

**City of Coral Gables Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting  
September 22, 2021  
Public Safety Building  
Community Meeting Room  
405 Biltmore Way, Coral Gables, FL**

**Blue Ribbon Committee Members**

**Chairperson Felix Pardo  
Board Member Aramis "Mitch" Alvarez  
Board Member Robert Behar  
Board Member Willy Bermello  
Board Member Glenn Pratt  
Board Member Javier Salman**

**City Staff**

**Assistant City Attorney, Gustavo Ceballos  
City Clerk, Billy Urquia  
City Architect, Juan Riesco  
Planning and Zoning Director, Ramon Trias  
Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director, Warren Adams  
Development Services Director, Suramy Cabrera**

**Public Speaker(s)**

**Sue Kawalerski**

---

Chairperson Pardo: I'm sorry for the tardy -- late -- the late start today because we have three

Chairperson Pardo: We're going to start the Blue-Ribbon committee at this time, although two of our board members are not here again. I'm expecting at least...

City Clerk Urquia: Felix, let me interrupt you. I spoke to both Mitch Alvarez and Javier Salman.

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

City Clerk Urquia: Javier is not going to make it, period. And Mitch, said he's going to try to be here.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. We do have a quorum, so let's continue. As far as the agenda, we received the minutes of the -- the verbatim minutes of the September 2nd meeting. Is there a motion to approve?

Board Member Bermello: So move.

Chairperson Pardo: It's been moved...

Board Member Pratt: Second.

Chairperson Pardo: By Mr. Bermello.

Board Member Pratt: Second.

Chairperson Pardo: Second by Mr. Pratt. Any comments? All those in favor?

The Board Members (Collectively): Aye.

Board Member Behar: Mr. Chairman, should you -- should we call a roll call? Just to -- for the record who's here.

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Clerk, please do so.

City Clerk Urquia: Absolutely. Board Member Behar?

Board Member Behar: Present.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Bermello?

Board Member Bermello: Present.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Pratt?

Board Member Pratt: Present.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Salman? Board Member Riesco?

City Architect Riesco: Here.

City Clerk Urquia: Chairman Pardo?

Chairperson Pardo: Here.

City Clerk Urquia: Sir, you have quorum.

Chairperson Pardo: So, I know we had a staff report coming up, but I wanted to bring something to the committee's attention, the public -- the members from the public here, also and staff. After going through the September 10th final document provided by Mr. Ceballos, I found a couple things that - a few things that were not quite accurate in some cases, and there was one particular item. So, what I did was I made a copy of it and highlighted it in writing in blue, so you could see the difference. It's got the date on top of 9/22. If you can please go to Page 5-2. So, (INAUDIBLE) conversation during our earlier to deliberations about number four on 5-2.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chairman, may I have some clarification?

Chairperson Pardo: Yes, sir.

Board Member Bermello: Why are we here?

Chairperson Pardo: We're here to listen to staff's report and...

Board Member Bermello: My understanding was that we had a meeting scheduled that was cancelled (INAUDIBLE). And then we ended up here.

City Manager Iglesias: May I say something, Mr. Chair?

Board Member Bermello: I just want to...

City Manager Iglesias: We -- yes. And the issue was we (INAUDIBLE) the meeting too close. There was not enough time to really review it, what we had done. I mean, there was a lot of work to do. We felt that it needed a little bit more time. So, the idea was to have staff review it. Ramon is here - - Ramon Trias is here, our Assistant Director of Planning, to go over staff comments, (INAUDIBLE) with the committee, and then meet with the Commission on the 28th; go to the October 13th P&Z, then finalize it in the second meeting in October instead of rushing everything. So, that meeting -- the special meeting (INAUDIBLE) on the (INAUDIBLE) 28th. I thought that was not enough time to really look at this thing and let staff analyze it, come back, talk to the committee. And let me just -- before I start, I just want to thank all of you for the work you've done. Much appreciated. You've put a lot of effort into it. And I can tell you, the Commission, the Mayor, the Commission appreciates this very much and so do I. And so, I did not want to go (INAUDIBLE) the staff report that you do not -- have not seen, that was not analyzed. And ideally, it would be great to go with one comprehensive document. What this does, it puts into one document the existing ordinance, the committee ordinance, and staff comments into one document. And it allows you all to go through this document. And hopefully, Mr. Trias will explain and hopefully come to some meeting of the minds. If you agree, that's fine. If you disagree, it's fine. I think what we want to do is get staff comments to you before it goes to the Commission meeting next Tuesday.

Board Member Behar: Mr. Iglesias -- and through the Chair -- I understand why we're here today.

But we've been working on this for the last seven, eight weeks, I believe. Why was staff's recommendation not provided to us sooner? Why --? Because had the meeting not been, you know, postponed, it would have gone through Commission. And we -- I think all of us (INAUDIBLE) -- we never even got a chance to read that.

City Manager Iglesias: Well, I do think that -- I think what the committee -- the committee report should be your committee report, right? It should be your committee report that staff reviews. And I don't want anything that can say that the Administration had their thumb on the scale on anything here. So, we looked at your report. I think your committee report is excellent. I hope that some -- maybe some issues that staff has can make it -- maybe make it better or maybe not. It just depends on you, but this is your report. And I wanted to make it clear that staff has had no thumb on the scale for this report. This is yours. We have some comments on it. And so that's the idea of that, okay? So, we have these comments. We have the meeting on the 28th to get the Commission's comments. Then we go to the P&Z on the 13th, and then we go to the Commission meeting -- the second Commission meeting in October. It means that we have time to review these comments, time to organize them. If you think these comments are good, we will adopt. If you feel these comments are not, we won't. But to answer that, Mr. Behar, it is -- this is your -- I do not want anybody to think that we had anything to do with what this commission did, and we have our thumbs on the scale as far as the architectural bonus program is concerned. Okay, and that's -- and I think it's important that the committee acted on its own, and then we come back to discuss and then present something to the City Commission. So, that was the reason. It was purposely done so that the -- so there would be no question as to what the committee wanted. And I think (INAUDIBLE) doing it. You come up with your report. Mr. Trias can come up with certain things here, and then we optimize and go to the City Commission. We can also get some of their feedback, some of the City Commission feedback in the Commission meeting, and then we've got time until October 13th for P&Z to make further revisions. Then we come back on the 28th. So, I think there's enough time to look at your comments, hear what the staff has to say, optimize the ordinance and proceed forward. Okay, so it was really done out of respect for the committee and the fact that we wanted this process to be independent, completely, completely independent. Again, let me thank all of you for the work that you've put in here, which has been substantial. Much, much appreciated.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Manager.

Board Member Bermello: Did I understand from Gus that you have a couple tweaks, clarifications?

Chairperson Pardo: The...

Board Member Bermello: Would you want to go through that first?

Chairperson Pardo: Right. I would like to get that out of the way. That's why I made quick copies here for...

Board Member Behar: And I also have, you know, a couple (INAUDIBLE) that I want to bring out. And once Mr. Pardo finishes, I want to bring, you know, a couple of them out.

Chairperson Pardo: So, if you go to Page 5-2, number 4. This paragraph was taken out. It seemed

to be completely arbitrary where it was located to begin with. And we had staff and asked staff specifically about the MF3, although there isn't a lot of MF3. One of them, an MF3 project, literally just came up recently. And one of the things that this paragraph did do is that as far as Mediterranean bonuses, the MF3 is exempt from receiving height bonuses. And I simply wanted to put that back into the thing. Because there was an example -- I had personally asked staff about whether this can apply or not apply. I was told, "No, it could not apply," and it just so happens there was an application that went before the Board of Architects last week where it did apply. So, therefore, for me, the reason that the MF3 needs to have the restriction of the additional height even with the -- even the Med bonuses is because normally they're adjacent to single-family or duplex areas. And therefore, that's why it was envisioned not to apply the additional height, you know, there in those areas. There are other safeguards that exist there when it comes to height when you're abutting other types of zoning, but I thought it would be best to put -- to leave it back where it was, and that's really the most technical of all of them, of these issues. The second one -- I circled the pages in blue so it would pop out easily so we could go through this quickly. If you go to Page 5-4, I just wanted to add the word "Table 1" before "Required Standards" because it does not state what the paragraph is talking about. So, by simply saying "Table 1 Required Standards," period, "Application shall be," and then continue. That's fine. The word "in" should have been removed; it was not. And also, the designation multifamily, MF, somehow was removed, but it applies to Table 1 MF and MX districts. And those were the only changes there. That's on Page 5-4. You skip to Page 5-6 under D; this is the Level 1 height table. The tables are not labeled, so you don't know which you're looking at. You could figure it out, by simply by putting in there and labeling it as Level 1 Height table. Then there's no doubt. That's on Page 5-6. 5-7, it looks worse than what it really is. If you go up to number 1 up above all application design Level 2 bonus because now you have Level 1 in the rearview mirror, but it's not telling you -- it's saying "bonuses" so it's confusing. It's not saying the next step. The next step should be Level 2 bonuses shall meet -- and then the minimums. That's making references to the, you know, 8 out of 12 or 6 out of 12, which is out the window. And the reason I showed the dotted arrow dashed line there is because it conflicts. We had all agreed that the applications for residential uses and mixed used districts shall substantially comply with all qualifications in Table 2. So, therefore, that was just a point of clarification of making sure because the reference of minimums being a minimum of how many and we took out the how many because we said they're going to comply with all of them, and that what is Table 2. Down below in the -- in Table 2, we still have the three and the two checks and the building setbacks crossed out, although they were not intended to be crossed out. So, I'm just saying take out the strikeouts. And if you notice, we had left the BOA of architects may allow for variations to the underlying zoning setback requirements. So, it should be replaced to take out the strikeouts on Page 5-7. Go to 5-8, these should become (INAUDIBLE) because we added the Table 2 on the page before because it was out there in space. And by adding E -- making E F, the other thing is that we've already clarified that Level 1 bonus is .2. And the one additional floor under the Level 1 has to do with Mediterranean style. That's already, again, in our rearview mirror. So, now, Level 2 bonuses are for the architectural and pedestrian amenities, which are what make up Table 2. So, it says bonuses of architectural and pedestrian -- because it's referring again to the style, not the heading of Table 2. Then it says an additional bonus up to .3 floor area ratio and one additional story if Level 1 bonuses are awarded and all architectural and pedestrian amenities for Table 2 are utilized in the application design. So, therefore, now it ties everything together. These are Level 1 bonuses, which you have to have the standards. You have to have the style of architecture. Level 2 bonuses: you're going to have architectural and pedestrian amenities based on Table 2. So, now we've (INAUDIBLE). And then finally, 5-9 -- or not finally but almost finally -- Page 5-9, G, Level

2 height table. Again, the height table is now coordinated with the Level 2 bonus. And then we added the letter G, changed H, I, J. And then finally, on 5-10, up above is Table 3. It should be I. Table 3, Other development options, which we had stricken out. That is the building setback reductions, and then added the larger units, and that is all. And I just wanted to try to get it as right as possible. This doesn't mean that, you know, it won't change, there won't be, you know, additional issues. I know that Mr. Behar has some...

Board Member Bermello: I move that we adopt these changes as presented (INAUDIBLE) cleanup and clarify, make it easier for the reader to identify where he or she may be going. So, I thank you for (INAUDIBLE). I will endorse these changes. And if we can adopt them, then we can move on to Mr. Behar's points and then to staff. But I'm all for it and I thank you for it.

Board Member Behar: I'll second.

Board Member Pratt: Just a quick -- before we do, just a point of clarification, Mr. Chair. We have two quick questions in regard to your proposal that has been moved and seconded. The first large removal or addition back, do you want to include all of the language or just the bonus height shall not apply to MF3?

Chairperson Pardo: The entire language.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: The entire language. Okay, and also in regard to Page 5-4, the reference of the MF that was removed, I'm looking at the existing language in the Code and MF was never there. It does say applicable residential, which MF would fall under.

Chairperson Pardo: Correct. It was always missing.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: It was always missing.

Board Member Behar: He wants to add it.

Chairperson Pardo: I'm adding...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Perfect.

Chairperson Pardo: Though it was -- I would call it a scrivener's error.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Perfect. Okay, just wanted to confirm.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you very much. And so, can we adopt this and then --? Okay. Will you call it, Mr. Clerk?

City Clerk Urquia: Roll call.

Board Member Bermello: Yes.

Board Member Pratt: Yes.

City Architect Riesco: Yes.  
Board Member Behar: Yes.  
Chairperson Pardo: Yes.  
(Vote: 5-0)

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you. Mr. Behar, you have the floor.

Board Member Behar: Thank you. We -- on the number 2 from Page 5-2, maybe we could go back to the document you presented to us and let me look for it there. The Public Pedestrian Amenities Purpose and Applicability. We -- under 2a, we put compatibility with the surrounding project and subject to compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood.

Chairperson Pardo: Page 5-1 on the document.

Board Member Behar: On your document, 5-1.

Board Member Bermello: 5-1?

Chairperson Pardo: Item 2a, the top one.

Board Member Bermello: Oh, the top one, okay.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. That sentence where it says, "and subject to compatibility with the surrounding neighborhoods."

Board Member Behar: My concern -- and I agree with compatibility with surrounding neighborhood -- is that I think we should reference something with the existing zoning for that particular area. Because you may have an area that is zoned for X, but you have existing buildings that may not -- that may be, for example, one or two stories and they're not going to be compatible with what's being proposed.

Board Member Bermello: For example, you're thinking, let's say, the industrial district before it became mixed use residential.

Board Member Behar: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: And if you have (INAUDIBLE) simply the wording abstracted from zoning or regulatory framework for that district, there could be an incompatibility just simply because of the state of transition of that area that might have gone to a redevelopment plan approved by the citizens, et cetera. So, I think it's a good point because I can think of that area particularly where you have, you know, all parts and places that were not in conformance, let's say, with the residential or mixed-use building. And if you go by this, you could say, "Hey, this building is not in conformance with what's next to it."

Board Member Behar: Or the new proposed...

Board Member Bermello: In height or in bulk, or you know, whatever. I think maybe -- it's a good point, particularly in areas that are being redeveloped.

Chairperson Pardo: I think you hit it on the head because this is the transition period between -- it's really redevelopment, but I would very much like to keep the verbiage in there but somehow interlace the existing zoning...

Board Member Bermello: Of the neighborhood.

Chairperson Pardo: In other words, the zoning, not the Comprehensive Plan, but the zoning. In other words, the zoning, let's say, is now midrise and it's midrise across the board. Therefore, you have both. Now, by having both phrases in there, then you would have to be very careful with the step backs, the massing of the building, you know, what you would do...

Board Member Behar: But that is addressed in this document.

Chairperson Pardo: Correct. Well, what I'm saying that's why I want to add not...

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Board Member Bermello: In the form of a suggestion, if we say, "surrounding neighborhoods and municipal ordinances in effect." Because like that, you address zoning. There could be an ordinance that's accepted by the City Commission addressing a particular area that (INAUDIBLE) amendment to the zoning. So, I mean, it would make it, you know, actualized so that at that point incompatibility is not just what's next to you but also what are the land use regulations enforced at that point in time. That would be one way I think you address your point, which is a very good one. You could be next to a gas station, you know (INAUDIBLE) compatible but not within the concept of the district guidelines that are in place.

Chairperson Pardo: Would "and existing zoning in the adjacent area" --? The adjacent area could be across the street, next to...

Board Member Behar: It needs to be clarified.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Behar: So, to -- you know, whether it's adjacent or, you know...

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE) across the street (INAUDIBLE). What you don't want is someone two blocks away...

Board Member Behar: No, no, no, no, no. Within the area.

Board Member Bermello: I think the point you're making, I believe, is that if you're complying with the zoning guidelines a hundred percent but because of the state of development of that district, there's a lot of uses that may be non-conforming to the scale or the use of the building and you're not allowed



to -- that somebody can't come across the street and say, "Based on this, they're not compatible..."

Board Member Behar: Correct.

Board Member Bermello: "With the neighborhood," and you know, I get it. I mean, that could be, you know...

Chairperson Pardo: You know, here is -- I agree with you on the issue because then, you know, conceptually you could basically bring any redevelopment to a halt and that's not what we want to do. But on the other side, the thing that I've never been able to understand on Malaga, immediately east of Ponce, you have on the south side, right behind Christie's, single-family residential areas. Then directly across the street, we have the last phase of the Plaza site. Now, the part I can't wrap my head, truly can't understand -- and it's water under the bridge now -- but what I truly can't understand and what I think we have to safeguard against, and I think we would all agree, is that one of the things that we have in the Code that we've always believed is a safety net when we're abutting single-family residential is that, "Well, you can't go any higher than 45 feet for the first 100 feet." And unfortunately, when you drive there and you're just sitting at the light waiting to make a left-hand turn on Ponce and you're looking straight down this tiny, tiny, tiny street and you have the single-family residential on the right, and then you have a very tall building on the left, much greater than 45 feet. They're totally incompatible. And what I can't understand is normally the zoning would be the buffer to protect. Yes, Mr. Iglesias.

City Manager Iglesias: My concern is -- and I just discussed that with the City Attorney -- that that should be a function of the underlying zoning adjacent to those areas. And if you have the Board of Architects changing underlying zoning, you have a Bert Harris issue and you have all kinds of issues that -- so we have to be -- so, I just want to say that we need to be very, very careful. Because if you have the Board of Architects reducing height, reducing things like this, you get into the Board of Architects is now dealing with zoning issues and that can be a serious problem.

Board Member Bermello: I agree. That's why I was saying it -- that could be respected by -- in other words, the zoning in the district that you're developing assumes that the zoning was done through a public process...

Board Member Behar: Right.

Board Member Bermello: It went through a whole vetting process with the neighborhood and with the City and City staff. So, I think the comment coming from Mr. Behar is that (INAUDIBLE) incompatibility with a use that is immediately next to it, but you're complying with the zoning, the zoning trumps that incompatibility not the other way around.

City Manager Iglesias: And -- yes.

Board Member Bermello: Not that you can use the incompatibility to modify or amend the zoning. That would be like spot zoning.

Board Member Behar: This is more of -- my comment is more of a clarification. That is if zoning

allows it, then it will be compatible. What exactly the point you made is what I'm concerned that they could come and say, "Well, you're allowed to do a midrise building," let's do as an example, "because the zoning allows it." But maybe the board says, "You've got existing one-story buildings. It is not compatible what you're producing."

Board Member Bermello: It may be the board. It could be a citizen. It could be one of the Commissioners.

Board Member Behar: And exactly what I'm trying to avoid is that we -- the City gets into one of those predicaments that we get sued for taking away development from a property owner.

City Manager Iglesias: Well, that's really not the Board of Architects' issue.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

City Manager Iglesias: Really, and the Chair brought a very interesting project up, but that should have been taken care of from a zoning perspective, where you do have 45 feet and they have a 100 footstep back. Or you may have some other issue that you provide some type of liner or some other zoning criteria. But we just have to be careful that -- and I've discussed this with the City Attorney - - that we don't get caught in rezoning and developing spot zoning. It's a Bert Harris issue.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Mr. Chairman, if I could answer the specific question. It's a PAD and that is why it happened, and the process had to come.

Chairperson Pardo: And that is exactly where the problem is. You are 100 percent correct. But I would -- and again, I'm not endorsing for the Board of Architects to, you know, get into zoning. But I think that the particular PAD that was approved there definitely left those single-family homes hanging. I mean, out to dry. There's no doubt in my mind. There's no one on the face of this earth that could say, you know, those people have got to feel really good opening their front door of their single-family home and looking at something that could have been stepped back, could have been done differently at that time.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And...

City Manager Iglesias: Mr. Chair, I understand that but that has to do with not looking at the underlying zoning and not sticking to the underlying zoning. The PAD -- it may be a PAD, but it still has to meet the underlying zoning and other issues that Mr. Trias can talk about.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

City Manager Iglesias: Now, so we are looking at a project that really, if you look at the prior project, this is a totally completely different project.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: What I want to point out is...

City Manager Iglesias: You may have a PAD, but that PAD doesn't allow you to work

indiscriminately is what I'm saying.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: As we discussed last time, that had a conceptual review by Board of Architects, multiple meetings by the Board of Architects. It did go through a very thorough process and so on. And unfortunately, some of the results are not what some people may like. But I don't want to have anybody have the impression that there wasn't a very thorough process and Commission approval multiple times, et cetera, et cetera.

Board Member Behar: And I don't want to deviate from the intent that I think -- my point is that was a project most of us would not -- you know, may not be in agreement with the project, but we cannot -- I don't think we should use that project. I'm concerned exactly what Mr. Iglesias -- we cannot get in a predicament, the city, that we take away and we get into a litigation process. And I think this language needs to be clarified. And maybe with Mr. Bermello's suggestion if -- you now, so long as it's compatible with the underlying zoning or something, that -- because this -- to me, this language could say, you know, the zoning may allow you to do it, but you got a one-story building next to you, you cannot do it; it's not compatible. And that's the clarification I want to make sure...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: (INAUDIBLE) compatible in the context of planning allows exactly (INAUDIBLE) what you're saying. That's what that means.

Chairperson Pardo: I added one word that the Manager brought up, which is underlying, as in underlying zoning. So, what I would suggest is, one, we just incorporate it now to get this out of the way -- is that on 2a, Page 5-1, where it says a at the last line -- "and subject to compatibility with the surrounding neighborhoods and existing underlying zoning in the adjacent area." Does anyone had any comment that they would like to change that?

Board Member Bermello: I just (INAUDIBLE) teacher would tell me that you don't use "and" twice.

Chairperson Pardo: Comma, comma.

Board Member Bermello: I would say "and subject to compliance with the underlying zoning district as well as compatibility with the surrounding neighborhoods." I think the zoning district needs to have (INAUDIBLE) of compatibility, which we all endorse. I think one is going to be a subjective estimation, and the other one is you're either in compliance with the zoning or you're not in compliance with the zoning.

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Ceballos.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Pardon my interruption. My concern is, I don't believe that this language you're adding adds any (INAUDIBLE). We've reviewed this for certain Bert J. Harris claims and we're comfortable with the language as you've already added. Adding language "applicable to the Zoning Code," of course you'd have to abide by the applicable Zoning Code. And once again, we have to remember what this is. This is a Mediterranean bonus. So, this is not to suggest that if I am as of right -- I can build 45 feet or to 100 feet and the abutting property is a single-family home with a cap of 35 feet, that I wouldn't be able to build as of right to 100 feet. This is simply saying, if you're going to build more than the as of right under this Med bonus, you need to

comply -- you need to be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. Does that make sense to everyone? I don't think that the language you're trying to add does the intent. And I don't think it makes it any better than what it currently states. I think it's just going to confuse the issue more.

Board Member Behar: With all due respect, Mr. Ceballos, I consulted two land use attorneys today, okay, and they both had a little bit difference of opinion, not one, but two. So, it could be up to interpretation. And I do believe -- and I did not ask, you know, to give me a language to propose. I asked the concern. So, that's something that we really need to look at because what we don't want is to get in a predicament, you know, for the city that we get -- and then you're saying you feel comfortable. But when I, you know, hear from two different land use attorneys that do a lot of work in the Gables, you know, it brings that point to light.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Understood. At the end of the day, the Committee is within their right to make any suggestions they want to the committee. But just for the references, I by trade am a land use and zoning attorney. I consulted with other land use and zoning attorney, and we feel comfortable with this language. So, it's just a difference of opinion.

Chairperson Pardo: What I would like to do -- if the Committee is in agreement -- I would like to have a legal opinion from the City Attorney's Office on specifically this paragraph. If there's something that they would suggest, you know, or that they feel that the development rights are not in jeopardy...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: As they currently stand, I am not concerned. If the board wants to make an amendment and a suggestion or a change to the Commission, it's well within your power. I recommend that you follow whatever you believe is appropriate.

Board Member Bermello: You know, I want to button it down because I agree with my colleague, Behar. (INAUDIBLE) really (INAUDIBLE) establish a (INAUDIBLE) issue of noncompliance simply because of the transition in a particular area where you have certain urban fabric that is historic, it's been there forever, but you have new underlying zoning districts approved by the City, approved by the Commission, which are different. And you know, I could come up (INAUDIBLE) and say this says it must be conforming. This is obviously not in conformance. They'll bring photos. They'll show the difference, and you know, you don't have to be a rocket scientist to figure out that there is a nonconformance when you put a ten-story building next to a, you know, one level warehouse. So, I get what you're saying, but here given with the issues that we're dealing with, I'm looking at the opposite. What is the harm? I can't see it. I realize that it's obvious that, you know, (INAUDIBLE), but this is introducing the concept of nonconformance of a neighborhood. And at any given point in time, (INAUDIBLE). There could be nonconformance. And this to me is establishing the number-one provision (INAUDIBLE) is neighborhood compatibility. The number one. It wasn't the last one. It was the first one. And it's one that the Chair, when he gave his kind of introductory remarks of why we're here and et cetera was dealing with that subject. So, I think the fact that you brought this up, you know, (INAUDIBLE). And just think of it, what do we lose by saying that -- I can't -- I don't...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: My only concern, like I stated before, I don't think it adds anything. I think what you just stated is exactly the issue. If your property is in compliance with the underlying

zoning code, neighborhood compatibility only would apply for a bonus. The property already has to comply with the Zoning Code. So, although, yes, there's a new Zoning Code regulation, now you can build 100 stories next to a one-story building, that's the Zoning Code. I cannot say -- unless they're applying for a bonus -- that they can't build that.

Board Member Behar: But that's just the (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Bermello: I get what you're saying.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I understand, I understand.

Board Member Bermello: I get what you're saying.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: But that's why I don't think that adding the language really adds anything to it. At the end of the day, if it's the will of the Committee, please.

Board Member Bermello: Gus, let me tell you what this is saying. You're asking for bonuses, and yes, you're complying with zoning but you're not being in conformance with the neighborhood, so we're not going to give you the bonuses. That's what this is saying.

Board Member Behar: Yeah.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: But that's what that says right there.

Development Services Director Cabrera: Yeah.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: That's what it currently says.

Development Services Director Cabrera: That's not what they want.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Yeah.

Development Services Director Cabrera: They want the bonus to be treated the way that as-of-right would be treated. That's what they want, which is exactly the opposite of what you're saying.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Mr. Bermello, I would use the word "compatibility" instead of "noncompliant," just because in the Zoning Code they're very different.

Board Member Bermello: It's fine. The issue here that we're saying is if you are complying with the Zoning Code in the district -- complying fully -- if you happen to be nonconforming with your next-door neighbor, it's not an issue. It should not be an issue. The way that it's written now without that would be an issue.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: If you were seeking a bonus.

Unidentified Speaker: (INAUDIBLE) with a bonus ...

Development Services Director Cabrera: Or (INAUDIBLE).

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Which is why I'm saying adding that language does nothing (INAUDIBLE). We're not even in the standards.

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Development Services Director Cabrera: What he's saying is that you do not have a right to get the bonus. They can decide on the bonus no. What they can't decide is on the zoning no additional -- (INAUDIBLE) you can't do that height because it's not compatible. You don't get that height. If it's allowed in the zoning, it is. Now, the bonus -- get extra whatever number of fee -- they could say no, it's not compatible with the neighborhood.

Board Member Bermello: That's the problem that (INAUDIBLE)...

Development Services Director Cabrera: Which is exactly what they're trying not to do because they want it to be like an as of right.

Board Member Behar: Not as of right. As long as you meet all the requirements that are set forth in this, you know, because there's no sense of meeting all these requirements...

Board Member Bermello: The way that you're putting it is you could be totally in keeping with the zoning in the district and be nonconforming.

Development Services Director Cabrera: No.

Board Member Bermello: Yes.

Development Services Director Cabrera: What I'm saying is you'll be in compliance with...

Board Member Bermello: No.

Development Services Director Cabrera: The zoning but you won't be in compliance with that list.

Board Member Bermello: Forget about the list.

Development Services Director Cabrera: You'll be in compliance...

Board Member Bermello: This entire paragraph starts with that provision, and this entire thing has to do with the bonuses for the Mediterranean style. So, any project in any district where they're going for these bonuses, they could be compliant perfectly with all the zoning requirements but not be able to aspire for bonuses simply because in that district there are uses that are not in keeping with the zoning. They're still lagging behind and there's an issue of no compatibility between the original

existing and the current being proposed. That's the issue.

Development Services Director Cabrera: And I can hear you clear. And what you want is -- what you're arguing is that the Med bonus should not be something that is arbitrary, like it's not compatible -- not arbitrary, that it's not compatible. You want it to be that if they meet the list, they get it, even if it's not compatible with the one-story home next door. And that's exactly what Gus is saying. It's not the way it's written and maybe it's not the way it should be.

Board Member Bermello: If your project meets the guidelines of the district that you're in, MF3, MX, whichever one it is, you meet that and there happens to be next to you one or two properties that are older properties that don't meet that, would never aspire to meet it, the issue of non-conformance or lack of neighborhood compatibility cannot be used if you're meeting zoning. That (INAUDIBLE)...

Development Services Director Cabrera: And Med bonus is not zoning. Is that a way of putting it? Med bonus is not really the underlying zoning.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Correct.

Board Member Bermello: But Med bonus is a zoning item. It's not comp plan. It's not something - it's in the zoning.

Development Services Director Cabrera: It's not the underlying zoning.

Board Member Bermello: No, of course not. It's an overlay, like you have different overlays. But the issue here is what is neighborhood compatibility. And someone could say that a 7-story building in the industrial area next to (INAUDIBLE) is not compatible with -- now they're about to become extinct. But what of the older buildings that are there? I could own the -- there was a school there. I could come up and say, "I don't want these buildings. It's not compatible with the scale of this area." And you would have to say, "Yes, it's true." Everything that's been built there wasn't compatible with what was there before.

Development Services Director Cabrera: But if seven stories is allowed in the underlying zoning, that's not a question. If you want to get the additional stories because of the Med bonus, that's the part that's still up to...

Board Member Behar: But you could be...

Development Services Director Cabrera: Measure of compatibility.

Board Member Behar: You could be complying with every point in this document (INAUDIBLE) in compatibility with the neighborhood.

Board Member Bermello: That's the point.

Board Member Behar: Right?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I agree. I believe that's the desire of the Commission (INAUDIBLE) the point of this committee (INAUDIBLE) to not make it a simple check, check, check, check, check.

Board Member Behar: No, no, but that "check, check, check" -- you do -- in order to achieve this, you have to do more than a check. But then you could do all the checks and do exactly what these documents are requiring, but you're not going to be in compatibility.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: For the bonus, yes.

Unidentified Speaker: Yeah. That's what...

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE) underlying zoning.

Board Member Behar: But then we take away the incentive to do this, right?

Chairperson Pardo: Wait. Which is the --? Wait a minute. Let me make a proposal here. Right now, this should be promoting an assortment of street-level public realm and pedestrian amenities in order to earn development bonuses and special allowances through the structured discretionary review process in compliance with the underlying adjacent zoning and subject to compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood.

Board Member Pratt: And I think that's the point Mr. Bermello...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Can I...

Chairperson Pardo: Exactly.

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, and I think that that's a good compromise. I think that gives flexibility to the Board of Architects to review. And if you could be adjacent to some structure that may in the future be changed. And so why -- to limit the development of a project based on something that may change in the future.

Chairperson Pardo: And I'll tell you. I think the language states it, reinforces it. I don't think we get into a legal issue.

Board Member Pratt: No, I think (INAUDIBLE).

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Chairman, if I can remind you that the challenges of compatibility have to do with the Comprehensive Plan most of the time. So, don't forget that that is the way that a third party can challenge.



Chairperson Pardo: I really take issue with that, specifically, when you use the vehicle of a PAD. When you read the PAD and you see what it's supposed to do in theory and what I have seen it do in practice, sometimes they're very different. And that compatibility issue, that's where you see a lot of the compatibility issue clashes.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I'm informing you. It's just information for you. The challenges usually are of compatibility with the Comprehensive Plan, so let's not forget that level of...

Chairperson Pardo: Oh, no, no. I haven't forgotten.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: And that is true. But the point is that where the zoning fluctuates is once you meet that magical 43,560 square feet and you get into a PAD, and then all of a sudden, the reliability of the Zoning Code sometimes does not achieve a compatible situation with the existing neighborhood.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No, you're correct. I had nothing to do with the PAD, so I don't know how that was developed.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: But you are correct. That is a special item in the Zoning Code that you may want to make some suggestions on at some point.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Behar, does what the Chair just said, does that satisfy...?

Board Member Behar: That sounds good. And in defense, I agree. He's not responsible for the PAD.

Chairperson Pardo: No, no, no.

Board Member Behar: That was there before and (INAUDIBLE). You know that we cannot blame on him.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Chairperson Pardo: I really feel that...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Can -- just because -- can you repeat it again so I can try to write it down?

Chairperson Pardo: I wrote it. You know, I feel like -- to quote Rodney Dangerfield, I feel like I went to a fight at a hockey game. There's something about this particular meeting.

Board Member Behar: And we haven't even begun yet.

Chairperson Pardo: We're almost at the beginning. Number 2a, "Promote an assortment of street level public realm and pedestrian amenities in order to earn development bonuses and special allowances through a structured discretionary review process in compliance with the underlying adjacent zoning and subject to compatibility with the surrounding neighborhoods."

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: My apologies again. But the land use and zoning attorney in me, I have -- I'm going to start poking holes in that language. "In compliance with the underlying adjacent zoning," what does that mean? So, if I am a commercial property and I face MF2, I now have to comply with MF2? Because that's what that says.

Chairperson Pardo: No.

Board Member Bermello: I would (INAUDIBLE) the word adjacent to the underlying zoning.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: And then if you do that, complying with the underlying zoning, that's inherent in the entire Zoning Code. You always have to comply with the underlying Zoning Code.

Board Member Bermello: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: So, what are we adding once again? I don't -- I'm trying to understand.

Board Member Bermello: You're reinforcing that. You're reinforcing that.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Okay, so if that's the case, if you just want to reiterate the fact that you need to comply with underlying zoning...

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I don't think it adds anything because obviously you're in the Zoning Code and you have to. But that's perfectly fine. But the word "adjacent" makes it even more problematic in my opinion.

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Chairperson Pardo: Because it's the same thing as saying surrounding neighborhoods. The neighborhood is (INAUDIBLE)...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: But you're comparing the compatibility. You're not making -- my property has to comply with the abutting zoning. If you do that, then me as a commercial now what?

To get the bonus I have to comply with MF2 across the street? That doesn't make any sense.

Board Member Behar: I see where the adjacent is...

Board Member Bermello: I would take the word "adjacent" out.

Chairperson Pardo: Under the (INAUDIBLE). Alright.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: But just to confirm, I'll try to read it back. A structured discretionary review process in compliance with underlying zoning and subject to compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright, we all agree?

Board Member Behar: Alright, Clerk, let's move on.

Chairperson Pardo: We're going to add that to...

Board Member Bermello: Now, we've come to the main event? We're done?

Chairperson Pardo: Well, we're pretty much done. Let's take a roll call on this.

City Clerk Urquia: Can I have a motion on this?

Board Member Bermello: I make the motion to...

Board Member Behar: I second.

Board Member Bermello: Adopt the wording of our Chair.

Board Member Behar: I'll second it.

City Clerk Urquia: Okay.

City Architect Riesco: Yes.

Board Member Behar: Yes.

Board Member Pratt: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

(Vote: 5-0)

Chairperson Pardo: Alright. So, Mr. Trias, we all received your staff recommendations to the work we've been working on. And I had a few issues, and I didn't want to send these to you at the time. I'd rather hear your...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I think I got a memo -- I don't know if you sent it to me, but I

did get your comments. And on Monday, I tried to clean up some of the language based on your comments. And I think it got better. However, what I would like to say is this, thank you very much for all the work you've done. It's great to be working with fellow members of the American Institute of Architects on architecture. That's very rare, but in this business, it's very special. And the comments from staff are not meant to influence anything that you may want to suggest. In fact, I support everything that the City Manager said. You should make your own recommendation. And I even advised Mr. Ceballos to just let them say whatever they need to say because the fact of the matter is that that is what you were tasked with. Now, if you want my opinion, you can ask at any point. And certainly, I'm available to say that, but I don't really like to hear myself talk that much, so I'll try to keep to as little as possible.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chair, may I?

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: I have not read (INAUDIBLE). And I didn't want to read it on purpose. And the reason for that is that this process, I think, has been a very good process and a long process. We had gone painstakingly by every word, comma, phrase, definition of terms. We have the city historian discuss what is this versus that. And all of that was done with the cameras on, with citizen sitting in front of us hearing the back and forth between us. We were not always in agreement. I mean, that's what democracy's all about, ventilating in public discourse, weighing opinions, et cetera, et cetera. So, what I would like to do, I would like to hear from Mr. Trias on every single point, on every comment. He's someone that I respect highly. He knows and he has gone through many, many wars (INAUDIBLE). So, he brings a very unique perspective, but that's not to say that, you know, one versus the other. What I would like to -- if he has comments on any area, I'd like to hear him out and question him because I was not aware that there was like a minority report being prepared. That kind of took me by surprise. But if there is a minority report, so be it. I just think that the minority report should be ventilated publicly the same way that our thoughts were. I mean, we did ours, you know, not home. We didn't meet in my office and structure something and then bring it all cooked. So, I'm not saying that this is -- but I'd like to hear it, just like we ventilated our -- Do we have the time to do that or...?

Board Member Behar: I agree with you, Mr. Bermello. And I -- as a matter of fact, I called Mr. Ceballos -- was it yesterday?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: We've spoken a lot recently. I don't know.

Board Member Behar: Okay, but -- and I asked, "Is there a report from staff? Because I had heard. And you sent it to me yesterday. I truly -- I started going through it. I have not gone through all of it.

Board Member Bermello: You know, it may be the best thing since apple pie, and we may adopt everything and say, "Wonderful. I wish we had done it beforehand." So, it's not -- I'm not -- just I can tell you, I have not read it. I'm not aware of any of the items. I just think that I would, you know

-- and first, you know, your company is always enjoyable, and he's a very learned person, so I'd like to hear his positions. I mean, he's good. We're blessed to have Ramon Trias in the City of Coral Gables. I'd like to hear, you know, all these comments, his experience and his critique and additions. I would -- I don't think it should be underplayed is my opinion.

Board Member Behar: I started reading some of them. I would like to see if we could somehow incorporate them, not all of them, I would say. And that's why I want -- I agree with you. Let him present it to us.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah. I think that would be the best way. I mean, I think -- I'll do whatever is best for you. I think probably it's easier like Mr. Pardo said, ask questions since you have reviewed it. In a nutshell, I feel that there's a need to talk about architecture in the Code, really talk about architecture. And I don't think that the Med bonus text did enough of that. And that's one of the things that we have been working with the update, but we never presented that as part of the update because we knew that it was a controversial aspect of this. So, you know, we've been working on this for a while. It's not something that just came up the other day. But I think in my -- maybe the easier thing for me is just to answer the questions from the Chairman.

Unidentified Speaker: (INAUDIBLE).

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I think it's a very lengthy document.

Board Member Behar: It is very lengthy.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Board Member Behar: But you have made, and you said -- you had made reference particularly to architecture, which is what I want you to tell -- you know, for example, if we go to this document, Page 5-17 and just -- I'm just going to pick one of them where -- number 3 under the...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: That's a good one, yes.

Board Member Behar: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: How do we know which is the document? I mean, I...

Chairperson Pardo: I think Robert is talking about the one that (INAUDIBLE)...

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Board Member Bermello: What does it say on the top?

Board Member Behar: Comparison.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Comparison.

Chairperson Pardo: Comparison, on the very top.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah, and the document is structured in the three sections.

Board Member Bermello: And what is this?

Chairperson Pardo: This is just the staff comments, which are these. Here they copied and pasted the existing language, the Blue-Ribbon committee in red, and then the staff's (INAUDIBLE)...

Board Member Bermello: So, this has your comments?

Board Member Behar: No, no, no, no. This is not...

Chairperson Pardo: This is -- that's staff's.

Board Member Behar: That's his latest comments.

Board Member Bermello: That's ours.

Chairperson Pardo: No, these -- this is staff comments only. This is staff comments right here...

Board Member Bermello: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: And goes straight back.

Board Member Bermello: So, why don't we take their list of staff comments and just go one by one?

Chairperson Pardo: Well...

Board Member Behar: That's what -- I was going to reference to something that, you know, I don't think it's necessary because in that particular one, Mr. Trias, you referenced "based on classical systems such as double square or the Golden Section." I think that is taking it a bit...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Board Member Behar: Too far.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And I'm thinking -- but I'm thinking that all the buildings by, let's say Le Corbusier, that he took the time to explain the Golden Section and so on. So, it's not even a Mediterranean or classical concept.

Board Member Bermello: But that's definitely not Mediterranean.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No, absolutely.

Board Member Behar: No.

Board Member Bermello: I mean, we can go back to (INAUDIBLE) and discuss...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: (INAUDIBLE) is great.

Chairperson Pardo: They did.

Board Member Bermello: And (INAUDIBLE).

Chairperson Pardo: They did, they did. They have it as a (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Behar: We have.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No, we did.

Chairperson Pardo: Wait, wait, wait, wait.

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: This is really more of a polemic more than an actual alternative to your very good proposal. The issue is I believe the Code will be stronger if we have language about architecture that people can talk about architecture in those meetings and really make a -- and that's why we -- in number three, we talked about the overall building form, massing, roofline, location and scale of architectural features, details of these eaves, cornices, moldings, column bases, et cetera. For example -- and I'm just picking something that Mr. Behar has explained. That language allows that detailed conversation about design. I think that's helpful. I think that's helpful. And what I would say is that what you have done with the Code is very good, but I don't think -- I think the process is what has -- because for example, the one that -- the Plaza that you were unhappy with, that went through a very thorough process, and yet because some of these things about architecture were not there, maybe the process went the wrong way. That's my thinking. That's my thinking in terms of my critique of the existing code. In addition, I think that the PAD is too much of a loophole clearly, but that's a whole different story. So, that's one thing. Mr. Behar, do you have any other questions for me?

Board Member Behar: Well, for example, Mr. Trias -- and what I'm concerned -- and when you go, for example, on Table 5-202.2 on Page 5-27, under the arcade and/or loggia, you introduce a specific order for columns to be incorporated.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Well, you may not agree and I'm not...

Board Member Behar: Because what I'm concerned -- at the moment I read this, I thought about downtown Boca Raton. When you look at it and all the buildings start looking the same, and that's what we don't want to be so prescriptive that we force the architect to have to do that, and that's what I think...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: That was Mr. Pardo's comment also. And what I said was -- I

added some language saying this is not meant to be prescriptive. And I know it may sound like that but having had a chance to -- I did do some work in Palm Beach County under some of those guidelines that the people have, those are prescriptive. They tell you, "Oh, you have to have molding at ten feet," and then, "You have to have barrel tile only," and so on. We shouldn't do that.

Board Member Behar: But Mr. Trias, I read this -- okay? -- and that's what came to mind, that it was going to be so prescriptive that we're going to force the architects to do that.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And that's not the way it's meant to be, so maybe we need to tone it down so it's clear.

Board Member Behar: Okay.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Because it is not meant to be prescriptive. I want to make it very clear.

Board Member Bermello: Are we going on the 28th before the Commission?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: Is the idea that we're going to consolidate staff's comments with ours?

Chairperson Pardo: Not necessarily, no.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No, I -- it's up to you.

Chairperson Pardo: And...

Board Member Bermello: I mean, I would like to hear -- if we have time, maybe not -- but I would like to go (INAUDIBLE) by word...

Chairperson Pardo: I think...

Board Member Bermello: All the comments.

Chairperson Pardo: I think that Mr. Trias is asking for questions because it'll be easier.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes, yes.

Chairperson Pardo: It'll be easier to defend compared to...

Board Member Behar: In order to have questions -- with all fairness -- we need more than one day to go through this.

Board Member Bermello: No, absolutely.



Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Behar: Because you know -- at least I do. I got this yesterday.

Board Member Bermello: So, I thought we were going to get -- in other words, when we made changes, we deliberated and we discussed publicly every word, every sentence, and then we went through it a second time. Again, I feel uncomfortable diminishing the importance of Mr. Trias' work, which is very valuable. But I don't want to accept it without studying it and reviewing it with him and also with dismissing it without also doing the same. So, I haven't read it but I'm a quick learner. So, if we go one by one...

Board Member Behar: I will tell you. I agree with you. And I went through it, and I may not agree with all of them, but there are some that have very valid points that I would like to go through it. And if it takes more than today, you know, I know our deadline is the 28th. Maybe perhaps we have one more session next week, by next Tuesday, whatever. But I want him -- I want you to go through it because otherwise to ask the questions, I need more time to review this.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: This is a very substantial set of comments. Basically, what I'm saying is you did a fantastic job. Go further. I mean, that's really what I'm saying. Go further and really talk about architecture. If you're ready to do that, if you want to do that and spend that type of -- the time it takes to go through this, then I think we should do it between today and maybe Monday or Tuesday. We need a couple of days to -- probably to go through it.

Chairperson Pardo: I don't think that kicking the can down the road is a good idea, and I'll tell you why. When you took Table 1 and made it into 5-202.1, I was really surprised because the things that were important as basics were basically stripped from the original table, and it did become prescriptive. And in fact, what I did was I actually went back to Appendix C of the Plaza PAD, and I saw certain phrases completely intact from that portion of the zoning. So, the problem that I have is that although taught in college of these proportions and the different books and this is part of what we study, we've gone now from the original problem that was heard by the entire Commission the evening of the Sunshine meeting, which was that we had gotten to the point where it became paint by numbers. Now, it's all become -- the architecture's all based on formulas. This is what is written. I read every word, read every comment, compared it to ours. And to be quite honest, I was taken aback that now all the architecture is going to be based on this type of specific classical design, although these components exist in all architecture. The funny thing is that when you look at 5-202 and it has the examples of Coral Gables architecture and specific buildings and the elements of, I also went back to the original guidelines and although simple, this is when everything was pretty low tech and photographs were made, and then elements were actually called out and described as those elements of each one of these buildings that influenced the development of Coral Gables. Therefore, that was one type of document. Then about in -- I don't know -- seven, eight years ago, there was a similar document, but now of course, where computers and everything can be Photoshopped and that kind of thing, it was a similar document created by staff again. And then there was just the pictures, no analysis, no...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Sir, those are the original...

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE). No analysis. The elements weren't called out as they were in

the original document that was done 35 years ago, and it's not very helpful. Then what happened was that when I went back to the staff recommendations, the original document is being -- which is available at the Historic Department and was adopted by Coral Gables Commission -- that's basically been put on the side and then this newer document is the one that people are supposed to look at and understand what those elements are. But when you look at this and there's no analysis of the elements, then it becomes problematic because there's no direction for the architect. Now, I tried to take that and then throwing in certain formulas to create great architecture to me is why we have a Board of Architects. And if we have a Board of Architects that does their job and if we have a representative of the board here, and we've all sat on the board, then you have the ability of understanding what should be approved and should not be approved. Those architects that are seasoned architects that sit on the board and have sat on the board, they don't have to go back to college, and they don't have to go get certified for this. The whole point is that my concern now is the reason that we're having this conversation is because these bonuses affect what we build and what we live with. And what we live with is more density, more height, and unfortunately recently, (INAUDIBLE) the type of architecture that we were promoting to begin with. I think we're back on the track of where we're supposed to be, but by changing this, I disagree 100 percent with these formulas. I disagree with the proposition that this is something that anyone can do. And that is for me very unfortunate because I think that it diminishes the strength of the Board of Architects, the City Architect, and the city in general. And it diminishes what we -- there are seven representatives here of seasoned architects that know what has to be done. And the problem that I see is that we've taken three steps forward, and now we've taken four steps backward. I went painstakingly through every word. And when I went through every single word of these documents, one of the things that popped out is that changes to the approved design before, during, and after the construction shall be reviewed by the Planning Director for compliance with the original approval. Now, I've heard complaints from the Board of Architects -- members of the Board of Architects that they've seen and approved something, and then all of a sudden what gets built looks completely different. And so...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: But that would correct it because...

Chairperson Pardo: If I may finish.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: The problem is that the way that this has been written by your department now making the Planning Director the overseer of this cuts out the ability of the Board of Architects to receive a revision for whatever reason, whether it's value engineering or whatever the reason is. But once you change that, you should go back to the Board of Architects and the City Architect for them to do their job.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: But they do, they do. What happens...

Chairperson Pardo: No, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait. They don't, Mr. Trias. I have...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: (INAUDIBLE).

Chairperson Pardo: What is the name of the project that you mentioned before that when you saw it

go up it was different?

Board Member Pratt: Oh, Paseo.

Chairperson Pardo: Paseo.

Development Services Director Cabrera: Can I make a comment? And I'm trying to be impartial here. But the Paseo changes did not go through Planning. It was actually approved by the previous City architect. That's what we're trying to avoid, to leave it in the hands of the one -- not one. But when Ramon did see what was going on, he said, "Wait a minute. This is really different from what the board approved." The Mediterranean items that we feel are really required to be on there for this to be a Mediterranean building and have gotten the Mediterranean bonus. So, that's the intention there.

Chairperson Pardo: But don't you think that the Board of Architects should review this the same as a revision to anything? I mean, if anything would have been done structurally, it would have gone back to the (INAUDIBLE)...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: We can add that language.

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE).

Development Services Director Cabrera: We can make it that...

Chairperson Pardo: It didn't happen.

Development Services Director Cabrera: That it...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: We can add that language.

Development Services Director Cabrera: If it's significant, it should go back to BOA. Or we can make it that it always goes back to the BOA.

Chairperson Pardo: The language is already there.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No, that's not...

Chairperson Pardo: The point (INAUDIBLE) is...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: It's not.

Chairperson Pardo: That this was inserted, completely new, above and beyond.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I understand your perspective. And I'm very disappointed that that is the message that we have given to you because that was not the intent at all. In fact, I'm puzzled by this because we were trying to actually be helpful. What happened in Paseo is that I went on site,

and I realized that certain changes had been made that were aesthetic and they had to do with the fact that they had not been reviewed by the board or by anyone else, except perhaps a staff member at some point. We are trying to add some language that will make it clear that changes have to be reviewed. Now, whatever language you feel comfortable with, that's fine with me. But we need to say that because otherwise things may happen.

Board Member Behar: May I? Because I -- what I think you're saying is because -- in reference to the Planning Director, but if that says the Board of Architects...

Chairperson Pardo: And the City Architect.

Board Member Behar: And the City Architect and...

Chairperson Pardo: And...

Board Member Behar: The Planning Director, then what I'm thinking...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I have no problem with that.

Board Member Behar: I think it's really semantics there where you -- who -- the point is, it needs to be reviewed.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, it's not...

Development Services Director Cabrera: Or maybe it should be reviewed by (INAUDIBLE)...

Chairperson Pardo: Excuse me.

Development Services Director Cabrera: Because I think the issue is (INAUDIBLE)...

Chairperson Pardo: Let me add one more thing so you understand -- you, as the director, understand clearly what is happening. The people that grant these bonuses is not the Planning Director. It's the Board of Architects. Once we understand that if there's a change to the plan, it has to go to the Board of Architects, not to the Planning Director. I can't make that any clearer. And let me say one more thing. The night of the Sunshine meeting, there were over 80 people from the public here that were upset and there 300 people on Zoom there because they were upset. Something didn't work very well. And we're not talking about in the last 12 months. We're talking about for quite some time because now is when people see those buildings that have gone up. So, it's not just one instance. So, I'm sure that the previous City Architect can't be to blame for everything.

Development Services Director Cabrera: I'm not -- I'm sorry. I was not blaming the previous City architect. I was just explaining to you that it wasn't Ramon Trias who had made those approvals.

Chairperson Pardo: No, no. What I'm saying is...

Development Services Director Cabrera: (INAUDIBLE) Planning Director. But I would agree with

you that the best thing probably is that it has to good evening the approval of the board and planning, period.

Chairperson Pardo: And that was...

Development Services Director Cabrera: (INAUDIBLE) Ramon (INAUDIBLE).

Chairperson Pardo: That was already in our document and that was the problem. I'm sorry.

Board Member Behar: No, I think it's not -- I think this has a simple solution, in my opinion, okay? The problem comes is that who is going to go out to look at what was proposed, approved, and actually built because that's where they're going to do the switch and bait.

Development Services Director Cabrera: That's exactly how it happened.

Board Member Behar: That's the problem that we have.

Development Services Director Cabrera: That's exactly how it happened.

Board Member Behar: Okay.

Development Services Director Cabrera: The master set matches exactly what the board approved, and what went through Planning, went through DRC, and went through Commission; the whole thing. But then when they come back and make a little revision here and a little revision there, it's in the Permitting Department and...

Board Member Behar: But a little revision may be not noticeable.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Behar: But when you get a revision of that magnitude is the problem that we have.

Chairperson Pardo: Robert, take the balconies off. Oh, it looks a little different. They just took off all the balconies, and that's what the BOA and that's what the City Architect approved.

Board Member Behar: (INAUDIBLE) to see that. That's the problem.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, then that's on existing buildings. But the whole -- the point I'm trying to make is you cannot assert the people that gave the bonuses with another department, the same thing as Public Works or some other department. That's not who should be involved with it. And the other thing is -- speaking of departments -- when we're talking about -- in these proposed comments, we were talking about historically designated buildings. We put in there very carefully -- and you were present that evening -- we put in there very carefully that the Historic Department would be involved, the Board of Architects would be involved, and the Planning Department would be involved. All of a sudden, our historic buildings guess what? Gets taken out in your proposal, the Historic Department. How can you do that with a historic building? It's completely stripped out of this. So,

what I'm saying is, going back to what Mr. Bermello said, we looked very carefully at every sentence, every word, every concept. And the thing is that we had certain tables, certain things to be addressed. And the point is that, as I said before, if you just change a few words here or there, if you take -- you change the intent. And one of the things that I saw from the staff report was that whoever wrote the staff report should have listened to the hours of taped public conversations that this committee had with the public, both in person and on Zoom, so they could understand the intent. And the intent was, for example, with historic, we spoke about the viewshed. It's been stripped out completely. How can you strip out the viewshed and say, "We don't care about the viewshed." So, right now, it...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: We can (INAUDIBLE) the language. There's some other language.

Development Services Director Cabrera: On the historic, it's not historic buildings. It was that every development -- I mean, the entire city's a historic plan -- right? -- so we (INAUDIBLE) every single development.

Board Member Bermello: No, no, no, no, no, no, no.

Development Services Director Cabrera: Historic buildings always go to Historic. That process is...

Board Member Bermello: We're talking about...

Development Services Director Cabrera: Codified elsewhere, correct?

Board Member Bermello: Designated historic properties, not the entire city.

Development Services Director Cabrera: No, but we can now remove that because the process for historic buildings is codified elsewhere...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Development Services Director Cabrera: Under historic (INAUDIBLE) zoning.

Board Member Bermello: But we cannot have every Tom, Dick and Harry say, "My house is historic, and therefore," blah, blah, blah.

Development Services Director Cabrera: That -- and that is what we removed. Because the way it read is that -- and we didn't remove it. I mean, there is (INAUDIBLE)...

Board Member Behar: They clarified it. I took it -- when I read it briefly very quickly, I read it to that. I mean, I...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: That was the intent.

Board Member Behar: Okay, I -- to me...

Development Services Director Cabrera: Could we get to that? Because it's important that that be clear.

Board Member Bermello: Personally, again, I'm not going to vote tonight for anything here. I am not -- I can understand that you don't want to present it, and that's fine. Well, then I got to read it and I got to compare it page by page, line by line, word by word. Because I think the day that we stand in front of the City Commission and we say, "This is what we're approving," I got to be able to say if I got a call that I've read this, I considered it, I meditated on it, and it's my best professional opinion. I'm not going to rubberstamp anything that I'm just given that I'm looking at for the first time, so...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: That was never the intent.

Board Member Bermello: And I know that's not your intent. By the way, I also realize that as staff, this was your opportunity to address a lot of the things that maybe you've been dealing with for a number of years, so I get it.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Thank you, sir.

Board Member Bermello: I wish -- the only thing that I think should have been done differently, Mr. Manager, is knowing that we really should have taken longer. And every day, we should have spent more time with you, so that when we prepared the first document, it really should have incorporated your ideas and thoughts as an ad hoc member of the committee so -- as opposed to coming in and doing kind of a retrofit, you know, after, you know, we just finished.

City Manager Iglesias: Mr. Bermello, I don't think it's a retrofit. I think it's just throwing ideas to the Committee to make sure that the document is everything that you think it is, that's all. The idea was not to have it retrofit.

Board Member Behar: It's not a retrofit, but...

City Manager Iglesias: It's not a retrofit.

Board Member Behar: I understand, but...

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Board Member Behar: My first point today...

Unidentified Speaker: And if we need more time...

Board Member Bermello: I think...

Board Member Behar: (INAUDIBLE) prefer to have him here since the beginning to give us his input.

Board Member Bermello: I think we need more time.

City Manager Iglesias: But I don't know about that. I'm not -- I don't agree with that because I do think that this document -- you guys -- I think the board -- the committee should have prepared this document, and then we -- my problem was that there wasn't enough time and we tried to do it (INAUDIBLE) which creates a lot of pressure.

Unidentified Speaker: (INAUDIBLE).

City Manager Iglesias: No, no, and this is a very important thing, and we want to make sure that the committee started fully up and then we -- we did not -- the idea here is not to strip the (INAUDIBLE). Is there any point that we should add...?

Board Member Bermello: Absolutely.

City Manager Iglesias: That we need to go for? And look at the committee and look at the committee's report. This is your report. We have nothing to do with -- this is (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Behar: I understand but let me be -- Willy made some valid points, that we could have done it and incorporated, you know, at the right time, maybe not at the very beginning. I retract my statement at the very beginning. But at some point, I think the collaboration would have been good.

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Unidentified Speaker: Can I say something?

City Manager Iglesias: (INAUDIBLE) a lot of valid points here. And if we're not ready on the 28th, then we're not ready on the 28th. (INAUDIBLE) discussed because (INAUDIBLE) go very quickly because (INAUDIBLE). And that's something that we need to discuss now because I think it should be thoroughly addressed, all the issues. And I'm not saying to change your document. I'm saying there may be some issues, some valid point that we might want to add to this document that doesn't affect your underlying document that you came -- that you prepared.

Chairperson Pardo: I would make the following suggestion. First of all, I'd like to recognize Mr. Mitch Alvarez there. He got here a little late, but he had a previous engagement since we changed the date from Thursday to Wednesday.

City Manager Iglesias: You're always welcome here, sir.

Board Member Alvarez: I didn't know where your meeting was. It took me 15 minutest to figure it out.

City Manager Iglesias: We're trying to show off our new building.

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE).



City Manager Iglesias: But Mr. Chair, the idea is not to circumvent the Committee. The idea is to bring this -- to bring a certain thought process and that's it. And I think that -- I think staff was well served by having your document to start off with to look at the committee's thought process and then come back with something. I just think that we're trying to discuss too much at one time and that's something that I was concerned about. We were just trying to (INAUDIBLE) because the idea is to get your thoughts, get your document; come back and say what do you of these issues, and discuss them, and then come back. I would prefer to go to the Commission with one document.

Board Member Bermello: Absolutely.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

City Manager Iglesias: Okay, with one document that we've all had time to really discuss and -- but I think it's important that the committee did their document, that you did your document and now we have comments on your thought process.

Development Services Director Cabrera: Peter, can I make a point? Because on the historic, I just want to say that the way it was written was that compatibility with the historic City plan shall be reviewed by the Planning Department in consultation with the Historical Resources Department. That says nothing that it's related to historic buildings. Med bonus, I would probably -- I would say I can't think of a situation where Med bonus would apply to a historic building, so you're talking about every new building because our entire city is a historic...

Chairperson Pardo: No.

Development Services Director Cabrera: Is a...

Chairperson Pardo: No, that's not...

Board Member Bermello: That was not the...

Chairperson Pardo: That is not what we wrote.

Development Services Director Cabrera: What you don't understand -- the Med bonus...

Chairperson Pardo: That is not what we wrote.

Development Services Director Cabrera: Is made for new construction. It's not written for historic. So, when you say that for compatibility with the historic City plan, you don't say the zoning historic structures. And typically, the majority of the buildings that will be reviewed here are not historic. They're new construction.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: So, the changes of that nature that we made were meant to clarify those issues. They were not meant to change your intent.

Development Services Director Cabrera: No, it's just that -- I'm assuming that you do not want

every...

Chairperson Pardo: Let me read this to you.

Development Services Director Cabrera: Development to go -- sure.

Chairperson Pardo: Let me read this to you. Compatibility of designated historic landmarks and the Historic City Plan adopted by the Coral Gables Commission. And it says Compatibility of designated historic landmarks...

Development Services Director Cabrera: But that's what I just said.

Chairperson Pardo: And the Historic City Plan adopted. So, when you...

Development Services Director Cabrera: But that's (INAUDIBLE)...

Chairperson Pardo: A perfect example (INAUDIBLE), going back to the Plaza, if you look at 2901 Ponce...

Development Services Director Cabrera: I understand but that's the viewshed issue.

Chairperson Pardo: Sorry?

Development Services Director Cabrera: You're on C, not on B. C is the viewshed, which Ramon is going to address why the viewshed was also modified. That's on the viewshed.

Board Member Bermello: Which item are you on?

Development Services Director Cabrera: The viewshed...

Board Member Bermello: (INAUDIBLE).

Development Services Director Cabrera: On every historic building.

Board Member Bermello: What are you on, what page?

Development Services Director Cabrera: We're on 5-10 of the one that has the city and the...

Chairperson Pardo: Look at ours. If you look at the markup that we approved...

Board Member Bermello: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: Take a look at Page 5-6.

Board Member Bermello: 5-6?

Chairperson Pardo: 5-6. Oh, I'm sorry. It's actually 5-4, Willy.

Board Member Bermello: 5-4?

Chairperson Pardo: Yes, the very top.

Board Member Bermello: (INAUDIBLE).

Chairperson Pardo: Yes, compatibility of designated historic landmarks and the Historic City Plan adopted by the Coral Gables Commission.

Development Services Director Cabrera: Exactly. So, C is a viewshed for every historic building, which means that pretty much anywhere there's a historic building, they're going to have a viewshed issue. And then D is...

Chairperson Pardo: No, no.

Development Services Director Cabrera: Every building with the Historic City Plan.

Chairperson Pardo: Do you know how many designated historic buildings there are in the city?

Development Services Director Cabrera: I don't know.

Chairperson Pardo: Very few.

Board Member Bermello: Do you know how many?

Chairperson Pardo: Very few.

Unidentified Speaker: I (INAUDIBLE).

Chairperson Pardo: But you know what the designated -- what designating a historic building entails?

Board Member Bermello: Isn't this gentleman the Historic Preservation Officer?

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Adams.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: There are 1,200 in the city, but that includes the districts. Individually designated, there are far fewer.

Chairperson Pardo: And many of those are single-family homes.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: Individually designated are not many.

Board Member Bermello: How many? I mean, there should be a finite number.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: Yeah, I mean, I can get that number.

Board Member Bermello: We should know that, right?

Chairperson Pardo: Correct.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: Well, there are 1,200 buildings that are affected by the historic preservation ordinance.

Board Member Bermello: I get it. But we were very careful here to say "historically-designated properties."

Chairperson Pardo: Correct.

Board Member Bermello: And I'm sure there's a finite -- (INAUDIBLE).

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Mr. Bermello, for example...

Board Member Bermello: (INAUDIBLE).

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: For example...

Development Services Director Cabrera: But that's not the way it reads.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Let me...

Board Member Bermello: No, no, no, no. That's exactly the way it reads.

Chairperson Pardo: That's what it reads.

Board Member Bermello: If you look at it, it says compatibility...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Can I give you one example?

Board Member Bermello: Of historically designated.

Unidentified Speaker: Right.

Board Member Bermello: Why did we do that? Because before, it said something like...

Chairperson Pardo: Historical significance.

Board Member Bermello: Historical significance. That could be every property here.

Chairperson Pardo: Exactly. And we put in...

Board Member Bermello: Okay, and then...

Development Services Director Cabrera: Did you read B?

Board Member Bermello: So, you were not at that meeting, he was. And we said discuss this. He said I don't have the resources to spend time to finish all the designations. We said that's not our problem. This is only going to apply to historically designated -- if it's not designated...

Development Services Director Cabrera: Can you read B and tell me how you interpret B? It says compatibility with the Historic City Plan shall be reviewed by the Planning Department in consultation...

Chairperson Pardo: That's if you're going to change it.

Development Services Director Cabrera: With the Historical Resources Department and the Board of Architects.

Chairperson Pardo: That's if you're going to change it. For example...

Development Services Director Cabrera: So, every single revision to a new building will have to be reviewed by Historic?

Chairperson Pardo: No, no.

Board Member Bermello: No.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: (INAUDIBLE) Historic City Plan's right-of-way.

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: So, unless you're vacating right-of-way, this doesn't fall under that category.

Chairperson Pardo: For example -- again, the example of 2901 Ponce, a historic building that was built in 1925 for the City's architect, in other words, George Merrick's architect...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: How would you (INAUDIBLE) that one?

Chairperson Pardo: And that particular building had two streets on either side.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And (INAUDIBLE)...

Chairperson Pardo: It was designed like this, which is part of the architecture. It was never ever reviewed by the Historic Department.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No, the PAD.

Chairperson Pardo: When the PAD was done.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: First of all...

City Manager Iglesias: How would you deal with that particular project? What would you do in that particular project if you were -- you had that site to actually develop and you had a viewshed? I understand that you have the (INAUDIBLE) -- you have a viewshed right down the -- to the capital.

Unidentified Speaker: We did (INAUDIBLE).

City Manager Iglesias: So, if I have a capital building and I have a viewshed on that capital building, I don't want (INAUDIBLE).

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

City Manager Iglesias: How do you deal with a building of that size and a project of half a million dollars.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Can I...?

Board Member Bermello: We did the original masterplan for Ralph Sanchez on that.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Mr. Bermello.

Board Member Bermello: I think our plan was very different. I think our plan...

City Manager Iglesias: Yes, it was.

Board Member Bermello: Our plan did a much better...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: It was, it was. I have to say that.

Board Member Bermello: (INAUDIBLE) of respecting that property. And I think the Chair has kind of, you know, (INAUDIBLE) quite often since we've been meeting. And I think that's what led to the viewshed concept that...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Can I --? Just for history's sake, one of the very first meetings I had with the prior City Manager -- that we may not remember -- was about me insisting that we keep those two streets. Because at the beginning of that discussion, there was discussion about just get rid of the streets.

Chairperson Pardo: Again...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: So, we kept it.

Chairperson Pardo: I'm not blaming you.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No, no.

Chairperson Pardo: What I'm saying is, I was trying to answer the director's question, why is it important? Why? Think of this. Look at City Hall down Miracle Mile. Let's say someone says right now, let's put a bunch of high-rises here. Do you think that's going to affect...?

Development Services Director Cabrera: No, I understand.

Chairperson Pardo: The historic...

Development Services Director Cabrera: I understand.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: So, I...

Development Services Director Cabrera: I was there when you explained the viewshed.

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE) that we have.

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE) a historic...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Can I...

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE) that we have.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: So, if they...

Chairperson Pardo: We'd lose it...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Actually...

Chairperson Pardo: Forever.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I added some language which says, "terminated vistas and aesthetic enhancements of the urban context." That's something that you need to...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And the viewshed is very specific. To answer your question, Mr. Manager, going back to 2901, what Mr. Bermello did was (INAUDIBLE) because what he did was, he understood what that grid looked like. George Merrick was a very, very, very smart person. If not for his vision, but his selection of the great people that planned the city, and the great people that designed all these elements after 100 years that have influenced the City Beautiful from the City Beautiful Movement. The thing about this is that what you see now -- and I took a picture that I showed the Commission when I gave the update for the committee to the Commission -- the last

picture I showed was the -- facing east from the south part of the circle looking at 2901 Ponce. And it looked like it's got the Shops at Sunset behind it. It destroyed it completely. So, to answer your question, Director, one of the things that I look at is if we don't put viewshed in there, then everything is capable of being destroyed forever.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: How would you regulate the viewshed discussion (INAUDIBLE)?

Chairperson Pardo: It's not a formula. What they would do, like any plan is, for example...

City Manager Iglesias: Mr. Chair, you do realize that Mr. Bermello's concept versus the concept that was there are completely, completely different.

Chairperson Pardo: I understand.

City Manager Iglesias: Totally completely different.

Chairperson Pardo: And again, I don't mean to pick on the Plaza, but I'll tell you that -- in my opinion -- was a mistake. And just a little further south, you have Malaga. That was another mistake. They could have still developed that little part in Malaga by simply having a step back 100 feet at 45 feet of height. It would make all the difference in the world. And when it comes to that historic building, 2901 Ponce, which is the oldest building in that area because Charade burned down and the old (INAUDIBLE), we had to tear it down because of the salt entrained sand and build the Bank of Coral Gables there. That building would have been perfect not only for the city to have to actually buy and use it as a museum if they wanted to.

Development Services Director Cabrera: I guess the question is, do you want the viewshed to be checked on every historic building or only certain...

Chairperson Pardo: Some build...

Development Services Director Cabrera: Certain buildings that are worthy because...

Chairperson Pardo: That is a legitimate...

Development Services Director Cabrera: Otherwise, it...

Board Member Bermello: No.

Chairperson Pardo: No, that is a legitimate question because -- (INAUDIBLE), Mr. Bermello.

Board Member Bermello: See, the question is: What is worthy? According to whom? So, that's why we said historically designated. If they're designated, it went through a process. The City has a process for designation and it's a formal process. It shouldn't be just anybody that wakes up one day and says I think this is worthy.



Board Member Behar: That (INAUDIBLE)...

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: (INAUDIBLE).

City Manager Iglesias: If I may say -- if I may just say one thing. There is historically designated and then historically significant. We have building like the Biltmore that are on the National Register. That includes historical designation.

Board Member Bermello: Oh, absolutely.

City Manager Iglesias: (INAUDIBLE) that we want to keep the viewshed for the Biltmore, I completely agree. So, there are historical designations and there are major historical designations.

Development Services Director Cabrera: Right.

City Manager Iglesias: We have a lot of local designations, and we have some buildings that are fantastic and some of our structures are nationally designated. How many national designated structures do we have?

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: I believe there's about 10 or 12. There's not many.

Chairperson Pardo: From Venetian Pool to -- you name it.

Development Services Director Cabrera: (INAUDIBLE).

City Manager Iglesias: (INAUDIBLE) national designations too so...

Development Services Director Cabrera: (INAUDIBLE).

City Manager Iglesias: So, Mr. Bermello, there are -- there's 1,200, but there are 12 that are nationally designated, and then there's another group that go below and then there's...

Board Member Bermello: There are 1,200 properties in districts. There are not 1,200 designated -- I've asked him, and I've never gotten a response.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: They are designated. They've gone through a process. They're in a recognized district so they're designated. That's your number, 1,200.

Development Services Director Cabrera: Unless you want to limit it to the nationally designated.

Chairperson Pardo: No, no, no.

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Development Services Director Cabrera: That might be a compro -- no?

Chairperson Pardo: No, no, because 2901 Ponce is not nationally registered. Okay, and it is an integral part of the history of Coral Gables. But the point I would...

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: It'll follow the process, which is what you seem to be concerned about, so they all follow the process.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: For example, the San Sebastian Apartments. Would you say that that's an important building?

Chairperson Pardo: It's an important building and it's not designated.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Exactly.

Chairperson Pardo: And the point is, again, if they were going in there for a demolition permit, it would be denied, and they would be forced to do something about it.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: But it's not designated.

Chairperson Pardo: But wait a minute but wait a minute. That's the point. But the point is that -- let's think about that example. All of a sudden, you want to put a -- that building is on a corner -- okay? -- but not every historically designated building is on a corner. So, therefore, 2901 had a very sharp angle and it had...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And it still has it. I mean, that hasn't changed, right?

Chairperson Pardo: Well, (INAUDIBLE)...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: (INAUDIBLE) there's something blocking it?

Chairperson Pardo: The background, you know, it's like we're in Dubai, you know. It's...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Would you say that the background should be four stories? Is that what you're saying?

Chairperson Pardo: The background could have been more nondescript instead of what they did. If you take a look at the photograph of looking directly east there, after they take down the construction fences and everything...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And they put the landscape in.

Chairperson Pardo: And they put the landscaping, they've destroyed the viewshed. They've destroyed the importance of that particular building.

City Manager Iglesias: Mr. Chair.

Chairperson Pardo: Yes, sir.

City Manager Iglesias: Mr. Bermello's project is a completely different project (INAUDIBLE) lower scale and that's the point I was trying to make.

Chairperson Pardo: No, no. I agree.

City Manager Iglesias: That if you do -- if you do this -- and I'm just -- but this is, by the way, a great discussion that we're having so far, and we should -- I think Mr. Bermello (INAUDIBLE) more. That would be -- Mr. Bermello's project, which I thought was a fantastic project and I agree it was less impactful certainly and less impactful to the viewshed. But when you have to (INAUDIBLE) a number of things to that project, so that's quite an impact on a historical building. (INAUDIBLE) only historical building impacting his site, but it's impacting the entire surroundings. So, you have to look at that very, very carefully that you don't have other legal issues involved -- right? -- because now it's not just the building site. Now it's all that's surrounding.

Board Member Behar: Or...

City Manager Iglesias: And (INAUDIBLE)

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Chairperson Pardo: Look...

City Manager Iglesias: Because Mr. Bermello's project was a four-story building -- was a four-story project. (INAUDIBLE) telling us was more than four stories.

Chairperson Pardo: I got to tell you, when we analyzed buildings when I was on the Dade Heritage Trust and we analyzed buildings, historical buildings, you know, they have tremendous purpose. And the purpose that they have is from not only history, but they go all the way to economic impact on our city. There are destinations where people go to Charleston, they go to Savannah, or they go to New Orleans. They go to Boston specifically to enjoy those historic buildings. And Boston is a great example because there you have a huge plaza in one of the areas and you have this very historic church that was designed by a famous architect. And there's a high-rise right next to it. But what they did with that high-rise is they put reflective glass so everyone could see the image of every point of the viewshed of that particular church. What I'm saying is that there are many ways that architects can enhance the view. But unfortunately, by putting it in the Code, that makes people think about it. By taking it out and putting abstract language, then people forget about it. In fact, they forget about the intention of it.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Trinity Church by H. H. Richardson is a classic example of that. But I would wonder if in Coral Gables we would want to have a...

Board Member Behar: A glass tower.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: A glass tower...

Chairperson Pardo: We already have them.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: (INAUDIBLE) was very smart and that's what he did because he wanted to do exactly what you're saying. I mean, that's a classic example of something that worked over there, but I'm not sure that would be in compliance with the Med bonus.

Chairperson Pardo: I didn't say to do it here. What I said is, for example. In the specific example of the Plaza -- not to discuss Mr. Bermello's proposal -- but at the Plaza, what they could have easily have done is -- without taking away their development rights -- would have been to simply simplify the background, indent where those termination points of the street were, possibly create an arch where they have one of the entrances into one of the garages there. It could have been lined up with the original bridge. The reason that the grid was put in there is it was -- or the plan, the Plaza was adopted by a previous Commission. It is part of our history, and you see over and over people wanting to develop, and it's like we're going to -- they're not taking out an alley. They're taking out streets or they're changing streets.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah, and we all agree with that. But the thing that I'm frustrated with is that there were many meetings with the Board of Architects on that particular project, many more than required actually, beyond, and yet the outcome is still something that doesn't satisfy you. So, what I'm thinking is, there's something wrong here, but it's probably that we're not giving enough information during the process. That was my perspective.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, I also...

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: I still think -- and I said this at the meeting -- of what should be in here is that the setting of historic buildings and districts should be considered. If you consider the setting of a building at which they'll allow something larger to be built near it or something more appropriate in style or some -- the viewshed theoretically can be taken to mean if you go up to it, if you can still see something. But if you consider the setting of historic buildings in your determination, you're considering the materials, the height, the setbacks, the scale, the massing. It doesn't mean to say something very modern couldn't be built next to a historic building or something slightly higher than the historic building, but it has to be compatible with the historic building. And I think what the Board of Architects (INAUDIBLE) staff are always at these meetings, especially where historic buildings are concerned, then between Preservation and the Board of Architects and Planning, if you consider the setting of the historic buildings, that would still allow for...

Chairperson Pardo: And that is why I asked Mr. Adams to attend our meetings. And that is why we put in language and did things by adding Historic, the Board of Architects, and Planning, not one over the other two, not two over the third one, but all three. Because if you guys can't figure it out, we're all in deep trouble. And that's why I wanted to be sure...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: That's a good recommendation.

Chairperson Pardo: That it was added that way.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: That's a good recommendation. The only thing is that the changes we made were really technical zoning changes to clarify the language. And if that didn't do the job, then we need to do it better. Now, I did have a chance many years ago to work with the viewsheds with in the project that I was doing in Austin, Texas. And over there, the zoning code had very specific lines, three-dimensional maps that told you that the buildings couldn't go here or there to block the view of the capital. That's my only experience with that topic. So, I'm just saying, you know, if we're going to introduce those kinds of ideas, we need to be careful because the implementation in places that I've seen is a significant effort.

Chairperson Pardo: Many of the properties that are historically designated are inside, not even a corner parcel, and they're inside. And the point is inside the lot, there really isn't a viewshed. It's just straight on from the thing. So (INAUDIBLE)...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: What I'm going to propose is that I say that the viewshed -- as most people would understand it -- is not block in that historic building in the Plaza. What you're talking about is the background, I think, what you're objecting to.

Chairperson Pardo: In that example, it's the background.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: But in the example in the future -- for example, Miracle Mile and what could be put on Miracle Mile, it could forever affect City Hall, which is one of our historic buildings -- designated historic buildings. And you have to be very careful with that. And by the way, the example that I gave you, for example, Denman Fink's office. Denman Fink's office looks just fine where it is, right?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: The only thing is, what happens if all of a sudden someone goes in and says -- to Public Works, they say, "You know, let's put in trees now," and they put the trees in and they block that view of that just by putting in trees. It affects the viewshed. That's why it's talking about compatibility with the historic building and the historic plan, so you've heard both examples.

City Manager Iglesias: Mr. Chair, that would not be covered by this or by anything that's in the right-of-way. I think what we need to do is maybe work -- is look at this from the perspective that I see you all truly want, which is certain buildings, certain things, certain perspectives, certain parameters to make sure that the buildings are not isolated, are not blocked so they could still be appreciated and be viewed, which is very important. Maybe it's something that...

Board Member Bermello: Do you think that we should include that, the designation in the National Registry? (INAUDIBLE) or you want to leave it?

Chairperson Pardo: I am completely against that.

Board Member Bermello: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: How can we now say, "Well, you know what, the Colonnade building is not on the National Register, so let's forget about the Colonnade building," right, Mitch? How careful were you with the Colonnade when you designed that?

Board Member Alvarez: Very careful. (INAUDIBLE).

Chairperson Pardo: And it's not on the National Register.

Board Member Alvarez: We brought in (INAUDIBLE) from Tallahassee.

City Manager Iglesias: It could be National Register or significant by the Historical -- or deemed significant by the Historical Department.

Board Member Bermello: Well, and is there such a list currently?

City Manager Iglesias: I think it would have to be something that could be done with the Historical Department or could be taken care of by the director of (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Behar: I think that...

Board Member Bermello: You mentioned a word that I like, which is -- and I don't think we used that word, was consider the setting. I think -- I like that phrase because it tells the Board of Architects, you know, the total context. And I like -- we did not include that here. I think we (INAUDIBLE) I'd like to...

Board Member Behar: That could be very good. You know, you mentioned something that to me I'm a little bit concerned, district. Because (INAUDIBLE) means it could be much larger, and then with that then becomes more of an issue that how far do you go.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: And I think that's more of the concern of the viewshed as opposed to the setting because even...

Board Member Behar: The setting is good.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: If you have a historic district, you could have development around the edge of the district that still takes the district into consideration. Viewshed, you're potentially looking at seven, eight blocks. The setting is immediately around the historic building. So, setting may actually be...

Board Member Behar: May be more appropriate because it's more defined.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah, the language we use is urban context and terminated vistas, which in my view, were the critical issues with the viewshed discussion. You need to be able

to see the building, the vista and in the context.

Chairperson Pardo: I truly believe that those words are too open and that the viewshed concept is very specific. And the viewshed concept can be applied depending on the case-by-case basis, where sometimes the viewshed would be very simple. And then sometimes, the viewshed includes the original plan, where the altering of the street should be really considered different. Keep in mind that some of our historic elements that we have are fountains in the middle of rights-of-way, are arches over those rights-of-way. These are things that we have to preserve, which includes how future development will affect those (INAUDIBLE). It's very sad to see when you erase that either, you know, just unknowingly and you erase it permanently and you diminish that. That's what I was concerned with. Now, we...

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chairman, may I make a motion that we table this meeting until Thursday, the 30th, that we come prepared to go line item by line item, word by word and either accept or reject -- by accepting I mean incorporate into our document -- and at that time finalize -- which would mean pushing our presentation to the Commission -- to the following meeting after the 28th. It's obvious that -- I mean, I -- in all candor, I have not read the document. Ramon, and I don't want to do a disservice to your work. I want to read it. I want to study. I may want to call you and ask you a question.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I'll encourage that if you want to, you know.

Board Member Bermello: (INAUDIBLE) the meeting. And maybe we could all come prepared with all of our comments. I know that you're probably ahead of us, Mr. Chair, in looking at this.

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Bermello: So, I would like to catch up to you and then we can go item by item and do a service to staff and deliberate and make -- and hopefully we come to a very quick agreement, and we have a document that incorporates as much of staff recommendations as we believe are relevant and good to incorporate. And those that we don't we discuss it with them, and we explain why. And if you still disagree, I think, Mr. Manager, you know, I don't see a problem with staff getting up and saying we agree with everything except we think these, and these still need to be considered.

City Manager Iglesias: Mr. Bermello, if I may say that if the committee votes today to go to the October 12 meeting, it allows us -- I think we've had an excellent discussion today, and (INAUDIBLE) discussion prior to the 12th -- there's an October 12 meeting, the Commission meeting. On October 13 is P&Z. It's going to be presented at P&Z. Then we could go to the second reading in October. We just have tried to crunch everything I think a little too much, and we haven't had time for these kinds of discussions. This is what -- we're not talking about changing the document. We're talking about having some good discussions about certain things here. I thought we've had an excellent discussion today. And truly -- I've been here -- I came here just to make sure that the committee understands that I think you've all done a fantastic job. And the Commission -- the Mayor, the Commission, and myself truly appreciate it. What we want to do is we don't want to change the document. We just want to discuss it and come up with possibly the best document we

could come up with because I see a lot of fantastic architects here, and I think that we have the ability to do so in this committee. But I think that -- and it's not a bad process. You've come up with it. We've come up with certain things. We look at those issues. And the viewshed, for instance, you know, it's an excellent topic. And those are the things that you all came up with. And so, I just think that we need a little more time. We tried to compress it so much and it's too important an issue really, and we want to make sure that we get it right. But I completely agree with you. If the Committee votes to go to the October 12 meeting, I will take it off the agenda on the 28th, which will allow us to go to the 12th, and hopefully, we get it done. But I think a couple weeks more or less or a month more or less (INAUDIBLE).

Chairperson Pardo: I agree.

City Manager Iglesias: And get something that we can truly discuss. And Mr. Chair, there's nothing wrong with -- I mean, you all have done a tremendous job. I much appreciate it. You've done a great job as chairman, and you all have done a fantastic job as members of this committee. What we want to do is get this document -- get this thing right. And there's a number of discussions that we've just had that -- with Planning, with Historical. We have a few issues that we tweaked a few things because it was some legal language because that was basically tweaking things that really were just more legal issues. But really looking at the substance, looking at the meat of this thing and having these good discussions that we're having today. And if you vote for that, I will take it off the agenda on the 28th. I don't think we're ready for the 28th.

Chairperson Pardo: Before we do that, I would like to listen to anyone in the public. We have someone here from the public. We also may have someone on Zoom.

City Clerk Urquia: (INAUDIBLE). Ms. Kawalerski, if you want to speak.

Sue Kawalerski: I would just like to say I think you're doing a fantastic job. I think giving it a couple more weeks to breathe a little bit and to consider it is a good idea.

Chairperson Pardo: Is anyone on Zoom, Mr. Clerk?

City Clerk Urquia: So far on Zoom, no one has raised their hand to speak.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright.

Board Member Alvarez: I'd like to add a couple of comments here. We set out with the mission to figure out how to (INAUDIBLE) the categories of bonuses and how to appropriately allocate bonuses to the quality of architecture, the design or Mediterranean design. That was the mission we were originally targeting. I'm really happy that we've moved away from the straitjacket to work on that. And the conversations that I've been hearing for the last few meetings, the part of Ramon and really all of us have found (INAUDIBLE) more interesting part of the discussion that was not even considered when we started, which is analyzing and studying the possibilities of building site, what happens if we do this, how do we respect the building historic shed, the relationship to the neighborhood. They were much beyond, and I think much more important than the very narrow target of figuring out bonuses for a particular project as a building. This has broadened significantly,



and to me, it's far more valuable and far more significant to the future of projects that are inevitably going to come by. And the size of these projects, (INAUDIBLE) we used to work on a site because that's the site. No more. Any site geographically suitable according to demographics and a number of other analyses becomes a legitimate target for development. This analysis, this planning is far more significant for the consequence of the project and the city and everything that relates to the urban-scape of the city. I'm very happy to have been available and participate in listening to very intelligent propositions from everyone. (INAUDIBLE) I haven't been exposed to (INAUDIBLE) with this situation. But I hear and I know they're surrounded by the pressures coming in as a client legitimately had that. So, I will propose that maybe in defining or maybe in the (INAUDIBLE) doing all things (INAUDIBLE) put in as part of these collateral findings of this effort that we want to devote significant time and effort to analyzing the future projects that will come and is -- we don't have them, we don't see them yet, but you know they're going to be existing. Through our initial effort to try to make the most of the possibility, guide these guys very early in the game, there's a lot of money on the table and a lot of risk. We've got to guide these guys really early in the game what is the scope of Coral Gables mission and how we want to approach it. And if they want to use Mediterranean style, well, then you have to live with these guidelines. Beyond the architectural detail of the building or the fenestration or the arcade or the setback or the height or the window size, we need to make them aware that the most significant part of decision making is that effort. Where's your site? Which streets you're closing? Which alleys are you rerouting? What utilities do you have? What is really the infrastructure? Do you have enough water to meet the Chief Wood equivalent or the Chief --? In my time, Chief Wood was the Director of Safety for the City when I was doing Colonnade. We had extended meetings in infrastructure (INAUDIBLE) evacuation, movement of traffic, movement of people. We've got to bring this type of vision at the beginning before we immerse ourselves at the Board of Architects in looking at this particular elevation and this particular façade or elements of (INAUDIBLE) value, which they are. It's not negating them. Before we enter into that scenery (INAUDIBLE) develop significant resources, time and effort allocating to making decisions on these types of projects.

City Manager Iglesias: Mr. Chair, if I can say one thing.

Board Member Alvarez: The title of the presentation should address -- encompass that. I'm sure Felix and all of you that (INAUDIBLE) should be writing the preamble of what is the real presentation.

City Manager Iglesias: Mr. Chair, if I may say. I'm very impressed with this group we have. I think we've had some not heated but very interesting discussions. And when a group of professionals gets together, that's the case. But I think this group gets along very well. And what we have here is deep discussions, but a lot of respect. There's nothing wrong with that. And I think, from what I see, that we have the ability to take one document to the City Commission. There's no doubt here. If we all work together, we'll take that one document, that kind of unique document that really (INAUDIBLE) to the City Commission and bring it together. And you just need I think a little bit more time to work on this document and get it done. The idea, Mr. Chair, is not to rip apart your document, not at all. (INAUDIBLE). (INAUDIBLE) certain issues and had certain discussions that now that we have the document we can truly have -- I think it's great to work with a solid document and have these kinds of discussions. I don't think there's any doubt in my mind that what I saw here and the fact that it's a very -- everybody's opinionated, but everybody's very respectful and we can come to (INAUDIBLE)

something that could be really meaningful for our city. (INAUDIBLE) give it a little bit more time and work together on it. And I'm willing to do that if you all -- and this is what I had in mind.

Chairperson Pardo: So, you're saying two weeks, Mr. Manager?

City Manager Iglesias: Well, I'd like to -- we can have the Commission meeting -- instead of it going to the next Commission meeting next Tuesday, we can plan on going to the Commission meeting of the 12th. The P&Z is the day after, so this document can be presented to the P&Z on the 13th and go to the second meeting of the -- of October. And I think if this document goes as one document to the City Commission, I'm not sure if the discussions are going to be anywhere near as great as if we go with (INAUDIBLE). The idea of creating the document is that (INAUDIBLE) be able to discuss all of these elements together one by one and then come up with that final document. And it's -- and most of that (INAUDIBLE) tremendous part of this document is (INAUDIBLE). And I think we can work together in going together.

Board Member Behar: You're right. I think that's the goal. That's the intent that we need to achieve. I think the sooner that we get, you know, together again, the better. I think Mr. Bermello proposed...

Board Member Bermello: The 30th.

Board Member Behar: The 30th. You know, I think that that would be to me the latest that we could meet in order to start this process. But I think we need to do that, Mr. Manager, otherwise we're never going to be able to be ready to present something to the Commission.

City Manager Iglesias: (INAUDIBLE) present as one.

Chairperson Pardo: I think there's no reason (INAUDIBLE)...

City Manager Iglesias: They're spirited conversations, but I think everybody is respectful and we all know what we want is the best for our city. So, I think I really thank all of you for spending the time to give us a fantastic document here that we can further discuss. And (INAUDIBLE) with your votes and go to the Commission.

Board Member Behar: If I may, before we conclude, my concern is when I was looking at staff's recommendation where it's more prescriptive of something that needs to be done, and that's what I'm -- you know, I'm reading this document and we have been for the last eight weeks complimenting the building that Mitch did in front of the Plaza, the circle. Today, that building will require -- to get the full bonuses -- a roof (INAUDIBLE), and that's what I think that we cannot have.

Chairperson Pardo: I think staff heard the Committee clearly of the prescriptive component...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I even wrote some from language saying, "This is not intended to be prescriptive." So, clearly, we haven't gone far enough, but Mr. Behar, I agree with you, and I want to thank you very much for your comments. I'm available next week if you want to chat. This is really a polemic for discussion more than a finished document, okay? So, I think we can get to a finished document if we all work with it.

Board Member Bermello: I...

City Manager Iglesias: Mr. Trias, I would like you to look at this document, further refine it, so that we can be ready for the meeting of the 30th.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Board Member Pratt: So, if we could ask sufficient time to review those too.

City Manager Iglesias: So, we want to give you sufficient time, so we need to get that done as soon as possible.

Board Member Pratt: (INAUDIBLE).

City Manager Iglesias: And get you -- not give it to you the day before.

Board Member Bermello: Well, can we...

City Manager Iglesias: You already have this one to start with.

Board Member Bermello: Can we just lock in on this one so that we can --? Because if not -- I'm going to be studying this one. I'm going to be making a comparative. I'm going to pull my notes so if by next Thursday there's now another document presented, I'm not going to have my (INAUDIBLE)...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No, no, no. I think (INAUDIBLE).

City Manager Iglesias: (INAUDIBLE) you're right. I was trying to help, but I think it may be...

Board Member Bermello: Yeah.

City Manager Iglesias: (INAUDIBLE) the other way. (INAUDIBLE).

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Chair...

City Manager Iglesias: If the Committee has no problem, let's lock in on this document and work from this document and then you can further refine it on your own so when you get to these items, you can...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah, yeah.

City Manager Iglesias: (INAUDIBLE).

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I mean, whatever works for you in terms of (INAUDIBLE).

City Manager Iglesias: And I agree with you.

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE).

City Manager Iglesias: I agree with you.

Chairperson Pardo: And just to clarify, Mr. Ceballos, it's okay for us to send emails to Mr. Trias?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: The only issue is board members talking to board members about items that come before them.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: So, you talking to staff -- as long as it's you, one individual...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: That is never going to be a Sunshine law (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Behar: Individually we can.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Individually, that will never be a Sunshine law (INAUDIBLE).

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Right. And the thing that I cannot do is tell you, "Oh, you know what Mr. Bermello said." No, I cannot do that.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Staff and the City Attorney's Office and the Clerk's Office cannot be...

Unidentified Speaker: I thought that's the way that it worked.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: No, cannot be used as avenues to circumvent the Sunshine law. So, if you tell something to Mr. Trias, he cannot relay it to another board member.

Board Member Bermello: And I think that this kind of serves like -- you know, Ramon, I like to call you during the week.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Sure.

Board Member Bermello: You know, like a one on one because I may see something and I may say what the heck were you thinking about, you know, about certifying architects on Mediterranean style architecture.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah, we changed that.

Board Member Bermello: That will be accredited and (INAUDIBLE)...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: We changed that, we changed that.

Board Member Bermello: What is it going to be?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: What I was thinking is...

Board Member Bermello: Teach your course, get a couple of credits, and (INAUDIBLE)...

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Board Member Bermello: And they'll find you. They will all applaud you. Give five credits.

Unidentified Speaker: (INAUDIBLE) did that.

Board Member Bermello: Put it on Zoom.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No, no. I...

Board Member Bermello: And everybody will be happy.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: We did that once. No, I -- what I meant was continuing education, and I did that once with the University of Miami. We did six credits on a Saturday. We had great attendance. Everybody was happy and yeah.

City Manager Iglesias: So, we will keep it -- we will use Mr. Trias' polemic document to (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Bermello: Great.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright. We have to -- we're going to have Glenn out all of October, so we have to get this done next week.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Sure.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, the 30th.

City Clerk Urquia: So, the 30th is also the last day before we publish the agenda so that -- you'll have a chance to meet because we publish the agenda on October 5 for the October 12 meeting, one week prior. So, if you're meeting on Thursday, the 30th is the only Thursday between now.

Board Member Bermello: Can we --? We have to start like just on this item. And I would suggest - - I know that you're always allowing time for public comments and that, but did you make a lot of comments? How long do you think it's going to take us to go through your document?

Chairperson Pardo: I could tell you.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Three to four meetings.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Look...

Board Member Behar: I would agree with (INAUDIBLE).

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No, no, look...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: To incorporate all of his comments and your comments into a single...

Chairperson Pardo: No, I don't...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Document...

Chairperson Pardo: Wait, wait just a minute. I don't think we should be doing that. My personal opinion -- Mr. Manager, this is the way I would like our committee to do this. I think for clarity, any components of what staff has come up that we adopt, so the comparison will be from the existing language that's in the Code today compared to this in the redline form, the same as what you sent us on the 10th, the afternoon of the 10th. That way it'll be easier, I think, for anyone, because the 42 pages, I think are unnecessary. If staff -- if we only adopt 10 percent of what staff has proposed -- this committee adopts only 10 percent -- and staff feels strongly against it, they could say whatever they want. But it's going to be very confusing, in my opinion...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah, but...

Chairperson Pardo: To the Commission. I would rather have one document and any of these things gets incorporated into our base document, and then that way, you know, it goes in comparing to the existing.

Board Member Bermello: Right.

Chairperson Pardo: The reason that's important is because that way the Commission can see there is a problem here, and we added this. That's the difference. If you start comparing three things, you'll go crazy.

Board Member Bermello: Well, I guess what I was getting at was not necessarily that. I agree that we're going to have one document, that's our document, that hopefully has a lot of staff's recommendations as part of it, hopefully. My comment was not having read your...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: Your comments, my question was more logistically, do you think that knowing what you've written, that we can start at 4 o'clock and say end at 7 and have gone through 100 percent of your comments? It doesn't mean we're going to adopt them, but that we have gone

through and deliberated.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I think so.

Board Member Bermello: Do you think that's possible?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I think so.

Board Member Behar: In my opinion, you will. You know why? Because when you read some of the comments, I can tell you that we're going to go through and those items that I consider to be prescriptive, you know, I will vote not to incorporate them.

Board Member Bermello: And as Ramon -- you were there. You heard my points on prescription.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And I agree.

Board Member Bermello: And I know prescription helps staff. It's very easy (INAUDIBLE)...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: But I don't like it. I agree.

Board Member Bermello: If you're going to make rice then it has to be two cups of water for every cup of rice. It's very simple to measure the cups of water and the cups of rice.

Board Member Behar: Because the Board of Architects is the one that's going to look at it, not the prescription.

Board Member Bermello: Right, so...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: But please, just my method is simple. We need to talk about our architecture. Right now, the Code doesn't really talk about it.

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Board Member Behar: You have a Board of Architects that's going to do this, the architecture.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Well, I'm just saying that's my...

Board Member Bermello: That's what you were trying to convey...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: That it should be more of architect -- okay. So, I mean...

City Manager Iglesias: Mr. Bermello, I just want to clarify that. I completely agree with you. I think prescriptive architecture is cookie-cutter architecture. We don't want that. That's not our view. That is not our review. And so, what I was thinking is exactly, Mr. Trias, what you were saying. Take

your document, add what you feel is appropriate, and I think -- and I'm sure that we could come up with one document to present to the Commission as a whole from everyone here, and I think that will allow us to go to the 13th...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

City Manager Iglesias: On the Planning and Zoning.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And I will consider it a big failure on my part if I had to say, "Oh, I disagree with what the Committee is suggesting," which I'm not saying. I'm just saying, I think you should add some more things because you have that opportunity.

Board Member Behar: With that in mind, I think we are good. And we'll have a meeting set for the 30th, correct?

City Manager Iglesias: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: Starting at 4.

Board Member Behar: Mr. Chair, I'll make a motion to...

Board Member Bermello: For the meeting on the 30th? We have to make a motion for that?

Chairperson Pardo: Absolutely.

Board Member Behar: So, we'll make a motion to meet at 4 o'clock.

Board Member Bermello: At City Hall on the 30th.

City Clerk Urquia: If the room is available, we'll make it at City Hall.

Board Member Bermello: If not, here.

Unidentified Speaker: (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Bermello: No, it's just that finding parking here is -- it wasn't -- I illegally parked just (INAUDIBLE)...

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Unidentified Speaker: If you have a ticket, give it to (INAUDIBLE).

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

City Manager Iglesias: (INAUDIBLE) for free. (INAUDIBLE).



(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

City Manager Iglesias: We also would like a vote on the Commission meeting to the 12th.

Board Member Behar: I move that.

Board Member Bermello: Can we accept that this item will be brought before the Commission on October 12?

Board Member Behar: I'll make a motion -- I'll second that motion.

City Clerk Urquia: All in favor?

The Board Members (Collectively): Aye.

City Clerk Urquia: Opposed?

Board Member Behar: Motion to adjourn?

Chairperson Pardo: Alright.

Board Member Bermello: I second.

Chairperson Pardo: All those in favor?

The Board Members (Collectively): Aye.