

Page 125

1 MR. BELLIN: Whenever they're ready, they
 2 come in.
 3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.
 4 MS. MENENDEZ: Can we take a five-minute
 5 break?
 6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Go ahead, Scot.
 7 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?
 8 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.
 9 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiel?
 10 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.
 11 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?
 12 MR. BEHAR: Yes.
 13 THE SECRETARY: Jeffrey Flanagan?
 14 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes.
 15 All right.
 16 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Thank you very much.
 17 We'll see you.
 18 MS. MENENDEZ: Thank you, Mario.
 19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you, Mario.
 20 Maria, five minutes?
 21 MS. MENENDEZ: Five minutes.
 22 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah. The Vice
 23 Chair -- yeah, we'll take a five-minute break.
 24 It's ten after 8:00.
 25 We will resume at 8:15 sharp.

Page 126

1 (Short recess taken.)
 2 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. We'll get
 3 re-started. So much for 8:15 sharp. It's
 4 almost 8:20.
 5 Charles, do you want to read the next item
 6 on the agenda?
 7 MR. WU: Yes, sir.
 8 Item Number 9, "A Resolution of the City
 9 Commission of Coral Gables, Florida requesting
 10 mixed use site plan review pursuant to Zoning
 11 Code Article 4, "Zoning Districts", Division 2,
 12 "Overlay and Special Purpose Districts",
 13 Section 4-201, "Mixed Use District (MXD)" for
 14 mixed use project referred to as "One Merrick
 15 Park" on the property legally described as Lots
 16 8-11, Block 9, Industrial Section (351 San
 17 Lorenzo Avenue), Coral Gables, Florida;
 18 including required conditions; providing for an
 19 effective date."
 20 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Thank you.
 21 Looks like the Applicant is ready.
 22 MR. NAVARRO: I'm ready to go.
 23 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right.
 24 MR. NAVARRO: Thank you.
 25 Now, Mr. Chair, Board Members, for the

Page 127

1 record, Jorge Navarro, with offices at 333
 2 Southwest 2nd Avenue, in Miami, Florida.
 3 With me is the owner of the property,
 4 Mr. Oscar Roger, and Mr. Oscar Roger, Jr. Also
 5 is Sam Ferreri and Bruno Phillips, from the
 6 architecture firm of PGAL.
 7 The project before you is located at the
 8 northwest corner of San Lorenzo Avenue and
 9 Laguna Street. You can see it here on the
 10 aerial.
 11 It is an existing 11,000 square foot
 12 unimproved and vacant parcel of land, that's
 13 located directly in front of Merrick Park.
 14 The property is currently zoned Industrial.
 15 It's part of your North Industrial Mixed-use
 16 District, and the request before you is simply
 17 to obtain your approval of our proposed site
 18 plan, pursuant to your MXD regulations.
 19 The project consists of 13 units. They're
 20 very large units. They're about 2,600 square
 21 feet. So these are really like a high end,
 22 luxury type of unit that we're trying to
 23 incorporate into this market, and it has 4,000
 24 square feet of ground floor retail.
 25 The project, we believe, is important.

Page 128

1 Even though it's not very large, in terms of
 2 density, from what you're used to seeing in
 3 other projects in this area, it is important,
 4 because of its proximity to Merrick Park, and
 5 it presents a very unique opportunity to create
 6 a high end mixed-use project, where you could
 7 actually have people live, shop, walk and dine
 8 within close proximity to the City's premiere
 9 dining and shopping destination, which is your
 10 Merrick Park.
 11 In addition to the proposed development
 12 concept of having these high end luxury units,
 13 which are about two units per floor, we're also
 14 trying to improve the pedestrian experience
 15 along this corridor and improve the walkability
 16 and connectivity between the projects that are
 17 located north of this site and the Merrick Park
 18 destination.
 19 We have an arcade, which surrounds the
 20 property, all along San Lorenzo and Laguna
 21 Street. It's completely enclosed. So you have
 22 pedestrians, they can have cover from the
 23 elements. It provides a shading element.
 24 And we also, in addition to that, have
 25 designed our plan in a way that we preserve as

1 many of the on-site trees that are located
2 along the sidewalk. So we're gone ahead and
3 designed our plan to try to do that and improve
4 the public realm.

5 Additionally, we're providing all of the
6 decorative pavers that match the existing
7 sidewalk, and we also have gone ahead and
8 re-designed our project to have the access
9 directly on Laguna Street.

10 You know, this site is very unique, in that
11 you have the Merrick Park shopping center, and,
12 also, next to you, you're going to have the
13 future Baptist Medical Plaza, as well.

14 So this is an area which is being
15 re-developed and we believe this project is
16 going to complement the area. It's going to be
17 compatible with those uses that you see there.
18 We're very excited for it.

19 It complies with all of your MXD
20 regulations. Your Staff has reviewed it. It
21 complies with your concurrency standards. We
22 have a positive recommendation, and we're here
23 this evening to ask for your approval.

24 I'm here to answer any questions, and so is
25 our team. Thank you very much.

1 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.
2 Mr. Trias.

3 MR. TRIAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
4 If I could have the PowerPoint.

5 The best that I can say about this project
6 is that they're not requesting a land use
7 change or a Zoning change or an overlay. This
8 is an existing overlay, that you're very
9 familiar with, which is the mixed-use overlay
10 that is in the Industrial area, and the project
11 follows those rules.

12 As you can see, there's many buildings
13 already built surrounding the area. There are
14 some proposed, as the Applicant said, along Le
15 Jeune. So I expect that the area will build
16 out according to the MXD regulations.

17 I will go fast, given the late hour.

18 I'm sure you're familiar with the project.
19 The land use and the Zoning remain, and no
20 changes are being proposed.

21 And in terms of the design, the access of
22 the property is from Laguna. That changed a
23 couple of times.

24 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.

25 MR. TRIAS: You had a question?

1 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. Sorry.
2 I just thought I saw in my packet that the
3 access was in the alley.

4 MR. TRIAS: I was going to say that. The
5 access used to be in the alley, and because of
6 input from the traffic engineers and others,
7 then it was changed back to the front. So that
8 is the only issue that I think was reviewed
9 through the process.

10 If you look at it in context, the building
11 follows Mr. Behar's preferred design, which has
12 a podium, and then the building is on top.

13 MR. BEHAR: That's not my preferred design.
14 Let's get that clear, for the record.

15 MR. TRIAS: I wanted to explain that, but
16 it does follow that design scheme, which is
17 fairly typical in the mixed-use projects, and
18 you can see how it looks, in terms of the
19 design and the architecture.

20 It has been reviewed and approved by the
21 Board of Architects.

22 MR. GRABIEL: Can we go back one image?

23 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

24 MR. GRABIEL: Is that the site of the
25 Baptist?

1 MR. BEHAR: No, that is the north side.

2 MR. TRIAS: That is the north elevation, yes.

3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But you only see the
4 top part of that deck, because --

5 MR. TRIAS: Right. There are buildings
6 next to it.

7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right.

8 MR. TRIAS: So the intent is that there
9 would be other buildings around that base,
10 right?

11 MR. NAVARRO: Correct. Yeah.

12 We worked with the Board of Architects on
13 that facade for some time. There's an existing
14 three-story building, that currently exists
15 next to it, and we've gone ahead and provided
16 some additional articulation along the trim of
17 the parking pedestal, in order to try to blend
18 it in, until that property is developed in the
19 future.

20 MR. BEHAR: That facade most likely is
21 going to do away in the very near future.

22 MR. NAVARRO: Yeah.

23 MR. TRIAS: That's true.

24 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.

25 MR. BEHAR: The north facade.

1 MR. GRABIEL: Yeah. Those one story
 2 buildings.
 3 MR. BEHAR: Right.
 4 MS. MENENDEZ: Got it.
 5 MR. TRIAS: Very good.
 6 If you look at the site plan information,
 7 the project, as proposed, is within the allowed
 8 FAR and height and the ten floors that are
 9 allowed currently in this overlay.
 10 It complies with the parking requirements.
 11 We've had multiple public notices. The
 12 Applicant had the public information meeting in
 13 July. There was a mail-out, a courtesy
 14 notification, in August. The property was
 15 posted in August, also. The legal add was done
 16 in August, and it was posted on the Agenda
 17 website, and also in the City web page.
 18 As you can see, the Board of Architects
 19 gave preliminary design approval, and then
 20 Mediterranean bonus, back in March.
 21 The Applicant reviewed all of the
 22 Development Review Committee comments and
 23 addressed them properly.
 24 The findings of facts are that the
 25 application satisfies the provision of the

1 developer. I attended the Charrette or the
 2 reception that was held by the developer, and
 3 it wasn't just the reception that impressed me,
 4 but, rather, the substance and the answers that
 5 were given.
 6 This project, to me, stands in stark
 7 distinction to many others that I have objected
 8 to. This one is, as best I can tell, as of
 9 right. There are no variances or
 10 quasi-variances requested. There's no alleyway
 11 vacation, where there's no real value to the
 12 City, which I complained about mightily in
 13 other projects. There's no overlay being
 14 requested.
 15 The articulation and the style is sensitive
 16 to the area, and it's just refreshing to see a
 17 project that is not asking for all of these
 18 additional overlays, alleyway vacations, all of
 19 the things that I have seen in other projects,
 20 and I've complained about.
 21 So, in conclusion, as a resident who
 22 attended the Charrette and who tracks these
 23 projects in my area, I think this is a great
 24 one, and I urge you to vote favorably on it.
 25 MS. MENENDEZ: I'm sorry, so where is your

1 Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Code for
 2 mixed-use projects, and Staff recommends
 3 approval, with certain conditions that are
 4 outlined in the Staff report.
 5 MR. NAVARRO: And we agree with all of
 6 those conditions that are proffered by Staff.
 7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Thank you.
 8 Scot, do we have any speakers signed up for
 9 this application?
 10 THE SECRETARY: We have one speaker.
 11 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: One speaker, okay.
 12 We'll open the public hearing.
 13 THE SECRETARY: Paul Savage.
 14 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Were you sworn in
 15 earlier?
 16 MR. SAVAGE: No, I was not.
 17 (Thereupon, Mr. Savage was sworn.)
 18 MR. SAVAGE: I do.
 19 Good evening. I know the hour is late.
 20 I'll be very quick.
 21 My name is Paul Savage. I am a nearby
 22 resident, at 522 Vilabella Avenue. I am here
 23 to speak in favor of this project.
 24 I was in receipt of all of the legal
 25 mail-outs, as well as an invitation from the

1 address? Where do you live?
 2 MR. SAVAGE: 522 Vilabella Avenue, which is
 3 basically -- a lot of these drawings, or, site
 4 plans, rather, depict Coral Gables High School,
 5 and you can see the soccer field and all of
 6 that. I'm basically on the other side of the
 7 soccer field, along Riviera.
 8 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. So you're in the
 9 residential community --
 10 MR. GRABIEL: West of the high school.
 11 MR. SAVAGE: Yes, I'm west of this.
 12 MS. MENENDEZ: West of the high school.
 13 MR. SAVAGE: Yeah, just west of the high
 14 school.
 15 MS. MENENDEZ: That Vilabella, right,
 16 because I was saying, I don't remember
 17 Vilabella being in this area. Thank you.
 18 MR. SAVAGE: Right.
 19 MS. MENENDEZ: Continue with your comments.
 20 MR. SAVAGE: Sure. I'm watching this and
 21 other nearby projects, and I thank this Board
 22 for its important work.
 23 You know, I am concerned about site lines,
 24 height variances. Obviously this area is going
 25 to mature and be built up. We just want to

1 make sure that we do it right, that it's
2 appropriate, in terms of density, and also
3 sensitivity to the Code, and I think this is a
4 good one.

5 This is not overly dense. It looks like a
6 Coral Gables building. It's not too tall.
7 They haven't come in and asked for the copula
8 on the top and all of these wonderful things
9 that I like to come in and complain about in
10 other projects, but not this one.

11 I really like this one, and I appreciate
12 the Applicant's work on it and the Staff's work
13 on it.

14 MR. BEHAR: Well, actually, you bring up a
15 good point and I want to get the Applicant --
16 George, come up.

17 This area allows you to go up to how high?

18 MR. NAVARRO: Per Code, the Code has been
19 recently amended. It allows you to go up to
20 120 feet. That's just habitable height.

21 And then I believe the Code allows you to
22 go up an additional, at the discretion of the
23 Commission, a certain amount of height.

24 I believe our architectural elements are
25 about 13 or 20 feet maximum. So we're not

1 maximum. Okay, so those two regulations apply.

2 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Thank you.

3 Okay. There's no more public comments?

4 THE SECRETARY: No, that's all.

5 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Mr. Navarro, do
6 you have anything else you wanted to add before
7 we --

8 MR. NAVARRO: No, that's it. I'm here to
9 answer any questions. I mean, I know that
10 we've done a good job, when my colleague Paul
11 comes up here to support a project. I know
12 that he looks for excellence in design, so I
13 think we've done a good job with this one.

14 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Thank you.

15 MR. WU: Mr. Chair, if you can acknowledge
16 the resident's e-mail, from resident Lita
17 Silver, who lives at 4250 Salcedo. That
18 pertains to this project.

19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. I think
20 everybody has a copy of that e-mail, that was
21 on our seats when we got here.

22 MR. NAVARRO: I don't think I've seen a
23 copy of the e-mail.

24 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: 4250 Salcedo. Lita
25 Silver. She's opposing.

1 taking full advantage of that new Code. I'll
2 get you the exact heights right now.

3 MR. BEHAR: But you're not seeking any
4 height variance or anything like that?

5 MR. NAVARRO: Yeah, it's all in accordance
6 with the MXD regulations. We have 117 feet of
7 habitable height, and then 127 feet to the
8 parapet, with certain elements going up to 131
9 feet.

10 And we're within the ten stories.

11 All we do is provide a little bit more
12 floor to ceiling height, to provide a better,
13 you know, type unit. So we're not increasing
14 density or anything, as a result.

15 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And according to the
16 Staff analysis, it's a hundred feet. The City
17 Commission can approve up until 120.

18 MR. NAVARRO: Uh-huh. And that was
19 recently done, because there was some issues
20 with developers trying to design these high end
21 units, and what happens is that you end up
22 taking away from the retail tenant, and then
23 the retail suffers, because you try to reduce
24 the height of the retail.

25 MR. TRIAS: It's 120 and 10 stories,

1 If you haven't seen it, I think the Staff
2 probably has -- do we have another printout for
3 the Applicant?

4 Okay. We'll start discussion with the
5 Board.

6 MR. GRABIEL: Yeah. I like this project.
7 I'm finding this project -- it's refreshing to
8 see something that fits in a 100 by 100 foot
9 lot.

10 And I think, for the City, it's good to
11 have the variety that you obtain by having
12 different buildings, which are rather small,
13 one next to each other.

14 I had a couple of questions.

15 Ramon -- excuse me -- you said the driveway
16 was moved from the alley to Laguna?

17 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. That discussion took
18 place through the process. So there were
19 several iterations of that design. Eventually
20 it ended up, the final design is Laguna, yes.

21 MR. GRABIEL: And why was that?

22 MR. TRIAS: It had to do with the
23 neighboring projects that were also accessing
24 the alley and the traffic impacts that were
25 anticipated.

1 MR. GRABIEL: Okay. Because the only thing
2 I don't like about the project is that. We're
3 driving into Laguna, which should be pure
4 retail or commercial.

5 MR. TRIAS: There was another issue related
6 to that, which was that the ramping of the
7 garage, because it's a very small site, it
8 didn't allow to get tall enough, high enough,
9 to have the 13 feet that are required for the
10 arcade.

11 So there were some conflicts, in terms of
12 design, that made it difficult, because of the
13 size and the dimensions.

14 MR. BEHAR: And I think also Public Works
15 does not allow you to have 100 percent of your
16 egress for your garage from the alley.

17 MR. GRABIEL: Did not know that.

18 MR. TRIAS: Right.

19 MR. GRABIEL: Well, it's a shame. One of
20 the nice things about the project is the amount
21 of commercial on the ground floor.

22 MR. TRIAS: Absolutely. Like I said, that
23 was debated and discussed and analyzed, and at
24 the end, Mr. Behar is correct, that was what
25 prevailed from the Public Works comments.

1 circumstances, you know, the alley being so
2 tight and the Public Works -- and that was
3 before Glen's time. That's a requirement that
4 was here since Alberto Delgado was here, and
5 that's something maybe that for future we
6 should look at.

7 MS. MENENDEZ: You're talking about a small
8 number of units, small number of parking
9 spaces. What impact does this really affect?

10 MR. TRIAS: As I said, that was the
11 original idea, but that has some design
12 challenges, because then the arcade, because of
13 the ramping, couldn't get high enough, fast
14 enough, because of the tight dimensions of the
15 site.

16 MR. BEHAR: But what height have you got on
17 the arcade, ten feet? If you think about it,
18 ten feet on an arcade that size, the proportion
19 could have still been -- ten feet could have
20 been -- in my opinion, it would have been a
21 better choice to put the parking in the back.

22 MR. TRIAS: And those are issues that are
23 valid concerns that you may want to make some
24 recommendations, if you choose to.

25 MS. MENENDEZ: What was it, the Board of

1 MR. NAVARRO: Yeah, it was our preference,
2 as well, but, unfortunately, due to those
3 issues that your Director mentioned, it was
4 very difficult to accomodate that access along
5 the alley.

6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But Julio raises a good
7 point, and maybe for any other developments on
8 Laguna, the apartments on the north side of
9 what I'll call the equinox part of Merrick
10 Park, they've got a two or three bay entrance
11 to their parking garage and I think a service
12 bay there on Laguna.

13 MR. GRABIEL: Right.

14 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I mean, you raise a
15 good point. With this now, and depending on
16 what happens in the future, just a thought.

17 MR. BEHAR: But in this case, too, that
18 alley behind this property is only twenty feet
19 wide. So that also posed another problem.

20 You know, I'm a believer -- despite of what
21 Mr. Ramon says that I like pedestal parking, I
22 am a believer that all of the access to the
23 parking should be in the back side, should not
24 be in public, and you're right, and this could
25 have been one of those, but, unfortunately, the

1 Architects wants --

2 MR. BEHAR: No. I think that comes from
3 Public Works, where the entrance to the
4 parking, only a small percentage can be in the
5 back. You know, the majority of the parking
6 has to be accessible from the primary or
7 secondary street, not from an alley.

8 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, as I said, this
9 issue was designed and discussed and reviewed
10 and the final recommendations from the traffic
11 experts was that traffic worked better from
12 Laguna.

13 MS. MENENDEZ: Is that in here? Is the
14 traffic analysis in here that says that?

15 MR. NAVARRO: No. I think our traffic
16 analysis is based on -- so what happened was,
17 we originally had the plan with --

18 MR. TRIAS: But it's not about traffic
19 analysis. It's the operations of traffic.
20 It's the movement.

21 MR. NAVARRO: Like turning radiuses and slopes.

22 MR. TRIAS: And the dimensions.

23 MS. MENENDEZ: That's what I thought.

24 MR. BEHAR: It's a very small alley. It's
25 only 20 feet.

1 MR. NAVARRO: And I think the alley,
2 actually, at that point, is actually less.
3 Yes, there's 18 feet at a portion of that
4 alley, for whatever reason. So even, you know,
5 kind of affected the ability to get a proper
6 turning radius.
7 MR. BEHAR: Unless you want to vacate part
8 of your property to make the alley wider.
9 MR. NAVARRO: Correct. So it was just --
10 you know, there was a lot of considerations
11 that had to be done.
12 MR. BEHAR: He didn't even get it.
13 MR. NAVARRO: Yeah.
14 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: The Baptist facility,
15 is that an as of right project, or is that --
16 MR. TRIAS: Yes, and the architect is
17 sitting next to you.
18 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah, I know. I saw
19 something somewhere.
20 What's the height of that project?
21 MR. BEHAR: That's six stories, 70 --
22 MR. NAVARRO: -- two feet, I think.
23 MR. BEHAR: Something along that line.
24 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Does anybody remember,
25 what's the project directly north of that,

1 Merrick Manor?
2 MR. TRIAS: Merrick Manor, yes.
3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Anybody recall, give or
4 take, how high that one is?
5 MR. NAVARRO: I think it's 72 feet along Le
6 Jeune and 100 feet --
7 MR. TRIAS: The architect is sitting next
8 to you, also.
9 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: You did Merrick Manor?
10 MS. MENENDEZ: Well, he should know.
11 That's a high one, super high. Too high.
12 MR. BEHAR: It is 77 feet on Le Jeune Road
13 and only a hundred on the back side.
14 MR. TRIAS: But that one was a special
15 approval by settlement by the Commission.
16 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right.
17 MR. TRIAS: So that's not a good example.
18 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: They went a little
19 higher, didn't they? Did it end up at that?
20 MR. BEHAR: Okay. But that was special,
21 because of the whole issue --
22 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. Okay. But then
23 this is a much smaller footprint, so we're
24 going a little higher, but okay.
25 MR. BEHAR: And the Code has changed, I

1 think it's for the better, because you really
2 allow for the retail to be better. The units
3 itself, without increasing the number of
4 floors, you get a better -- in a project of
5 this magnitude or this quality, this is very
6 appropriate.
7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Sorry, Julio, I think
8 you were in the middle of your questioning when
9 we started down different paths.
10 MR. GRABIEL: That's all right.
11 I mean, I understand that it couldn't be
12 done, but it's a shame, because it destroys the
13 pedestrian quality of Laguna.
14 My second question on the garage is, as the
15 owners and the architect heard me before, I
16 want to make sure that from the outside, you
17 cannot see inside the garage at night or during
18 the day.
19 What is the design of those grills so we
20 not are able to see into the garage?
21 MR. NAVARRO: I think that you echo the
22 same concerns from the Board of Architects.
23 You're right on point. We actually worked on
24 this with our architect. We worked on the
25 paneling and the way that the lights would be

1 located, but I'll let our architect expand on
2 that.
3 MR. FERRERI: For the record, Sam Ferreri,
4 PGAL Architects.
5 All of the lights will be shielded, so they
6 won't be direct vision of any of the
7 lightbulbs, and we also have grills that will
8 basically also temper the light, that's in the
9 garage at night, that would filter out.
10 So we take that concern seriously. I
11 currently live in a house that I see the glow
12 of lights down the street from me, and it is
13 objectionable. So we have tried in every way
14 to make sure that you will not see the direct
15 light, but also to filter the light that's
16 spilling out, by using screens and louvers,
17 grills.
18 MR. GRABIEL: Okay. Thank you.
19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Maria, any questions?
20 MS. MENENDEZ: No.
21 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Robert?
22 Marshall?
23 MR. BEHAR: I'm going to make a motion, if
24 there's no questions, to approve the project.
25 MR. BELLIN: I'll second it.

1 MR. NAVARRO: Thank you.
 2 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And that's with Staff's
 3 conditions?
 4 MR. BEHAR: Yes.
 5 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Any further
 6 discussion?
 7 Scot, if you can call the roll.
 8 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?
 9 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.
 10 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell?
 11 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.
 12 THE SECRETARY: Marshal Bellin?
 13 MR. BELLIN: Yes.
 14 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?
 15 MR. BEHAR: Yes.
 16 THE SECRETARY: Jeffrey Flanagan?
 17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes.
 18 Thank you.
 19 MR. NAVARRO: All right. Thank you very
 20 much. Have a good evening.
 21 MS. MENENDEZ: You, too.
 22 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: You, too.
 23 MR. GRABIEL: Thank you.
 24 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Our agenda
 25 has one more item. It was a discussion item on

1 the US-1/Red/Sunset report and findings. Staff
 2 has given us, I think it was in our packet, the
 3 workshop report. However, on the advice of the
 4 City Attorney, we've been asked to take it off
 5 the Agenda, because one of the attorneys for
 6 the applicants is objecting to us discussing it
 7 here tonight.
 8 So apparently, in an abundance of caution,
 9 for some reason, they're objecting, so we will
 10 take it off the agenda.
 11 MS. MENENDEZ: Are we going to take it up,
 12 Mr. Chairman, on the 16th, next Wednesday,
 13 then?
 14 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Personally, I think it
 15 needs to be part of the discussion. I think it
 16 would have been good to discuss some of it now,
 17 but we won't.
 18 MS. MENENDEZ: It makes sense.
 19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Trias.
 20 MR. TRIAS: Just for information, the
 21 Commission had a discussion on the item this
 22 week and there was a lot of public input
 23 provided at that point. Just for your
 24 information.
 25 MR. GRABIEL: On this document?

1 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 2 MR. GRABIEL: So the Commission has already
 3 seen that document?
 4 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 5 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Trias, is there a
 6 way -- I don't know if Coral Gables TV or
 7 somebody, to -- not a snapshot, take a
 8 portion -- a portion of their meeting of the
 9 discussion of this, with the public comment,
 10 would we be allowed to -- and maybe send that
 11 to us in like a video link?
 12 MR. WU: We'll find a way to send that to
 13 you.
 14 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. The videos are posted,
 15 so we can probably send you the link, because
 16 they're very well organized, by topic. So,
 17 yeah.
 18 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Oh, that's true. You
 19 can click on the Agenda and it takes you
 20 right --
 21 MR. TRIAS: I think we can --
 22 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think we can figure
 23 it out. That's fine.
 24 MR. TRIAS: Thank you very much.
 25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.

1 All right. Anything else for discussion
 2 before we adjourn?
 3 Motion to adjourn?
 4 MR. GRABIEL: So moved.
 5 MR. BEHAR: Second.
 6 Just for the record -- excuse me, Mr.
 7 Chair -- next week, I won't be here. I already
 8 had a pre-arranged vacation, that my wife will
 9 definitely kill me if we don't that do.
 10 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right.
 11 We have a motion and a second. All those
 12 in favor of adjourning say, "aye."
 13 MR. GABRIEL: Aye.
 14 MS. MENENDEZ: Aye.
 15 MR. BELLIN: Aye.
 16 MR. BEHAR: Aye.
 17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you. We're out
 18 of here. See you next Wednesday.
 19 (Thereupon, the meeting concluded at 8:55
 20 p.m.)
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

1 C E R T I F I C A T E
2
3 S T A T E O F F L O R I D A :
4 S S.
5 C O U N T Y O F M I A M I - D A D E :
6
7
8

9 I, NIEVES SANCHEZ, Court Reporter, and a Notary
10 Public for the State of Florida at Large, do hereby
11 certify that I was authorized to and did
12 stenographically report the foregoing proceedings and
13 that the transcript is a true and complete record of my
14 stenographic notes.
15

16 DATED this 20th day of September, 2015.
17
18
19
20
21

22 SIGNED COPY ON FILE
23 _____
24 NIEVES SANCHEZ
25

Attendance/Speaker Sign In Sheet – September 9, 2015

Planning & Zoning Board Meeting

	Name	Mailing Address	Phone	(If you wish to speak, please check the box below)
1.	Paul Savacore	522 Vibelotta Ave	305-444-7188	<input type="checkbox"/> Villa Valencia <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> One Merrick Park
2.				<input type="checkbox"/> Villa Valencia <input type="checkbox"/> One Merrick Park
3.				<input type="checkbox"/> Villa Valencia <input type="checkbox"/> One Merrick Park
4.				<input type="checkbox"/> Villa Valencia <input type="checkbox"/> One Merrick Park
5.				<input type="checkbox"/> Villa Valencia <input type="checkbox"/> One Merrick Park
6.				<input type="checkbox"/> Villa Valencia <input type="checkbox"/> One Merrick Park
7.				<input type="checkbox"/> Villa Valencia <input type="checkbox"/> One Merrick Park
8.				<input type="checkbox"/> Villa Valencia <input type="checkbox"/> One Merrick Park
9.				<input type="checkbox"/> Villa Valencia <input type="checkbox"/> One Merrick Park
10.				<input type="checkbox"/> Villa Valencia <input type="checkbox"/> One Merrick Park
11.				<input type="checkbox"/> Villa Valencia <input type="checkbox"/> One Merrick Park
12.				<input type="checkbox"/> Villa Valencia <input type="checkbox"/> One Merrick Park
13.				<input type="checkbox"/> Villa Valencia <input type="checkbox"/> One Merrick Park

From: ledasil@aol.com
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Merrick Park - Laguna and San Lorenzo building request
Date: Tuesday, September 08, 2015 11:08:06 PM

Good evening,

I am a native Miami-Dade County resident who just recently moved to Coral Gables. I live in this area and am very opposed to the planned development being requested for the green space next to Nieman Marcus on the corner of San Lorenzo and Laguna Streets. I just saw the posting for the planning meeting over the weekend so I went online and read the proposal. I live in that area and would not recommend that additional residential and retail units be built there for several reasons:

1. Loss of green space - there is very little green space in the area and more concrete and congestion in that area is definitely not wanted. Local residents walk their dogs there and it gives the area a "park-like" feeling rather than more cars, parking places, stores, congestion. It is already very congested with the Nieman Marcus valet service right there. Residents are not permitted to use the field at Coral Gables High School.
2. Laguna is already extremely congested for a small street. Please watch on any given day, including Saturday mornings, when that small street is used for moving vans, deliveries for both residential and commercial properties, waste pick-ups regularly, numerous trucks parking in the streets (both sides at same time) in order to deliver fresh produce and other food/goods to the numerous restaurants at Merrick Park, etc. Last Saturday, even a small sedan could barely fit between the trucks blocking the street. Others had to back up and wait until trucks left. This is on top of the usual traffic from the retail and residential parking already there on Laguna and the metered spaces in front of the existing retail shops. The road is too small and congested now. San Lorenzo faces NM and cars are always stopping there to let people off since it is near the entrance and valet. There is already plenty of activity.< br>
3. During last Saturday's rain, Laguna floods badly and so adding more concrete, people, and congestion is not going to benefit the community.
4. The size of the planned building is taller than the other units around there and may block views, remove green space that people cherish, and eliminate some of the privacy that I, for one, sought when I relocated to that area. Furthermore, the thought of construction and banging and cranes is not appealing and had that been known at the time, I would not have chosen this location to live.
5. There are numerous empty retail spaces within 2 blocks of this site so I do not see the need for more small retail stores below the 3 bedroom residential units.
6. Do not want additional congestion there as it is already dangerous coming out of those parallel parking spaces and the garage.
7. All in all, for a few retail storefronts (where there are several available within a block or two) and for 13 units that will rise 10 stories, I respectfully request that you deny this request. I believe there are already enough units in the area and enough retail on that side of Merrick Park.

Thank you.

Leda Silver
4250 Salzedo
305-608-8976