agreeable, but that  
 12 there's other areas, especially along Ponce,  
 13 along East Ponce, which are vacant,  
 14 underutilized, and areas that could be  
 15 developed to address some of the needs that the  
 16 City has, such as was prominently mentioned  
 17 previously, the issue of Workforce Housing and  
 18 housing affordability overall.

19 And what do I think has happened in East  
 20 Ponce? I think, as was alluded to in the Staff  
 21 recommendation and the Staff presentation, we  
 22 have sort of strayed from the Historic plan for  
 23 East Ponce. East Ponce de Leon Boulevard, at  
 24 one point, was the principal entry point from  
 25 the City of Miami or one of the principal entry

1 points into the City of Coral Gables from the  
 2 City of Miami. It went straight through the  
 3 Douglas Entrance Office Complex, and connected  
 4 with Eighth Street.

5 It's a wide street. It's been a prominent  
 6 entryway to the City historically.  
 7 Historically its Zoning has not been the same  
 8 as the lower scale Zoning on the surrounding  
 9 side streets, residential side streets. I have  
 10 my usual maps, historic maps, and, you know,  
 11 historic information that I could show to you,  
 12 if you'd like, but for much of its history,  
 13 there's been no limit on FAR or density, and  
 14 its height has been somewhere between a hundred  
 15 and a hundred and fifty feet in permitted  
 16 height.

17 The Residential Infill District that is  
 18 proposed for East Ponce is not an afterthought  
 19 of the study effort. If you look at the  
 20 original North Ponce Vision study that was done  
 21 after the Charrette by Chuck Bohl, you'll see  
 22 that there's a whole section, in that North  
 23 Ponce study, that talks about the East Ponce  
 24 corridor, and even singles out my client's  
 25 property, at 100 Calabria, as a site that's

1 suitable for re-development.

2 It's been included in previous iterations  
 3 of the North Ponce study. Its name has  
 4 changed, and that might have caused some of the  
 5 confusion. It started being called the Ponce  
 6 Infill District, I think, maybe about two  
 7 meetings ago of this Board, but as Mr. Behar  
 8 was mentioning, if you look at the maps  
 9 historically, and here's one of them from  
 10 August of 2016, you'll see that not only is  
 11 East Ponce included, but even the properties to  
 12 the north, which are the subject of some  
 13 consideration as to whether the --

14 MS. MENENDEZ: Can I see that, please?

15 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Sure.

16 MR. BEHAR: By the way, we had those.

17 MS. MENENDEZ: Yeah, I know. I just have  
 18 to be reminded. Thank you. Yeah.

19 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Those properties to the  
 20 north of the previous speaker, were included at  
 21 that point in time in what was being called  
 22 uniformly the Ponce Mixed-Use Corridor. What  
 23 has happened is that East Ponce is given sort  
 24 of additional special treatment, limiting  
 25 exactly how much density and floor area could

1 be based there.  
 2 You're more limited on East Ponce than you  
 3 would be along Ponce, and, in particular,  
 4 addressing sort of the street frontage issues  
 5 and also excluding any commercial use along  
 6 East Ponce, because, again, East Ponce is sort  
 7 of the transition from main Ponce to the  
 8 residential communities to the east, and so I  
 9 think it was decided that having a potential  
 10 non-residential component wouldn't be welcomed.  
 11 So along that area, you would not be able to  
 12 have a non-commercial component.  
 13 You know, I think I can sum up by basically  
 14 saying, wouldn't it be great, as we were  
 15 discussing earlier, more people who worked in  
 16 Douglas Entrance, lived close to Douglas  
 17 Entrance, and could potentially walk out their  
 18 front door and walk to work, as opposed to  
 19 getting into the car and having the rush hour  
 20 craziness that we have in the mornings and the  
 21 evenings all over Dade County, but including in  
 22 this area, in particular.  
 23 So that's sort of the intent. It really  
 24 was a City initiated planning effort to try to  
 25 include Mixed-Use, to try to see re-development

1 where it's warranted, to try to have  
 2 preservation where it's warranted. We were  
 3 involved, as property owners, of course,  
 4 because we have an interest in it.  
 5 And, you know, were we potentially pushing  
 6 for more and wanted to see more as part of this  
 7 change in Zoning? Yes, but what's being  
 8 proposed, is it acceptable, is it a step in the  
 9 right direction, is it something that we think  
 10 can encourage the sort of development, in  
 11 certain cases, and preservation in other cases,  
 12 which is warranted, we do think so. So we  
 13 would encourage you to move forward with this  
 14 item tonight, so it can move forward to the  
 15 City Commission. Thank you very much.  
 16 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.  
 17 THE SECRETARY: Oscar Herrera.  
 18 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I have to leave.  
 19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thanks for being here.  
 20 MR. HERRERA: Good evening, Board Members.  
 21 My name is Oscar Herrera. I'm here  
 22 representing the property located at 105  
 23 Calabria, as owner of the same.  
 24 I'm here to support the petition that is  
 25 proposed for Blocks 8 and 3, and the reason for

1 my presence here was to request a clarification  
 2 regarding the specific -- Site Specifics for  
 3 those properties that are smaller than 20,000  
 4 square feet.  
 5 The fact that Staff has proposed the  
 6 tweaking of the language is a testament to the  
 7 quality of the employees that the City has. So  
 8 I'm very thankful for that. And, also, I want  
 9 to thank you for your time and dedication to  
 10 service, which is never enough emphasized.  
 11 Thank you so much.  
 12 MR. GRABIEL: Thank you.  
 13 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Any others?  
 14 MR. WU: Mr. Chair, before you, we have  
 15 three communications, just for the record. Two  
 16 are from Mr. Larry Rifkin and an e-mail from  
 17 Ms. Linda Baron.  
 18 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. And those were  
 19 at our chairs tonight.  
 20 MR. WU: Yes.  
 21 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. We'll close the  
 22 public hearing. And comments and discussion  
 23 from Board Members.  
 24 MR. BEHAR: Ladies.  
 25 MS. MENENDEZ: Thank you.

1 I just had a suggestion. Should we --  
 2 obviously these are two different areas that  
 3 we're looking at. We're looking at the Ponce  
 4 corridor and then we're looking at this Infill  
 5 concept. Could we separate them, perhaps?  
 6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Of course.  
 7 MS. MENENDEZ: And then deal with one and  
 8 the other?  
 9 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Uh-huh. Okay.  
 10 MS. MENENDEZ: Maybe that would help us get  
 11 to the point where we need to.  
 12 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: You want to just take  
 13 them in the order that we have it, and go with  
 14 the Mixed-Use --  
 15 MR. TRIAS: They're separate items, so  
 16 they're already separated.  
 17 MS. MENENDEZ: Right. Okay.  
 18 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: You want to go with the  
 19 Mixed-Use first?  
 20 MS. MENENDEZ: Right, which is the Ponce  
 21 corridor, right?  
 22 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Correct.  
 23 MS. MENENDEZ: I don't have comments at  
 24 this time, but I just wanted to separate them,  
 25 or ask the question whether we, in fact, could

1 separate them, and the answer is, yes.  
 2 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah.  
 3 On that, a question for Staff. On the  
 4 ground floor building frontage, it looks like  
 5 we've taken -- the bullet points are from the  
 6 Giralda Overlay, I think. They seem very  
 7 similar.  
 8 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes, they are.  
 9 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And I remember, one of  
 10 these says, the shopfront window sill height  
 11 shall be a maximum of two feet. Did we change  
 12 that on Giralda based on some comments from the  
 13 architects, max of two feet?  
 14 MR. GRABIEL: No. I was leading --  
 15 MR. BEHAR: The windowsill.  
 16 MR. GRABIEL: Yeah.  
 17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Shopfront window sill  
 18 height above the sidewalk elevation shall be a  
 19 maximum of two feet here. I think these mimic  
 20 Giralda, and I thought maybe we changed the  
 21 Giralda one to make it a max of three feet,  
 22 from memory.  
 23 MR. GRABIEL: The idea was that it  
 24 previously was too high, so it does not allow  
 25 for views into the shop.

1 pedestrian passage will be five to ten feet  
 2 wide, with a paved pedestrian path. Do we  
 3 define, paved, or are we just talking some sort  
 4 of hard surface there?  
 5 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: We don't define it. We  
 6 can, if you --  
 7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. No, I just don't  
 8 know that pavement is always the best design  
 9 feature, and I didn't want to get locked into  
 10 putting blacktop down.  
 11 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Okay. Yes, Ramon, was  
 12 just clarifying that there's other provisions  
 13 in the Code that deal with that.  
 14 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.  
 15 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: The vision was that it  
 16 would be a sidewalk, you know, some sort of  
 17 sidewalk.  
 18 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Like a hard surface.  
 19 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes, a hard surface.  
 20 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Sure. Okay. I think  
 21 that's all I have on the MXD.  
 22 MR. BEHAR: I have a question on that. On  
 23 Ponce de Leon, every block that I see, from  
 24 Eight Street all of the way to Navarre,  
 25 fronting Ponce de Leon, you have Commercial

1 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Right. It was three feet.  
 2 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.  
 3 MR. GRABIEL: So by dropping it no more  
 4 than 24 inches, it will allow you to give a  
 5 good view into the store.  
 6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So these mimic  
 7 what ended up on the Giralda?  
 8 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes.  
 9 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. On Number 14,  
 10 setbacks and step backs, so the additions for  
 11 the North Ponce MXD, are those all setbacks,  
 12 Megan, or are they --  
 13 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: It's both.  
 14 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can I just suggest that  
 15 for people reading it in the future, the bullet  
 16 points just seem to be all as if they were  
 17 setbacks, but no step backs, and I wasn't sure  
 18 which was which here.  
 19 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: We could look at  
 20 separating them, to make it clear.  
 21 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. On Number 16,  
 22 for pedestrian pass throughs, and the  
 23 landscaped pedestrian passages, it starts on  
 24 Page 21 -- actually, the added language is I  
 25 think mostly on Page 22. It says that the

1 High-Rise, except Block 24.  
 2 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Could you tell me which  
 3 page you're looking at?  
 4 MR. BEHAR: I'm sorry?  
 5 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Which page is this?  
 6 MR. BEHAR: On the Land Use Map, right, you  
 7 have every block fronting Ponce de Leon, again,  
 8 it seems to me that you have -- there is a  
 9 Commercial High-Rise designation every block  
 10 fronting Ponce de Leon, except Block 24.  
 11 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Correct.  
 12 MR. BEHAR: Why does that block not have  
 13 the same High-Rise designation on the frontage  
 14 to Ponce de Leon?  
 15 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: This is the existing Land  
 16 Use Map. So we have not changed the underlying  
 17 Land Uses.  
 18 MR. BEHAR: Okay, fine, but if you're  
 19 saying that anything within this highlighted  
 20 area is going to have the opportunity to use an  
 21 MXD, is there a conflict there now? Because  
 22 you cannot -- the Land Use Map says you don't  
 23 have the 150 feet, you know, Commercial  
 24 High-Rise, but yet you're allowed to -- you  
 25 included in the MXD --

1 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes, we should study that  
 2 further.  
 3 MR. BEHAR: I think you need to, yes, study  
 4 that and make the appropriate correction. And,  
 5 Ramon, you may want to maybe clarify my point,  
 6 but if that's the case, that frontage of that  
 7 block should also reflect the Commercial  
 8 High-Rise; isn't that correct?  
 9 MR. TRIAS: That is the only block  
 10 frontage, and I don't know why it's like that.  
 11 That's the existing condition, yes.  
 12 MR. BEHAR: But we should -- now that we're  
 13 doing this, we should correct that.  
 14 MR. TRIAS: And that could be a  
 15 recommendation from the Planning and Zoning  
 16 Board, that the Land Use should be consistent  
 17 with the rest of the corridor.  
 18 MR. BEHAR: Consistent.  
 19 MR. TRIAS: We did not make any  
 20 recommendations for Land Use as part of this  
 21 process, but, certainly, you can.  
 22 MR. BEHAR: Okay.  
 23 MS. MENENDEZ: But just like that? I  
 24 mean --  
 25 MR. BEHAR: Well, because when you look at

1 analysis, and they come back to us and say,  
 2 "You know what, this really needs to be  
 3 changed," then definitely we should consider  
 4 it. But just like that, to up-Zone  
 5 something --  
 6 MR. BEHAR: But it goes -- I mean, you have  
 7 this all --  
 8 MS. MENENDEZ: But it's different. It's  
 9 not exactly like the other blocks. It's on  
 10 East Ponce, which is another corridor. I mean,  
 11 I know what you're saying, but it's really not  
 12 the same. That's probably why it's Zoned the  
 13 way it's Zoned. Not to say that it shouldn't  
 14 in the future, when a project is before us, but  
 15 just to -- again, if they do the analysis and  
 16 their analysis and recommendation is something  
 17 we should consider, but just to up-Zone that,  
 18 like that, at this --  
 19 MR. BEHAR: It's not to up-Zone, Maria.  
 20 It's to keep it consistent.  
 21 MS. MENENDEZ: But I don't see it the way  
 22 you see it, as far as being along Ponce. I  
 23 think it's off of Ponce. It's along East  
 24 Ponce. Now, if in the future they were to come  
 25 in and request the City to vacate the street

1 it, Maria, every block --  
 2 MS. MENENDEZ: No, I understand that, but  
 3 that's off of Ponce. That's not facing Ponce,  
 4 per se. That frontage is East Ponce, which is  
 5 a different --  
 6 MR. BEHAR: Yeah, but I think that  
 7 essentially when you look at the block and  
 8 where that goes, to me, that -- yeah,  
 9 technically --  
 10 MS. MENENDEZ: I mean, at the end of the  
 11 day, if they were to come before us and they  
 12 have a project that meets -- I mean, I don't  
 13 want to speak right now about it, but, I mean,  
 14 it has merits, but just -- I'm not a proponent  
 15 of just up-Zoning without really having it  
 16 studied.  
 17 MR. TRIAS: I would agree with Ms.  
 18 Menendez, in the sense that we don't need to  
 19 overthink this. You have a future possibility  
 20 of proposing something.  
 21 MS. MENENDEZ: Right. I mean --  
 22 MR. BEHAR: But then what's the purpose of  
 23 this --  
 24 MS. MENENDEZ: If they study it -- let's  
 25 say, if Staff studies it, like they did the

1 and face Ponce, then that's different, but it's  
 2 not the same, from my perspective, but I'm just  
 3 one Board Member.  
 4 MR. GRABIEL: No, I agree with Maria. I  
 5 think that's -- that East Ponce Boulevard used  
 6 to be, as mentioned, the main entrance to the  
 7 City from Calle Ocho, and I'm old enough to  
 8 remember that opening to Southwest Eighth  
 9 Street, and coming in through there.  
 10 But, still, historically, it was the main  
 11 entrance, and I think that block -- I could  
 12 argue either way, but I'd prefer, also, to hold  
 13 on that, and do it.  
 14 I have a couple of other questions for  
 15 Staff. We talked about it, we touched on it  
 16 last meeting, that the line, in some places,  
 17 falls and splits a building. One part of a  
 18 building is in one Zoning and the other part of  
 19 the building -- what happens with the owner of  
 20 that property? How does he deal with the use  
 21 of his land?  
 22 MR. TRIAS: That was certainly not the  
 23 intent. So I would describe that as an error.  
 24 Do you know of any --  
 25 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Well, we've done a couple

1 of different iterations of the boundary. We  
 2 did do a version that looked at every building  
 3 and every property -- you know, multiple  
 4 properties that might be under one owner, and  
 5 the boundary was so wiggly that it really  
 6 didn't achieve what we're trying to do, in  
 7 terms of urban design.  
 8 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Grabiell, do you know the  
 9 specific building?  
 10 MR. GRABIELL: Yeah. I mean, I'm looking at  
 11 one in Calabria and I'm looking at another one  
 12 in Antiquera and in Santillane, where the line  
 13 is actually going through the buildings. So  
 14 there's three buildings there, that a portion  
 15 of the building falls on --  
 16 MR. TRIAS: Are you looking at the aerial?  
 17 MR. GRABIELL: I'm looking at the building  
 18 footprint map.  
 19 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. I don't think those maps  
 20 are as accurate as the Zoning and the Land Use  
 21 Maps --  
 22 MR. GRABIELL: Okay.  
 23 MR. TRIAS: -- but we should certainly  
 24 verify it.  
 25 MR. GRABIELL: I think you should take a

1 look at it, because it makes it difficult for  
 2 the owner of that land to --  
 3 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, but I don't believe that  
 4 they're that accurate. I think that may be a  
 5 mistake in the drafting of the map.  
 6 MR. GRABIELL: Okay.  
 7 MR. TRIAS: The ones that are accurate are  
 8 the Land Use and the Zoning Map.  
 9 MR. GRABIELL: Okay. But let's assume that  
 10 one of them is accurate, how would you address  
 11 it, just go around those buildings? If the  
 12 building is partially in one side --  
 13 MR. TRIAS: No, we intend to have the whole  
 14 building in one side or the other.  
 15 MR. GRABIELL: Okay. Okay. Thank you.  
 16 That's one question.  
 17 The other question is, I think the part of  
 18 East Ponce that runs all of the way through --  
 19 crossing Galiano and to Douglas Entrance, has  
 20 the possibility of being a very strong and nice  
 21 urban street, if the facade of those buildings  
 22 that could be developed there follow a strong  
 23 pattern, meaning the setback is fixed for all  
 24 of those buildings, there's a cornice line,  
 25 there's a use of arcades at the bottom, all of

1 the good things that we've been talking about.  
 2 Are we doing that, and with these changes, is  
 3 that achievable?  
 4 MR. TRIAS: If you want to recommend more  
 5 precise guidelines, we certainly can take that  
 6 to the Commission. Right now we don't have  
 7 that, because that's not the way that the Code  
 8 is designed.  
 9 But, certainly, that's a very good comment.  
 10 MR. GRABIELL: How could we do that?  
 11 MR. TRIAS: Just through the discussion. I  
 12 mean, the purpose of the meeting today is to  
 13 inform the Commission of ideas and concerns.  
 14 So I will forward your comments, certainly. I  
 15 mean, for my purposes, that's enough. If you  
 16 want to have some other members --  
 17 MR. GRABIELL: Do you guys --  
 18 MS. MENENDEZ: What's that? I'm sorry.  
 19 MR. GRABIELL: What I'm saying is that, East  
 20 Ponce, there's opportunities for -- actually, a  
 21 portion of Galiano, but I'm just talking about  
 22 these two blocks in here, that could create a  
 23 very strong urban edge, including, eventually,  
 24 even a motel that's there, the hotel that is  
 25 there, where you would have a good urban edge,

1 that goes all of the way to Douglas Entrance.  
 2 MS. MENENDEZ: But are you talking about  
 3 for the Infill? You're talking about for the  
 4 Infill?  
 5 MR. TRIAS: Yes. Yes.  
 6 MR. GRABIELL: Yeah.  
 7 MS. MENENDEZ: Yeah.  
 8 MR. GRABIELL: And I would like to have at  
 9 least the opportunity for clarification so any  
 10 developer coming in here will -- right now East  
 11 Ponce is the back of some of these blocks, you  
 12 know.  
 13 MR. TRIAS: Right.  
 14 MR. GRABIELL: And what I would like to do  
 15 is make that a strong frontage on East Ponce.  
 16 MR. TRIAS: That was partially the thinking  
 17 of having the Residential Infill District,  
 18 okay.  
 19 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. Since you're  
 20 mentioning the Infill, my concern about what's  
 21 being proposed for the Infill is that I don't  
 22 think it is complete, and I think you're  
 23 hitting on it. There's a lot of different  
 24 things that could be done to enhance that area  
 25 or to get something for what's being proffered,

1 and those types of things is what has to be  
 2 included in an overall view of the area. You  
 3 see what I'm saying?  
 4 MR. GRABIEL: No. No. I agree. And  
 5 then --  
 6 MS. MENENDEZ: Instead of just outright  
 7 providing some more density, it needs to be  
 8 looked at much more.  
 9 MR. BEHAR: You're right.  
 10 MR. TRIAS: Ms. Menendez, if I could add.  
 11 We have had that discussion with our Workforce  
 12 Housing consultant --  
 13 MS. MENENDEZ: That's another component  
 14 here.  
 15 MR. TRIAS: And we believe -- yes.  
 16 MS. MENENDEZ: That's another component.  
 17 And so right now I don't think it's ready,  
 18 because if you were, in fact, looking at  
 19 affordable housing seriously, then there might  
 20 be some incentives provided that could work  
 21 into this whole Infill area.  
 22 MR. TRIAS: That is the discussion that we  
 23 had today, so we agree.  
 24 MR. BEHAR: Yeah, and you're not really  
 25 addressing -- the way you present this -- and I

1 agree, the way this is being presented, this is  
 2 not really promoting -- I don't want to say,  
 3 affordable -- Workforce Housing, because the  
 4 way you have it, when you do the analysis,  
 5 those units are big units. They're not  
 6 conducive to have more affordability in that  
 7 area.  
 8 MS. MENENDEZ: Right. So I think that you  
 9 are on the right track, but if you are, in  
 10 fact, looking at Workforce Housing, then that  
 11 component needs to be part of that infill  
 12 discussion. It can't be separate. You can't  
 13 move -- in my opinion, you can't move forward  
 14 on the infill and then turn around and have  
 15 this studied, and then the study says, "Hey,  
 16 this is an ideal area to have this."  
 17 You know, you have to kind of like work it  
 18 in as an incentive for developers to, in fact,  
 19 provide for the Workforce Housing.  
 20 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.  
 21 MR. BEHAR: And one tool to do that is to  
 22 allow your density to go higher in order to be  
 23 able to reduce the square footage.  
 24 MS. MENENDEZ: Right. Exactly.  
 25 MR. BEHAR: You know, for example, and I'm

1 going to use -- because I did the analysis.  
 2 Today, the way you have it, at 75 units per  
 3 acre, on a lot that is 20,000 square foot,  
 4 okay, not a huge lot, not a small lot, your  
 5 unit size can range between 1,200 and 1,300  
 6 square feet.  
 7 If you increase that or if want to achieve  
 8 an average of 750 to 800, the density would go  
 9 up to 125 units per acre. So I think really we  
 10 need to consider, if you want to promote the  
 11 Workforce Housing, just by simply the FAR  
 12 you're proposing, that density has to increase.  
 13 MS. MENENDEZ: But even more than the  
 14 Workforce Housing is what Julio was saying,  
 15 those amenities that you want to enhance a  
 16 particular -- you know, the entrance, I think  
 17 that's important. It's got to be all part of  
 18 it.  
 19 MR. GRABIEL: I mean, continuous sidewalks,  
 20 the sidewalks are going to be wider --  
 21 MS. MENENDEZ: Right. Continuous  
 22 pedestrian amenities, parks, open spaces for  
 23 the --  
 24 MR. BEHAR: And that's similar to the MXD  
 25 provision that they're suggesting, that you

1 could do that, in order to promote that --  
 2 MS. MENENDEZ: Right.  
 3 MR. BEHAR: -- you know. I agree, I think  
 4 you want to encourage that. I think you want  
 5 to have a beautiful streetscape.  
 6 MR. TRIAS: And that's being done. It's  
 7 just not being done through Zoning. It's being  
 8 down through the projects that are built within  
 9 the right-of-way, but, you know, we could tie  
 10 it to the Zoning Code more clearly. I mean, we  
 11 do have a plan to enhance the sidewalks and the  
 12 landscape, that is separate from the Zoning  
 13 Code.  
 14 MR. GRABIEL: In this area?  
 15 MR. TRIAS: In this area, yes. But maybe  
 16 we need to tie it together, so it's clear.  
 17 MS. MENENDEZ: Well, you do have  
 18 landscaping mentioned here and you have certain  
 19 things.  
 20 MR. TRIAS: Yes.  
 21 MS. MENENDEZ: But I think he's looking at  
 22 it more in detail.  
 23 MR. TRIAS: Well, the public space, the  
 24 full section of the street includes the  
 25 right-of-way, and that is not covered by the

1 Zoning Code. So we need to explain that we're  
 2 also dealing with that with the proper tools.  
 3 MR. GRABIEL: Yeah.  
 4 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. So back on  
 5 that MXD stuff. Any other questions or  
 6 comments on the MXD?  
 7 Can I just ask why, going back to Block 24,  
 8 does the boundary go so far east on that block?  
 9 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: That was also because the  
 10 block pulls away from Ponce. We were trying to  
 11 get a minimum depth, and that's why it appears  
 12 to look deeper into the block.  
 13 MR. TRIAS: There is no hard science to  
 14 this line, and I wish I could do what Mr. Behar  
 15 had proposed, which is, you know, a perfectly  
 16 geometrical design, but when you have an  
 17 existing condition as complex as this, we can  
 18 do the best we can. And, then, in addition,  
 19 what I would say is that, let's keep our  
 20 options open, in the sense that it could be  
 21 amended based on a project that is proposed in  
 22 the future.  
 23 So I wouldn't want to overthink the  
 24 details, because that may interfere with the  
 25 big picture goals that we have.

1 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No, I appreciate that.  
 2 It's just that one block -- I mean, that goes  
 3 further east -- I mean, that goes deeper into  
 4 any block that I think --  
 5 MS. MENENDEZ: It seems to be --  
 6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Maybe other than one or  
 7 two others, and those are already commercial.  
 8 MR. TRIAS: And that's a very good point.  
 9 And the question there is, is that really  
 10 facing East Ponce or Ponce de Leon?  
 11 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I would just suggest  
 12 that you take another look at that one.  
 13 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, sure.  
 14 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And if you cut it back  
 15 one or two lots heading westward, that may be  
 16 more appropriate, in my mind.  
 17 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: And this area might be  
 18 more appropriate for the East Ponce Residential  
 19 Infill District, as well.  
 20 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.  
 21 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: But we'll look at it.  
 22 MR. BEHAR: I disagree with that.  
 23 MR. TRIAS: No, and those are very valid  
 24 points, too. Those are the two options. We  
 25 need to make a choice. Are we talking about a

1 public space along that plaza that is focused  
 2 on Ponce de Leon, all around that existing  
 3 plaza, or do we have Ponce de Leon and East  
 4 Ponce at a fork in the road? I mean, those are  
 5 significant --  
 6 MS. MENENDEZ: Or maybe doing something  
 7 special right there because of that. I mean, I  
 8 know that that plaza is being re-developed as  
 9 part of another project, right?  
 10 MR. TRIAS: Yes. The landscape has been  
 11 enhanced and so on, and I think we're really  
 12 going beyond planning now, into urban design  
 13 and architecture. I mean, there's a point in  
 14 which the tools that we have for Zoning don't  
 15 allow us to do the detailed plan that you're  
 16 talking about. We're really talking more in  
 17 terms of design, in terms of the actual  
 18 projects that could be built.  
 19 MR. BEHAR: Right.  
 20 MR. TRIAS: I think we can look at it more  
 21 closely, if Megan works with us for another  
 22 week.  
 23 MS. MENENDEZ: But I think that sometimes  
 24 the reason I think we mention it is because  
 25 sometimes when you're providing for more

1 density or intensity, you want something in  
 2 exchange.  
 3 MR. TRIAS: Absolutely.  
 4 MS. MENENDEZ: You want the City to be able  
 5 to say, we want Workforce Housing or we want  
 6 this or we want that, and this is what we're  
 7 going to provide to incentivize that.  
 8 MR. TRIAS: There are two public benefits.  
 9 One of them is public space and the other one  
 10 is the Workforce Housing. Those are the two  
 11 that we're working on, in this area. Workforce  
 12 Housing, we have not refined. It's just an  
 13 idea. That is why we have a consultant helping  
 14 us. The public space, I think we have refined  
 15 it more carefully.  
 16 So if you want to proceed with some of the  
 17 items, that will be fine. I mean, whatever.  
 18 It's up to you. But I would encourage you to  
 19 keep moving, because otherwise I think we may  
 20 miss some opportunities that are coming up.  
 21 MS. MENENDEZ: I'm ready to vote on the  
 22 East Ponce corridor, but I'm not ready to vote  
 23 on the Infill District that's being proposed.  
 24 MR. TRIAS: Okay. The Mixed-Use corridor  
 25 for Ponce de Leon?

1 MS. MENENDEZ: Right, the one that protects  
 2 the neighborhoods that are adjacent to the  
 3 Ponce corridor, because that's part of that.  
 4 MR. TRIAS: The Conservation District?  
 5 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes. That's part of the  
 6 East Ponce --  
 7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No.  
 8 MR. TRIAS: No, you already did that.  
 9 Yeah.  
 10 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: This is the Mixed-Use  
 11 corridor, this is the Transfer of Development  
 12 Rights, and then this is the Infill District.  
 13 MS. MENENDEZ: But this has -- oh, you know  
 14 why, because they included the study here.  
 15 That's already been approved.  
 16 MR. TRIAS: Right. Right. Right.  
 17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. Right.  
 18 MR. TRIAS: No, you already took care of  
 19 the -- the Conservation District is fine.  
 20 MS. MENENDEZ: Got it. Got it.  
 21 MR. TRIAS: It's going well. Now we're  
 22 dealing with Ponce de Leon.  
 23 MS. MENENDEZ: So now the important is  
 24 what's defining as the MDX; is that it?  
 25 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. There are two issues,

1 the Ponce de Leon and the Infill. Those are  
 2 the only two issues tonight.  
 3 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.  
 4 MR. GRABIEL: And you're saying, hold on,  
 5 on the Infill?  
 6 MS. MENENDEZ: I'm not comfortable voting  
 7 for it tonight, because I think --  
 8 MR. GRABIEL: I'm not, either.  
 9 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.  
 10 MS. MENENDEZ: I think there needs to  
 11 have --  
 12 MR. GRABIEL: Because I think that just  
 13 came up in the last meeting, and I don't think  
 14 we have looked at it. I mean, we're talking  
 15 about entrances. It used to be from Southwest  
 16 Eighth Street and Douglas, now if you -- I used  
 17 to work at Douglas Entrance for decades. So  
 18 what I found out is that the main entrance is  
 19 not really Ponce, it's Galiano. People coming  
 20 from the east use that traffic light to go down  
 21 Galiano and then East Ponce and into the City.  
 22 So I think, what I talked about on East  
 23 Ponce, is something we might want to look at  
 24 going north on Galiano. You have, on one side,  
 25 Douglas Entrance, which is a very large

1 complex, and that might give us a very nice  
 2 second entrance to the City.  
 3 MR. TRIAS: Yes. No, that's a really good  
 4 point, and that's really -- it turns the corner  
 5 on Galiano, it goes to Eighth Street, and  
 6 that's a frontage that right now doesn't exist.  
 7 MR. GRABIEL: Yeah.  
 8 MR. BEHAR: So what you're proposing, to  
 9 the west of East Ponce, from whatever --  
 10 Santillane or even the street to the south, all  
 11 of the way to Eighth Street, don't include that  
 12 right now?  
 13 MR. GRABIEL: Right.  
 14 MR. TRIAS: Tonight.  
 15 MR. GRABIEL: Tonight.  
 16 MR. BEHAR: Tonight.  
 17 MR. TRIAS: To bring it back to you with  
 18 more detail.  
 19 MR. BEHAR: To bring it back.  
 20 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. So let's  
 21 dispose of the Infill District items, which is  
 22 13, 14 and 15.  
 23 MR. TRIAS: The Mixed-Use District items.  
 24 MR. BEHAR: Can we recommend to Staff, you  
 25 know, what we want there, because I agree with

1 some of your points?  
 2 MR. TRIAS: You should recommend.  
 3 MR. BEHAR: Okay. I agree with your points  
 4 of having some public benefit, and yours, too,  
 5 but I think we really -- in my opinion, that's  
 6 an area that your density should be looked at,  
 7 and base it on size of units, not, you know,  
 8 just a number that came from that study back,  
 9 you know, ten years ago, fifteen years ago.  
 10 MR. TRIAS: Yes. Yes, from the 2002  
 11 Charrette.  
 12 MR. BEHAR: 2002. I mean, base it on  
 13 what's really the market, because I think that  
 14 when you do the analysis, you're going to find  
 15 that a high density is going to be better to  
 16 achieve the Workforce Housing and more  
 17 affordability in that area.  
 18 MR. GRABIEL: Maybe reduce parking, since  
 19 we're so close to Southwest Eighth Street,  
 20 Douglas and Ponce. I mean, there is so much --  
 21 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. And what I'll do is, I  
 22 asked the consultant to stay to listen to this  
 23 conversation. I'm going to ask him to give us  
 24 some recommendation on the Workforce Housing  
 25 implementation, which right now we don't have



1 any, and hopefully we can bring that back to  
2 you, and then some urban design ideas based on  
3 your comments.

4 MR. GRABIEL: That would be great.

5 MR. TRIAS: I think those two changes could  
6 be very helpful.

7 MS. MENENDEZ: This area is much more  
8 conducive to that than the previous project we  
9 looked at, in my opinion. I mean, the previous  
10 project and that whole thought of more density,  
11 more intensity, just didn't fit, as compared to  
12 here. Here you have Ponce, you have Eighth  
13 Street, you have Douglas Road, you have -- the  
14 GRID is there.

15 MR. TRIAS: And that's the recommendation  
16 of Staff, also, and we believe that some of the  
17 comments that were made did not take into  
18 account that you are working on all of this  
19 area very, very carefully, to make sure that we  
20 have Workforce Housing.

21 MR. BEHAR: And, Mr. Trias, my last  
22 question to you, you still kept the liner unit  
23 fronting the garages. You reduced them to 20  
24 feet, but your proposal is to keep the whole  
25 facade.

1 MR. BEHAR: I'll second it, with the  
2 condition that Staff will look at -- you know,  
3 what we recommended, look at the density  
4 increase, look at the public benefits --

5 MR. GRABIEL: The urbanism.

6 MR. BEHAR: Okay.

7 MS. MENENDEZ: And the urbanism.

8 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Craig, can we do all  
9 three as one or do we need to do it in separate  
10 votes?

11 MR. COLLER: Well, I think you can defer  
12 13, 14 and 15 as one vote, but I have a  
13 question for Charles. Which is, are we going  
14 to announce a time, we're not going to  
15 readvertise or how --

16 MR. WU: Well, I think mailers went out for  
17 these cases, right? Property owners were  
18 notified. So it's advisable that we have a  
19 time certain, yes.

20 MR. COLLER: So as I understand it, we're  
21 not having a meeting in January; is that  
22 correct?

23 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, if I could  
24 propose the dates. We're proposing the next  
25 meeting should be February 1st, and then the

1 MR. TRIAS: No. No. No. Actually -- why  
2 don't you explain it?

3 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes, it is still in there  
4 to keep it on the whole facade.

5 MR. BEHAR: The whole facade?

6 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes.

7 MR. BEHAR: Okay.

8 MR. TRIAS: What would be your  
9 recommendation, sir?

10 MR. BEHAR: I think, if you go back to the  
11 record, I'll be more than happy to go back and  
12 read the minutes of previous --

13 MR. TRIAS: Okay. We will revisit that, if  
14 you want, before we go to the City Commission  
15 with it.

16 MR. BEHAR: Please do.

17 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.

18 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Somebody  
19 want to move 13, 14 and 15?

20 MR. BEHAR: That's a deferral on those?

21 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah. Sounds like  
22 that's what I'm hearing. That's the Infill  
23 District items.

24 MS. MENENDEZ: I'll move to defer them to  
25 our next meeting.

1 following meeting should be March 15th, and  
2 that has to do with some of the staffing issues  
3 that we have.

4 So we can announce that it could be time  
5 certain or continued to the February 1st  
6 meeting in 2017.

7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is there room on the  
8 agenda on February 1st?

9 MR. TRIAS: Yes, I think so. I think we  
10 only have one item, right? Right. Yeah.

11 MR. COLLER: Since we read them into the  
12 record tonight, I would say that we don't need  
13 to re-read them.

14 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.

15 MR. GRABIEL: Well, I wanted to hear him  
16 say it.

17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Our wonderful court  
18 reporter thanks you, also.

19 MR. WU: So, for the record, we have a  
20 deferral to the February 1st regular --

21 MR. COLLER: Do we have a motion?

22 MR. BEHAR: We have a motion and a second.

23 MR. COLLER: I don't think you've had a  
24 vote.

25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No, we have not. So

1 the motion is to defer or continue to February  
 2 1st, same time, same place. Anybody have  
 3 anything to add?  
 4 Jill, call the roll, please.  
 5 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  
 6 MR. BEHAR: Yes.  
 7 THE SECRETARY: Marshall Bellin?  
 8 MR. BELLIN: Yes.  
 9 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell?  
 10 MR. GRABIELL: Yes.  
 11 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?  
 12 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.  
 13 THE SECRETARY: Jeff Flanagan?  
 14 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes.  
 15 All right. What we have left are the three  
 16 items dealing with the Mixed-Use corridor and  
 17 then the TDRs.  
 18 MR. WU: That's Item Number 8 --  
 19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: 8, 9, 10, 11 --  
 20 MR. WU: And Item Number 12.  
 21 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: -- is the MXD.  
 22 MR. BEHAR: I'll make a motion -- no.  
 23 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Before you do, can I  
 24 just -- I'm going to question, it was brought  
 25 up earlier, that Block 16, where the Mixed-Use

1 corridor takes in, I think it's one apartment  
 2 building facing Santillane Avenue --  
 3 MR. BEHAR: Yeah.  
 4 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: -- I'm wondering if the  
 5 boundary shouldn't just go up straight the  
 6 commercial, and then that may -- and it may  
 7 leave it open for consideration as part of the  
 8 Infill area.  
 9 MS. MENENDEZ: Which is that?  
 10 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: This little piece right  
 11 here.  
 12 MS. MENENDEZ: Oh, you're talking about  
 13 this thing here?  
 14 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. Yeah.  
 15 MS. MENENDEZ: Yeah.  
 16 MR. BEHAR: Jeff, I agree with you.  
 17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'm saying, because if  
 18 we put it in the Mixed-Use corridor now, then  
 19 we'd have to worry about backing it out.  
 20 MR. BEHAR: Well, you're not putting it.  
 21 You're not putting it. It's just been, you  
 22 know, excluded from that --  
 23 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. No. It's being  
 24 included in the Mixed-Use corridor, and not in  
 25 the Infill.

1 MS. MENENDEZ: You're saying to go like  
 2 this or you're saying to go like this?  
 3 MR. COLLER: Could you describe, for the  
 4 record, what you have just done?  
 5 MR. WU: Are you including certain lots?  
 6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah. I can tell you.  
 7 It's Block 16. It's Lots 3 and 4. It's the  
 8 two lots that are zoned MF-2, that are  
 9 currently proposed to be within the Mixed-Use  
 10 District.  
 11 MR. WU: You want to take them out?  
 12 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I just think that  
 13 there's an opportunity to have them in the  
 14 Infill District, assuming that that happens,  
 15 and I'd rather add those lots into the  
 16 Mixed-Use in the future if the Infill doesn't  
 17 happen, but not put them in the Mixed-Use and  
 18 then have to try and worry about some sort of  
 19 property right.  
 20 MR. BEHAR: Is there a reason why those two  
 21 lots -- are they part owner of whatever -- you  
 22 know, the lots fronting Ponce?  
 23 MR. TRIAS: I don't think there's any  
 24 reason. I think it's up to you to recommend  
 25 either way. Both solutions are appropriate

1 from a planning point of view.  
 2 But if the idea is to exclude them from the  
 3 Mixed-Use Ponce de Leon Boulevard District, I  
 4 think that's appropriate.  
 5 MR. WU: Actually, those two lots  
 6 constitute one building.  
 7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right.  
 8 MR. WU: Yeah.  
 9 MR. TRIAS: But having said that, I will  
 10 also encourage you not to overthink the details  
 11 of this line, because --  
 12 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, I'm not, except  
 13 for the fact that that then abuts -- I mean,  
 14 it's currently Multi-Fam, it abuts other  
 15 Multi-Fam that's going to be in the Infill. So  
 16 it just seems like that might be a better  
 17 opportunity for the Infill District versus the  
 18 MXD.  
 19 MR. BEHAR: I'm okay with that, taking  
 20 those out, as long as, you know, we do look at  
 21 the Infill.  
 22 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right.  
 23 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. Okay.  
 24 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right.  
 25 MR. WU: Was that part of the motion?

1 MR. BEHAR: No. I retracted my motion. I  
 2 was going to start. I never made a motion.  
 3 MS. MENENDEZ: No, it was --  
 4 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: You started. You  
 5 didn't make anything. And I asked if I could  
 6 interject.  
 7 I hear crickets chirping.  
 8 MR. WU: Is there a second?  
 9 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: There is no motion.  
 10 MR. WU: There's no motion?  
 11 MS. MENENDEZ: Is the concern the  
 12 boundaries? Is that it?  
 13 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Just on those. For me,  
 14 it was just on those two lots. That's all.  
 15 MS. MENENDEZ: And why don't we then -- I  
 16 mean, I hate to continue, but why don't we then  
 17 ask Staff to look at every single property  
 18 that's -- you know, that's similar to that, and  
 19 determine why they've taken the position on  
 20 setting the boundaries there? I'm sure they  
 21 did it looking at each one. I'm sure there's  
 22 some logic to it.  
 23 MR. BEHAR: But it doesn't seem like it.  
 24 It doesn't seem like there was a logic.  
 25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: To me, it does, because

1 it's almost like the line is coming from the  
 2 north and they came straight down, and then  
 3 they had -- there's like three apartments that  
 4 front -- buildings that front on East Ponce,  
 5 and I heard Megan say the intent was, the  
 6 parcels that fronted on East Ponce. And so  
 7 since these two aren't on East Ponce, it's  
 8 separate ownership, separate building, let's  
 9 put it in the MXD, versus the Infill, but I'm  
 10 just wondering if they're not better --  
 11 MR. BEHAR: You're right on that Infill  
 12 portion, but the rationale on everything  
 13 else --  
 14 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, if one looks at  
 15 these boundaries, it's mostly straight. I  
 16 mean, it does have a few times where -- but the  
 17 majority of the boundary is very logical.  
 18 MS. MENENDEZ: Right. The question is,  
 19 why, where it's not straight, it wasn't  
 20 straight? Is it because there's different  
 21 property ownerships, because a building divides  
 22 in the middle?  
 23 MR. TRIAS: More than ownership is  
 24 different buildings that exist. In that  
 25 particular case, there's a building there. So

1 that's why it has that shape. So we looked at  
 2 -- we have a general shape, and then we adapted  
 3 it to the existing conditions as best as we  
 4 could.  
 5 Now, I don't think it's the perfect or the  
 6 final solution for the next 200 years, either.  
 7 I mean, I think it's likely that there will be  
 8 some amendments as projects are proposed.  
 9 So having said that, I think that we have a  
 10 fairly competent designer right now, and  
 11 probably the best approach would be to continue  
 12 the process.  
 13 MR. BEHAR: Okay. With that in mind, then,  
 14 I'll make a motion to approve -- what item is  
 15 the first --  
 16 MR. WU: Number 8.  
 17 MR. BEHAR: -- Item Number 8, with the  
 18 friendly amendment of taking out Lot 3 and 4 of  
 19 Block 16, and those two lots will be considered  
 20 under the Infill --  
 21 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.  
 22 MR. BEHAR: -- provision. Is that clear  
 23 enough?  
 24 MR. WU: Yes. Is there a second?  
 25 MR. GRABIEL: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Any other discussion?  
 2 Hearing none, Jill, if you'll call the roll,  
 3 please.  
 4 THE SECRETARY: Marshall Bellin?  
 5 MR. BELLIN: Yes.  
 6 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell?  
 7 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.  
 8 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?  
 9 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.  
 10 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  
 11 MR. BEHAR: Yes.  
 12 THE SECRETARY: Jeff Flanagan?  
 13 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes.  
 14 We need a motion on Number 9, which is  
 15 additional Comp Plan Map Amendments, allowing  
 16 the Mixed-Use Overlay as an Overlay in the  
 17 Multi-Family Medium Density and Multi-Family  
 18 High Density.  
 19 MR. BEHAR: I'll make a motion for  
 20 approval, with the recommendation that we look  
 21 at those two -- those couple of blocks that was  
 22 discussed.  
 23 MR. GRABIEL: Which ones were those?  
 24 MR. BEHAR: I think Jeff made a motion to  
 25 maybe -- or made a comment to move the -- I

1 can't even see those lots, on Block 24.  
 2 MS. MENENDEZ: Are we anxious to get this?  
 3 Is there a reason why we're --  
 4 MR. WU: Yes. Commissioner Keon requested  
 5 at the last Commission Meeting encouraging the  
 6 Board and the Staff to move this forward. I  
 7 understand you want additional studies for the  
 8 Residential Infill District, but she encouraged  
 9 the Board to take action at this meeting, so  
 10 the Commission can see it in January. She  
 11 actually said that into the record.  
 12 If you'd like us to further study it and  
 13 bring those results to the City Commission, we  
 14 would be glad to do that.  
 15 MR. BEHAR: You know what, I'll make a  
 16 motion to approve as presented to us.  
 17 MR. GRABIEL: Number 9?  
 18 MR. BEHAR: Number 9.  
 19 MR. GRABIEL: I'll second that.  
 20 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: A motion and a second  
 21 on Number 9.  
 22 Ramon, does that create -- and I'm fine  
 23 with it, we'll move it along and it is what it  
 24 is, but do we now have an inconsistency in what  
 25 these two are doing and what we just did on the

1 prior one?  
 2 MR. TRIAS: Well, we are certainly going to  
 3 review that and we're going to clean up any  
 4 inconsistencies.  
 5 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.  
 6 MR. TRIAS: I think we have a clear idea of  
 7 what you're recommending.  
 8 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Motion and  
 9 second. Any further discussion?  
 10 Jill, call the roll, please.  
 11 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell?  
 12 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.  
 13 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?  
 14 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.  
 15 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  
 16 MR. BEHAR: Yes.  
 17 THE SECRETARY: Marshall Bellin?  
 18 MR. BELLIN: Yes.  
 19 THE SECRETARY: Jeff Flanagan?  
 20 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes.  
 21 Item Number 10. Oh, this creates the  
 22 District in the Zoning Code.  
 23 MS. MENENDEZ: That's what it says.  
 24 MR. GRABIEL: I move for approval of Number  
 25 10 as is.

1 MR. BEHAR: I'll second it.  
 2 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We have a motion and a  
 3 second. Any further discussion on Number 10?  
 4 Hearing none, Jill, call the roll, please.  
 5 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?  
 6 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.  
 7 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  
 8 MR. BEHAR: Yes.  
 9 THE SECRETARY: Marshall Bellin?  
 10 MR. BELLIN: Yes.  
 11 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell?  
 12 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.  
 13 THE SECRETARY: Jeff Flanagan?  
 14 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.  
 15 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. Isn't Number 11 the  
 16 one that I had previously mentioned?  
 17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: 11 --  
 18 MS. MENENDEZ: Doesn't this, in fact,  
 19 provide for the North Ponce Neighborhood  
 20 Conversation District?  
 21 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. This, in the  
 22 Zoning Code, creates the Mixed-Use District to  
 23 be assigned in a Multi-Family 2 Zoning  
 24 District, to create a transition to the  
 25 Conservation District.

1 MS. MENENDEZ: Well, that's important.  
 2 Yeah, that's the kind -- yeah. Okay.  
 3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.  
 4 MS. MENENDEZ: Because I knew we hadn't  
 5 done this. This is what was remaining --  
 6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. Yeah, this is the  
 7 MX --  
 8 MS. MENENDEZ: -- from the study, through  
 9 the MXD.  
 10 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right.  
 11 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. What happens is that,  
 12 yes, right now Mixed-Use can only be applied in  
 13 Commercial.  
 14 MS. MENENDEZ: Right. And now this is  
 15 applied to the Mixed-Use.  
 16 MR. TRIAS: What we're saying is, we are  
 17 expanding the places where you can apply  
 18 Mixed-Use to the MF-2.  
 19 MS. MENENDEZ: Right.  
 20 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So did you just move  
 21 it?  
 22 MS. MENENDEZ: Yeah. I can move it. I'll  
 23 move it.  
 24 MR. GRABIEL: Second.  
 25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Motion and a second.

1 Further discussion?  
 2 Hearing none, Jill, call the roll, please.  
 3 MR. GRABIEL: Item Number 12, there's a  
 4 transfer --  
 5 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. No. It's 11. We  
 6 need a vote.  
 7 MR. GRABIEL: Oh, I'm sorry.  
 8 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  
 9 MR. BEHAR: Yes.  
 10 THE SECRETARY: Marshall Bellin?  
 11 MR. BELLIN: Yes.  
 12 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell?  
 13 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.  
 14 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?  
 15 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.  
 16 THE SECRETARY: Jeff Flanagan?  
 17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes.  
 18 MS. MENENDEZ: A quick question on Number  
 19 12, which is the next one. On Page 28 of the  
 20 Staff report, which is where it addresses this,  
 21 on Number 2, under Section 3-1004 B-2, why did  
 22 we strike, "Duplex, dwelling, Multi-Family  
 23 dwelling or breakfast -- bed and breakfast  
 24 establishment," as a transfer site?  
 25 If we're trying to encourage, you know, the

1 low density -- I mean, conservation, what  
 2 better way of conserving what's there, if you  
 3 have an opportunity to do what the commercial  
 4 buildings can do, which is to transfer TDRs?  
 5 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: We struck it out, because  
 6 it's redundant with what the MF-2 is in the  
 7 North Ponce area. So everything that's Zoned  
 8 MF-2 in this area currently is either a duplex,  
 9 Multi-Family or bed and breakfast.  
 10 MR. BEHAR: But you have TDRs that you can  
 11 transfer. You could, in some cases.  
 12 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: And you'll still be able  
 13 to do that. We're not taking that away. We're  
 14 just adding the Commercial to it.  
 15 MS. MENENDEZ: No, but that's -- it's  
 16 struck here.  
 17 MR. TRIAS: Right, but the only -- yes,  
 18 you're correct.  
 19 MS. MENENDEZ: If it's stricken, then that  
 20 means it's not part of the Ordinance.  
 21 MR. TRIAS: That language, but MF-2 is  
 22 what's there in the Ordinance, and MF-2  
 23 includes --  
 24 MS. MENENDEZ: Describes this?  
 25 MR. TRIAS: Yes. Yes. That's all it is.

1 MS. MENENDEZ: Got it. It's too late at  
 2 night. Thank you.  
 3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.  
 4 MR. BEHAR: Motion to approve as presented.  
 5 MS. MENENDEZ: Second.  
 6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you. This is on  
 7 Item Number 12. Any further discussion?  
 8 MR. COLLER: One question. I think it was  
 9 on Item 11, but as part of your motion there  
 10 was the clarifying language on the Site  
 11 Specific that we had discussed earlier,  
 12 correct?  
 13 MR. BEHAR: Yes.  
 14 MS. MENENDEZ: That's what I heard.  
 15 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes.  
 16 MR. COLLER: Okay.  
 17 MR. BEHAR: Motion to adjourn.  
 18 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. Number 12. We  
 19 have a motion and a second on Number 12.  
 20 Further discussion?  
 21 Hearing none, Jill call the roll, please.  
 22 THE SECRETARY: Marshall Bellin?  
 23 MR. BELLIN: Yes.  
 24 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell?  
 25 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.

1 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?  
 2 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.  
 3 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  
 4 MR. BEHAR: Yes.  
 5 THE SECRETARY: Jeff Flanagan?  
 6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes.  
 7 Somebody move to adjourn.  
 8 MS. MENENDEZ: Happy holidays.  
 9 MR. GRABIEL: Motion.  
 10 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you. All say,  
 11 aye, aye. Happy holidays.  
 12 MR. TRIAS: Thank you very much.  
 13 (Thereupon, the meeting was concluded at 8:55  
 14 p.m.)  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25