	Page 1		Page 2
	CITY OF CORAL GABLES	1	THEREUPON:
	LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY (LPA)/	2	(The following proceedings were held.)
	PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT	3	MR. BEHAR: We'll call this meeting to
	WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 10, 2022, COMMENCING AT 6:06 P.M.	4	order. Good evening, everybody. This Board is
		5	comprised of seven members. Four Members of
		6	the Board shall constitute a quorum. Today we
	Board Members Present:	7	do have four members, so we do have a quorum.
	Robert Behar, Vice Chairman	8	The affirmative vote of four members should be
	Luis Revuelta Venny Torre	9	necessary for the adoption of any motion. If
	Wayne "Chip" Withers	10	only four members are present, the applicant
		11	may request and be entitled to a continuance to
		12	the next regularly scheduled meeting of the
	City Staff and Consultants:	13	Board. If the matter is continued due to a
	Jill Menendez, Administrative Assistant, Board Secretary Jennifer Garcia, City Planner	14	lack of quorum, the Chairperson or Secretary of
	Arceli Redila, Zoning Administrator	15	the Board may set a Special Meeting to consider
	Suramy Cabrera, Director of Development Services,	16	such matter.
	via Zoom Craig Coller, Special Counsel	17	In the event that four votes are not
	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	18	obtained, an applicant may request a
	AL District	19	continuance or we will allow the applicant to
	Also Participating:	20	proceed to the City Commission without a
	Laura Russo, Esq., on behalf of Item E-1	21	recommendation.
	Nina Boniske, Esq.	22	Pursuant to Resolution 2021-118 of the City
		23	of Coral Gables, it has returned to a
		24	traditional in-person meeting. Accordingly,
		25	any individual wishing to provide sworn
	Page 3		Page 4
1	testimony should be present physically in the	1	Claudia Miro?
2	City Commission Chamber. However, the Planning	2	Luis Revuelta?
3	and Zoning Board has established the ability	3	MR. REVUELTA: Present.
4	for the public to provide comment, non-sworn,	4	THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?
5	without evidentiary value, virtually.	5	MR. TORRE: Here.
6	Accordingly, only individuals who wish to	6	THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?
7	provide public comment in this format may	7	MR. WITHERS: Here.
8	appear and provide those comments via Zoom.	8	THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat?
9	Lobbyist Registration and Disclosure, any	9	Robert Behar?
10	person who acts as a lobbyist, pursuant to the	10	MR. BEHAR: Here.
11	City of Coral Gables Ordinance 2006-11, must	11	Notice regarding Ex Parte Communication.
12	register with the City Clerk prior to engaging	12	Please be advised that this Board is a
13	in any lobbying activity or presentation before	13	quasi-judicial Board, which requires Board
14	City Staff, Board, Committees and/or City	14	Members to disclose all ex parte communication
15	Commission. A copy of the Ordinance is	15	and site visits. An ex parte communication is
16	available in the Office of the City Clerk.	16	defined as any contact, communication,
17	Failure to register and provide proof of	17	conversation, correspondence, memorandum or
18	registration should prohibit your ability to	18	written or verbal communication that takes
19	present to the Board.	19	place, outside of a public hearing, between a
20	As Vice Chair, I now officially call the	20	member of the public and a member of the
21	City of Coral Gables Planning and Zoning Board	21	quasi-judicial Board regarding matters to be
0.0		~ ~	1 1 1
22	Meeting of August 10, 2022 to order. The time	22	heard by the Board. If anyone made any contact
23	Meeting of August 10, 2022 to order. The time is 6:06.	23	with a Board Member regarding an issue before
23 24	Meeting of August 10, 2022 to order. The time is 6:06.  Jill, can you please call the roll?	23 24	with a Board Member regarding an issue before the Board, the Board Member must state, on the
23	Meeting of August 10, 2022 to order. The time is 6:06.	23	with a Board Member regarding an issue before

	Page 5		Page 6
1	communication and the party who originated the	1	all persons physically in the Commission
2	communication.	2	Chamber, who will speak on the agenda item
3	Also, if a Board Member conducted a site	3	before us tonight, please rise to be sworn in.
4	visit specifically related to the case before	4	(Thereupon, the participant was sworn.)
5	the Board, the Board Member must also disclose	5	MR. BEHAR: Zoom platform participants, I
6	such visit. In either case, the Board Member	6	will ask any person wishing to speak on
7	must state, on the record, whether the ex parte	7	tonight's agenda to please open your chat and
8	communication and/or site visit will affect the	8	send a direct message to Jill Menendez, stating
9	Board Member's ability to impartially consider	9	that you would like to speak before the Board,
10	the evidence to be presented regarding the	10	and include your full name. Jill will call you
11	matter. The Board Member shall also state that	11	when it's your turn to speak. I'd ask to be
12	his or her decision will be based on	12	concise, for the interest of time.
13		13	
14	substantial competent evidence and testimony	14	Phone platform participants, after the Zoom
15	presented on the record today.	15	participants are done, I will ask the phone participants to comment on tonight's agenda
16	Does any Board Member have such communication or site visit to disclose at this	16	
-	time?		item. I also ask to be concise, for the interest of time.
17		17	
18	MR. REVUELTA: No.	18	At this time, I will ask for approval of
19	MR. BEHAR: None.	19	the minutes of Jill, what exactly is the
20	Swearing in, anyone who speaks this evening	20	date, July
21	must complete the roster on the podium. We ask	21	THE SECRETARY: June 21st, 2022.
22	that you print clearly, so that the official	22	MR. BEHAR: Thank you, Jill.
23	record of your name and address will be	23	Do I have a motion for approval of the
24	correct.	24	minutes?
25	Now, with the exceptions of the attorney,	25	MR. REVUELTA: Moved.
	Page 7		Daga 0
			Page 6
1		1	Page 8 THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?
1 2	MR. WITHERS: Second.	1 2	THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?
2	MR. WITHERS: Second. MR. BEHAR: Can you please call the roll?	2	THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? MR. TORRE: Yes.
	MR. WITHERS: Second.  MR. BEHAR: Can you please call the roll?  THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?	2 3	THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? MR. TORRE: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?
2 3 4	MR. WITHERS: Second.  MR. BEHAR: Can you please call the roll?  THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?  MR. REVUELTA: Yes.	2 3 4	THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? MR. TORRE: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? MR. WITHERS: Yes.
2 3 4 5	MR. WITHERS: Second.  MR. BEHAR: Can you please call the roll?  THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?  MR. REVUELTA: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?	2 3 4 5	THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? MR. TORRE: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? MR. WITHERS: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?
2 3 4 5 6	MR. WITHERS: Second. MR. BEHAR: Can you please call the roll? THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta? MR. REVUELTA: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? MR. TORRE: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6	THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? MR. TORRE: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? MR. WITHERS: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta? MR. REVUELTA: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. WITHERS: Second.  MR. BEHAR: Can you please call the roll?  THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?  MR. REVUELTA: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?  MR. TORRE: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?	2 3 4 5 6 7	THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? MR. TORRE: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? MR. WITHERS: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta? MR. REVUELTA: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. WITHERS: Second.  MR. BEHAR: Can you please call the roll?  THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?  MR. REVUELTA: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?  MR. TORRE: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?  MR. WITHERS: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? MR. TORRE: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? MR. WITHERS: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta? MR. REVUELTA: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar? MR. BEHAR: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. WITHERS: Second.  MR. BEHAR: Can you please call the roll?  THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?  MR. REVUELTA: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?  MR. TORRE: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?  MR. WITHERS: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? MR. TORRE: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? MR. WITHERS: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta? MR. REVUELTA: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar? MR. BEHAR: Yes. With that, Mr. Coller, can you start the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. WITHERS: Second.  MR. BEHAR: Can you please call the roll?  THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?  MR. REVUELTA: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?  MR. TORRE: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?  MR. WITHERS: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  MR. BEHAR: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? MR. TORRE: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? MR. WITHERS: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta? MR. REVUELTA: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar? MR. BEHAR: Yes. With that, Mr. Coller, can you start the agenda items?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. WITHERS: Second.  MR. BEHAR: Can you please call the roll?  THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?  MR. REVUELTA: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?  MR. TORRE: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?  MR. WITHERS: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  MR. BEHAR: Yes.  The procedure that we will use tonight, we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? MR. TORRE: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? MR. WITHERS: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta? MR. REVUELTA: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar? MR. BEHAR: Yes. With that, Mr. Coller, can you start the agenda items? MR. COLLER: Just a couple of housekeeping
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. WITHERS: Second. MR. BEHAR: Can you please call the roll? THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta? MR. REVUELTA: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? MR. TORRE: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? MR. WITHERS: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar? MR. BEHAR: Yes. The procedure that we will use tonight, we will have identification of the agenda by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? MR. TORRE: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? MR. WITHERS: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta? MR. REVUELTA: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar? MR. BEHAR: Yes. With that, Mr. Coller, can you start the agenda items? MR. COLLER: Just a couple of housekeeping measures. Because we have four members
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. WITHERS: Second.  MR. BEHAR: Can you please call the roll?  THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?  MR. REVUELTA: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?  MR. TORRE: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?  MR. WITHERS: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  MR. BEHAR: Yes.  The procedure that we will use tonight, we will have identification of the agenda by  Mr. Coller, presentation by Staff, presentation	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? MR. TORRE: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? MR. WITHERS: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta? MR. REVUELTA: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar? MR. BEHAR: Yes. With that, Mr. Coller, can you start the agenda items? MR. COLLER: Just a couple of housekeeping measures. Because we have four members present, first of all, you should be aware,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. WITHERS: Second.  MR. BEHAR: Can you please call the roll?  THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?  MR. REVUELTA: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?  MR. TORRE: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?  MR. WITHERS: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  MR. BEHAR: Yes.  The procedure that we will use tonight, we will have identification of the agenda by  Mr. Coller, presentation by Staff, presentation by the applicant or agent, open to the public	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? MR. TORRE: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? MR. WITHERS: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta? MR. REVUELTA: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar? MR. BEHAR: Yes. With that, Mr. Coller, can you start the agenda items? MR. COLLER: Just a couple of housekeeping measures. Because we have four members present, first of all, you should be aware, there are no Comp Plan Amendments tonight. So
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. WITHERS: Second.  MR. BEHAR: Can you please call the roll?  THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?  MR. REVUELTA: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?  MR. TORRE: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?  MR. WITHERS: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  MR. BEHAR: Yes.  The procedure that we will use tonight, we will have identification of the agenda by  Mr. Coller, presentation by Staff, presentation by the applicant or agent, open to the public comments in Chamber, Zoom platform, phone	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? MR. TORRE: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? MR. WITHERS: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta? MR. REVUELTA: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar? MR. BEHAR: Yes. With that, Mr. Coller, can you start the agenda items? MR. COLLER: Just a couple of housekeeping measures. Because we have four members present, first of all, you should be aware, there are no Comp Plan Amendments tonight. So the problem that we had previously with only
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. WITHERS: Second.  MR. BEHAR: Can you please call the roll?  THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?  MR. REVUELTA: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?  MR. TORRE: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?  MR. WITHERS: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  MR. BEHAR: Yes.  The procedure that we will use tonight, we will have identification of the agenda by  Mr. Coller, presentation by Staff, presentation by the applicant or agent, open to the public comments in Chamber, Zoom platform, phone platform, close public comments. We will have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? MR. TORRE: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? MR. WITHERS: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta? MR. REVUELTA: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar? MR. BEHAR: Yes. With that, Mr. Coller, can you start the agenda items? MR. COLLER: Just a couple of housekeeping measures. Because we have four members present, first of all, you should be aware, there are no Comp Plan Amendments tonight. So the problem that we had previously with only four members is not present in this case. If
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. WITHERS: Second.  MR. BEHAR: Can you please call the roll?  THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?  MR. REVUELTA: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?  MR. TORRE: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?  MR. WITHERS: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  MR. BEHAR: Yes.  The procedure that we will use tonight, we will have identification of the agenda by  Mr. Coller, presentation by Staff, presentation by the applicant or agent, open to the public comments in Chamber, Zoom platform, phone platform, close public comments. We will have Board discussion, then we will do a motion and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? MR. TORRE: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? MR. WITHERS: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta? MR. REVUELTA: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar? MR. BEHAR: Yes. With that, Mr. Coller, can you start the agenda items? MR. COLLER: Just a couple of housekeeping measures. Because we have four members present, first of all, you should be aware, there are no Comp Plan Amendments tonight. So the problem that we had previously with only four members is not present in this case. If you have less than four members, then you don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. WITHERS: Second.  MR. BEHAR: Can you please call the roll?  THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?  MR. REVUELTA: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?  MR. TORRE: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?  MR. WITHERS: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  MR. BEHAR: Yes.  The procedure that we will use tonight, we will have identification of the agenda by  Mr. Coller, presentation by Staff, presentation by the applicant or agent, open to the public comments in Chamber, Zoom platform, phone platform, close public comments. We will have Board discussion, then we will do a motion and discussion, the second motion, and the Board's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? MR. TORRE: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? MR. WITHERS: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta? MR. REVUELTA: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar? MR. BEHAR: Yes. With that, Mr. Coller, can you start the agenda items? MR. COLLER: Just a couple of housekeeping measures. Because we have four members present, first of all, you should be aware, there are no Comp Plan Amendments tonight. So the problem that we had previously with only four members is not present in this case. If you have less than four members, then you don't have a recommendation on a particular item.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. WITHERS: Second.  MR. BEHAR: Can you please call the roll?  THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?  MR. REVUELTA: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?  MR. TORRE: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?  MR. WITHERS: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  MR. BEHAR: Yes.  The procedure that we will use tonight, we will have identification of the agenda by  Mr. Coller, presentation by Staff, presentation by the applicant or agent, open to the public comments in Chamber, Zoom platform, phone platform, close public comments. We will have Board discussion, then we will do a motion and discussion, the second motion, and the Board's final comments, and then we will take the vote.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? MR. TORRE: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? MR. WITHERS: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta? MR. REVUELTA: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar? MR. BEHAR: Yes. With that, Mr. Coller, can you start the agenda items? MR. COLLER: Just a couple of housekeeping measures. Because we have four members present, first of all, you should be aware, there are no Comp Plan Amendments tonight. So the problem that we had previously with only four members is not present in this case. If you have less than four members, then you don't have a recommendation on a particular item. If you have an item, and you have less than
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. WITHERS: Second.  MR. BEHAR: Can you please call the roll?  THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?  MR. REVUELTA: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?  MR. TORRE: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?  MR. WITHERS: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  MR. BEHAR: Yes.  The procedure that we will use tonight, we will have identification of the agenda by  Mr. Coller, presentation by Staff, presentation by the applicant or agent, open to the public comments in Chamber, Zoom platform, phone platform, close public comments. We will have Board discussion, then we will do a motion and discussion, the second motion, and the Board's final comments, and then we will take the vote.  THE SECRETARY: Excuse me, Mr. Chair. We	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? MR. TORRE: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? MR. WITHERS: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta? MR. REVUELTA: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar? MR. BEHAR: Yes. With that, Mr. Coller, can you start the agenda items? MR. COLLER: Just a couple of housekeeping measures. Because we have four members present, first of all, you should be aware, there are no Comp Plan Amendments tonight. So the problem that we had previously with only four members is not present in this case. If you have less than four members, then you don't have a recommendation on a particular item. If you have an item, and you have less than four, you can still try to reach four, with a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. WITHERS: Second.  MR. BEHAR: Can you please call the roll?  THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?  MR. REVUELTA: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?  MR. TORRE: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?  MR. WITHERS: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  MR. BEHAR: Yes.  The procedure that we will use tonight, we will have identification of the agenda by  Mr. Coller, presentation by Staff, presentation by the applicant or agent, open to the public comments in Chamber, Zoom platform, phone platform, close public comments. We will have Board discussion, then we will do a motion and discussion, the second motion, and the Board's final comments, and then we will take the vote.  THE SECRETARY: Excuse me, Mr. Chair. We also have minutes for July 13 for approval.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? MR. TORRE: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? MR. WITHERS: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta? MR. REVUELTA: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar? MR. BEHAR: Yes. With that, Mr. Coller, can you start the agenda items? MR. COLLER: Just a couple of housekeeping measures. Because we have four members present, first of all, you should be aware, there are no Comp Plan Amendments tonight. So the problem that we had previously with only four members is not present in this case. If you have less than four members, then you don't have a recommendation on a particular item. If you have an item, and you have less than four, you can still try to reach four, with a different motion, if you so choose. So I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. WITHERS: Second.  MR. BEHAR: Can you please call the roll?  THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?  MR. REVUELTA: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?  MR. TORRE: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?  MR. WITHERS: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  MR. BEHAR: Yes.  The procedure that we will use tonight, we will have identification of the agenda by  Mr. Coller, presentation by Staff, presentation by the applicant or agent, open to the public comments in Chamber, Zoom platform, phone platform, close public comments. We will have Board discussion, then we will do a motion and discussion, the second motion, and the Board's final comments, and then we will take the vote.  THE SECRETARY: Excuse me, Mr. Chair. We also have minutes for July 13 for approval.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. Do I have a motion for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? MR. TORRE: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? MR. WITHERS: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta? MR. REVUELTA: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar? MR. BEHAR: Yes. With that, Mr. Coller, can you start the agenda items? MR. COLLER: Just a couple of housekeeping measures. Because we have four members present, first of all, you should be aware, there are no Comp Plan Amendments tonight. So the problem that we had previously with only four members is not present in this case. If you have less than four members, then you don't have a recommendation on a particular item. If you have an item, and you have less than four, you can still try to reach four, with a different motion, if you so choose. So I'm mentioning it now, in advance, in the case that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. WITHERS: Second.  MR. BEHAR: Can you please call the roll?  THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?  MR. REVUELTA: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?  MR. TORRE: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?  MR. WITHERS: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  MR. BEHAR: Yes.  The procedure that we will use tonight, we will have identification of the agenda by  Mr. Coller, presentation by Staff, presentation by the applicant or agent, open to the public comments in Chamber, Zoom platform, phone platform, close public comments. We will have Board discussion, then we will do a motion and discussion, the second motion, and the Board's final comments, and then we will take the vote.  THE SECRETARY: Excuse me, Mr. Chair. We also have minutes for July 13 for approval.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. Do I have a motion for the July 13th minutes approval?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? MR. TORRE: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? MR. WITHERS: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta? MR. REVUELTA: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar? MR. BEHAR: Yes. With that, Mr. Coller, can you start the agenda items? MR. COLLER: Just a couple of housekeeping measures. Because we have four members present, first of all, you should be aware, there are no Comp Plan Amendments tonight. So the problem that we had previously with only four members is not present in this case. If you have less than four members, then you don't have a recommendation on a particular item. If you have an item, and you have less than four, you can still try to reach four, with a different motion, if you so choose. So I'm mentioning it now, in advance, in the case that this should happen this evening.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. WITHERS: Second.  MR. BEHAR: Can you please call the roll?  THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?  MR. REVUELTA: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?  MR. TORRE: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?  MR. WITHERS: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  MR. BEHAR: Yes.  The procedure that we will use tonight, we will have identification of the agenda by  Mr. Coller, presentation by Staff, presentation by the applicant or agent, open to the public comments in Chamber, Zoom platform, phone platform, close public comments. We will have Board discussion, then we will do a motion and discussion, the second motion, and the Board's final comments, and then we will take the vote.  THE SECRETARY: Excuse me, Mr. Chair. We also have minutes for July 13 for approval.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. Do I have a motion for the July 13th minutes approval?  MR. WITHERS: I'll move it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? MR. TORRE: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? MR. WITHERS: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta? MR. REVUELTA: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar? MR. BEHAR: Yes. With that, Mr. Coller, can you start the agenda items? MR. COLLER: Just a couple of housekeeping measures. Because we have four members present, first of all, you should be aware, there are no Comp Plan Amendments tonight. So the problem that we had previously with only four members is not present in this case. If you have less than four members, then you don't have a recommendation on a particular item. If you have an item, and you have less than four, you can still try to reach four, with a different motion, if you so choose. So I'm mentioning it now, in advance, in the case that this should happen this evening. So if there's any questions, you just let
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. WITHERS: Second.  MR. BEHAR: Can you please call the roll?  THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?  MR. REVUELTA: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?  MR. TORRE: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?  MR. WITHERS: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  MR. BEHAR: Yes.  The procedure that we will use tonight, we will have identification of the agenda by  Mr. Coller, presentation by Staff, presentation by the applicant or agent, open to the public comments in Chamber, Zoom platform, phone platform, close public comments. We will have Board discussion, then we will do a motion and discussion, the second motion, and the Board's final comments, and then we will take the vote.  THE SECRETARY: Excuse me, Mr. Chair. We also have minutes for July 13 for approval.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. Do I have a motion for the July 13th minutes approval?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? MR. TORRE: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? MR. WITHERS: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta? MR. REVUELTA: Yes. THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar? MR. BEHAR: Yes. With that, Mr. Coller, can you start the agenda items? MR. COLLER: Just a couple of housekeeping measures. Because we have four members present, first of all, you should be aware, there are no Comp Plan Amendments tonight. So the problem that we had previously with only four members is not present in this case. If you have less than four members, then you don't have a recommendation on a particular item. If you have an item, and you have less than four, you can still try to reach four, with a different motion, if you so choose. So I'm mentioning it now, in advance, in the case that this should happen this evening.

	Page 9		Page 10
1	MR. BEHAR: So if we don't get four votes	1	effective date. Item E-1, public hearing.
2	on an item, can we continue that item for the	2	MR. BEHAR: Jennifer.
3	next meeting, that we could have more members?	3	MS. GARCIA: My PowerPoint, please.
4	MR. COLLER: You could choose you	4	All right. I'm going to go fast.
5	could we'd have to take a new motion to	5	Okay. So Snapper Creek is down south,
6	continue the item, but you could continue it to	6	between Snapper Creek, Village of Pinecrest and
7	the next meeting. There may be some time	7	Old Cutler Boulevard.
8	sensitivity to some of these items. So let's	8	Now, this is what it looks like as an
9	see if we have four votes and we'll cross that	9	aerial. You can see it's very lush. There's
10	bridge when we get to it.	10	large lots in the area. And these are the two
11	MR. BEHAR: Okay. And, I guess, before we	11	properties that Laura is going to talk about
12	start, I want to acknowledge and thank	12	when she is up here. I was expecting her to go
13	Mr. Bucelo for the time that he served on the	13	first, but these are two properties that the
14	Board. As of last Friday, Mr. Bucelo came off	14	applicants are requesting a Text Amendment to
15	the Board, but we want to thank him for his	15	the Site Specifics.
16	participation while we've had him here.	16	The proposed amendment is basically saying
17	MR. COLLER: Okay. Item E-1, an Ordinance	17	that all platted lots at the date of annexation
18	of the City Commission, Florida providing for a	18	in 1996 will be exempt from the building site
19	text amendment to the City of Coral Gables	19	determination process.
20	Official Zoning Code by amending Appendix A,	20	So the Zoning Code in Coral Gables is a
21	"Site Specific Zoning Regulations," Section	21	very specific process that requires any vacant
22	A-94, "Snapper Creek Lakes", to exempt platted	22	lot in single-family or duplex to go through a
23	lots within Snapper Creek Lakes from the	23	building site determination through City Staff,
24	Building Site Determination process, providing	24	and it's a little tedious, and they've gone
25	for severability, repeater, codification and an	25	through the process. They were rejected,
	5 11		
	Page 11		Page 12
1		1	
1 2	because they had a tennis court on one property and that's	1 2	Page 12 site right now. MR. BEHAR: Okay. And typically what are
	because they had a tennis court on one property		site right now.
2	because they had a tennis court on one property and that's	2	site right now.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. And typically what are
2	because they had a tennis court on one property and that's MR. WITHERS: I'm sorry, are you saying	2 3	site right now.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. And typically what are the size of the other lots in comparison to
2 3 4	because they had a tennis court on one property and that's MR. WITHERS: I'm sorry, are you saying they were rejected because of what?	2 3 4	site right now.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. And typically what are the size of the other lots in comparison to these lots?
2 3 4 5	because they had a tennis court on one property and that's MR. WITHERS: I'm sorry, are you saying they were rejected because of what? MS. GARCIA: It's two properties, and one	2 3 4 5	site right now.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. And typically what are the size of the other lots in comparison to these lots?  MS. GARCIA: So Snapper Creek, as
2 3 4 5 6	because they had a tennis court on one property and that's MR. WITHERS: I'm sorry, are you saying they were rejected because of what? MS. GARCIA: It's two properties, and one had a tennis court accessory use to the same	2 3 4 5 6	site right now.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. And typically what are the size of the other lots in comparison to these lots?  MS. GARCIA: So Snapper Creek, as subdivided, is one acre lots. Many of them are
2 3 4 5 6 7	because they had a tennis court on one property and that's MR. WITHERS: I'm sorry, are you saying they were rejected because of what? MS. GARCIA: It's two properties, and one had a tennis court accessory use to the same house, that is torn down now, the house there.	2 3 4 5 6 7	site right now.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. And typically what are the size of the other lots in comparison to these lots?  MS. GARCIA: So Snapper Creek, as subdivided, is one acre lots. Many of them are much larger than one acre.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	because they had a tennis court on one property and that's MR. WITHERS: I'm sorry, are you saying they were rejected because of what? MS. GARCIA: It's two properties, and one had a tennis court accessory use to the same house, that is torn down now, the house there. So they were rejected, as far as complying with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	site right now.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. And typically what are the size of the other lots in comparison to these lots?  MS. GARCIA: So Snapper Creek, as subdivided, is one acre lots. Many of them are much larger than one acre.  MR. BEHAR: And this property that we're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	because they had a tennis court on one property and that's MR. WITHERS: I'm sorry, are you saying they were rejected because of what? MS. GARCIA: It's two properties, and one had a tennis court accessory use to the same house, that is torn down now, the house there. So they were rejected, as far as complying with the requirements for the building site	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	site right now.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. And typically what are the size of the other lots in comparison to these lots?  MS. GARCIA: So Snapper Creek, as subdivided, is one acre lots. Many of them are much larger than one acre.  MR. BEHAR: And this property that we're looking at, how big are those  MS. GARCIA: Two acres plus.  MR. BEHAR: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	because they had a tennis court on one property and that's MR. WITHERS: I'm sorry, are you saying they were rejected because of what? MS. GARCIA: It's two properties, and one had a tennis court accessory use to the same house, that is torn down now, the house there. So they were rejected, as far as complying with the requirements for the building site determination. MR. BEHAR: Okay. MS. GARCIA: So this text amendment will	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	site right now.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. And typically what are the size of the other lots in comparison to these lots?  MS. GARCIA: So Snapper Creek, as subdivided, is one acre lots. Many of them are much larger than one acre.  MR. BEHAR: And this property that we're looking at, how big are those  MS. GARCIA: Two acres plus.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	because they had a tennis court on one property and that's MR. WITHERS: I'm sorry, are you saying they were rejected because of what? MS. GARCIA: It's two properties, and one had a tennis court accessory use to the same house, that is torn down now, the house there. So they were rejected, as far as complying with the requirements for the building site determination. MR. BEHAR: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	site right now.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. And typically what are the size of the other lots in comparison to these lots?  MS. GARCIA: So Snapper Creek, as subdivided, is one acre lots. Many of them are much larger than one acre.  MR. BEHAR: And this property that we're looking at, how big are those  MS. GARCIA: Two acres plus.  MR. BEHAR: Okay.  MS. GARCIA: Right? Because each platted lot is one acre.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	because they had a tennis court on one property and that's  MR. WITHERS: I'm sorry, are you saying they were rejected because of what?  MS. GARCIA: It's two properties, and one had a tennis court accessory use to the same house, that is torn down now, the house there. So they were rejected, as far as complying with the requirements for the building site determination.  MR. BEHAR: Okay.  MS. GARCIA: So this text amendment will affect three properties. The applicant is the one to the south. I think it's Lakeside,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	site right now.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. And typically what are the size of the other lots in comparison to these lots?  MS. GARCIA: So Snapper Creek, as subdivided, is one acre lots. Many of them are much larger than one acre.  MR. BEHAR: And this property that we're looking at, how big are those  MS. GARCIA: Two acres plus.  MR. BEHAR: Okay.  MS. GARCIA: Right? Because each platted lot is one acre.  MR. TORRE: To clear up the way that this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	because they had a tennis court on one property and that's  MR. WITHERS: I'm sorry, are you saying they were rejected because of what?  MS. GARCIA: It's two properties, and one had a tennis court accessory use to the same house, that is torn down now, the house there. So they were rejected, as far as complying with the requirements for the building site determination.  MR. BEHAR: Okay.  MS. GARCIA: So this text amendment will affect three properties. The applicant is the one to the south. I think it's Lakeside, but the south lake, that's in the middle.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	site right now.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. And typically what are the size of the other lots in comparison to these lots?  MS. GARCIA: So Snapper Creek, as subdivided, is one acre lots. Many of them are much larger than one acre.  MR. BEHAR: And this property that we're looking at, how big are those  MS. GARCIA: Two acres plus.  MR. BEHAR: Okay.  MS. GARCIA: Right? Because each platted lot is one acre.  MR. TORRE: To clear up the way that this came about, you're saying that the tennis court
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	because they had a tennis court on one property and that's  MR. WITHERS: I'm sorry, are you saying they were rejected because of what?  MS. GARCIA: It's two properties, and one had a tennis court accessory use to the same house, that is torn down now, the house there. So they were rejected, as far as complying with the requirements for the building site determination.  MR. BEHAR: Okay.  MS. GARCIA: So this text amendment will affect three properties. The applicant is the one to the south. I think it's Lakeside, but the south lake, that's in the middle. It's shaped yes, and also two properties on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	site right now.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. And typically what are the size of the other lots in comparison to these lots?  MS. GARCIA: So Snapper Creek, as subdivided, is one acre lots. Many of them are much larger than one acre.  MR. BEHAR: And this property that we're looking at, how big are those  MS. GARCIA: Two acres plus.  MR. BEHAR: Okay.  MS. GARCIA: Right? Because each platted lot is one acre.  MR. TORRE: To clear up the way that this came about, you're saying that the tennis court made that the two lots together became the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	because they had a tennis court on one property and that's  MR. WITHERS: I'm sorry, are you saying they were rejected because of what?  MS. GARCIA: It's two properties, and one had a tennis court accessory use to the same house, that is torn down now, the house there. So they were rejected, as far as complying with the requirements for the building site determination.  MR. BEHAR: Okay.  MS. GARCIA: So this text amendment will affect three properties. The applicant is the one to the south. I think it's Lakeside, but the south lake, that's in the middle. It's shaped yes, and also two properties on the north part of Snapper Creek.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	site right now.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. And typically what are the size of the other lots in comparison to these lots?  MS. GARCIA: So Snapper Creek, as subdivided, is one acre lots. Many of them are much larger than one acre.  MR. BEHAR: And this property that we're looking at, how big are those  MS. GARCIA: Two acres plus.  MR. BEHAR: Okay.  MS. GARCIA: Right? Because each platted lot is one acre.  MR. TORRE: To clear up the way that this came about, you're saying that the tennis court made that the two lots together became the one site?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	because they had a tennis court on one property and that's  MR. WITHERS: I'm sorry, are you saying they were rejected because of what?  MS. GARCIA: It's two properties, and one had a tennis court accessory use to the same house, that is torn down now, the house there. So they were rejected, as far as complying with the requirements for the building site determination.  MR. BEHAR: Okay.  MS. GARCIA: So this text amendment will affect three properties. The applicant is the one to the south. I think it's Lakeside, but the south lake, that's in the middle. It's shaped yes, and also two properties on the north part of Snapper Creek.  MR. BEHAR: And let me ask a question.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	site right now.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. And typically what are the size of the other lots in comparison to these lots?  MS. GARCIA: So Snapper Creek, as subdivided, is one acre lots. Many of them are much larger than one acre.  MR. BEHAR: And this property that we're looking at, how big are those  MS. GARCIA: Two acres plus.  MR. BEHAR: Okay.  MS. GARCIA: Right? Because each platted lot is one acre.  MR. TORRE: To clear up the way that this came about, you're saying that the tennis court made that the two lots together became the one site?  MS. GARCIA: Right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	because they had a tennis court on one property and that's  MR. WITHERS: I'm sorry, are you saying they were rejected because of what?  MS. GARCIA: It's two properties, and one had a tennis court accessory use to the same house, that is torn down now, the house there. So they were rejected, as far as complying with the requirements for the building site determination.  MR. BEHAR: Okay.  MS. GARCIA: So this text amendment will affect three properties. The applicant is the one to the south. I think it's Lakeside, but the south lake, that's in the middle. It's shaped yes, and also two properties on the north part of Snapper Creek.  MR. BEHAR: And let me ask a question.  MS. GARCIA: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	site right now.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. And typically what are the size of the other lots in comparison to these lots?  MS. GARCIA: So Snapper Creek, as subdivided, is one acre lots. Many of them are much larger than one acre.  MR. BEHAR: And this property that we're looking at, how big are those  MS. GARCIA: Two acres plus.  MR. BEHAR: Okay.  MS. GARCIA: Right? Because each platted lot is one acre.  MR. TORRE: To clear up the way that this came about, you're saying that the tennis court made that the two lots together became the one site?  MS. GARCIA: Right.  (Simultaneous speaking.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	because they had a tennis court on one property and that's —  MR. WITHERS: I'm sorry, are you saying they were rejected because of what?  MS. GARCIA: It's two properties, and one had a tennis court accessory use to the same house, that is torn down now, the house there. So they were rejected, as far as complying with the requirements for the building site determination.  MR. BEHAR: Okay.  MS. GARCIA: So this text amendment will affect three properties. The applicant is the one to the south. I think it's Lakeside, but — the south lake, that's in the middle. It's shaped — yes, and also two properties on the north part of Snapper Creek.  MR. BEHAR: And let me ask a question.  MS. GARCIA: Yes.  MR. BEHAR: Based on the exhibit you're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	site right now.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. And typically what are the size of the other lots in comparison to these lots?  MS. GARCIA: So Snapper Creek, as subdivided, is one acre lots. Many of them are much larger than one acre.  MR. BEHAR: And this property that we're looking at, how big are those  MS. GARCIA: Two acres plus.  MR. BEHAR: Okay.  MS. GARCIA: Right? Because each platted lot is one acre.  MR. TORRE: To clear up the way that this came about, you're saying that the tennis court made that the two lots together became the one site?  MS. GARCIA: Right.  (Simultaneous speaking.)  MR. TORRE: They're calling it one site
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	because they had a tennis court on one property and that's  MR. WITHERS: I'm sorry, are you saying they were rejected because of what?  MS. GARCIA: It's two properties, and one had a tennis court accessory use to the same house, that is torn down now, the house there. So they were rejected, as far as complying with the requirements for the building site determination.  MR. BEHAR: Okay.  MS. GARCIA: So this text amendment will affect three properties. The applicant is the one to the south. I think it's Lakeside, but the south lake, that's in the middle. It's shaped yes, and also two properties on the north part of Snapper Creek.  MR. BEHAR: And let me ask a question.  MS. GARCIA: Yes.  MR. BEHAR: Based on the exhibit you're showing up, these property seems to be double	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	site right now.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. And typically what are the size of the other lots in comparison to these lots?  MS. GARCIA: So Snapper Creek, as subdivided, is one acre lots. Many of them are much larger than one acre.  MR. BEHAR: And this property that we're looking at, how big are those  MS. GARCIA: Two acres plus.  MR. BEHAR: Okay.  MS. GARCIA: Right? Because each platted lot is one acre.  MR. TORRE: To clear up the way that this came about, you're saying that the tennis court made that the two lots together became the one site?  MS. GARCIA: Right.  (Simultaneous speaking.)  MR. TORRE: They're calling it one site because that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	because they had a tennis court on one property and that's  MR. WITHERS: I'm sorry, are you saying they were rejected because of what?  MS. GARCIA: It's two properties, and one had a tennis court accessory use to the same house, that is torn down now, the house there. So they were rejected, as far as complying with the requirements for the building site determination.  MR. BEHAR: Okay.  MS. GARCIA: So this text amendment will affect three properties. The applicant is the one to the south. I think it's Lakeside, but the south lake, that's in the middle. It's shaped yes, and also two properties on the north part of Snapper Creek.  MR. BEHAR: And let me ask a question.  MS. GARCIA: Yes.  MR. BEHAR: Based on the exhibit you're showing up, these property seems to be double the size of the other property adjacent to it;	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	site right now.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. And typically what are the size of the other lots in comparison to these lots?  MS. GARCIA: So Snapper Creek, as subdivided, is one acre lots. Many of them are much larger than one acre.  MR. BEHAR: And this property that we're looking at, how big are those  MS. GARCIA: Two acres plus.  MR. BEHAR: Okay.  MS. GARCIA: Right? Because each platted lot is one acre.  MR. TORRE: To clear up the way that this came about, you're saying that the tennis court made that the two lots together became the one site?  MS. GARCIA: Right.  (Simultaneous speaking.)  MR. TORRE: They're calling it one site because that  MS. RUSSO: When I give my presentation, we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	because they had a tennis court on one property and that's  MR. WITHERS: I'm sorry, are you saying they were rejected because of what?  MS. GARCIA: It's two properties, and one had a tennis court accessory use to the same house, that is torn down now, the house there. So they were rejected, as far as complying with the requirements for the building site determination.  MR. BEHAR: Okay.  MS. GARCIA: So this text amendment will affect three properties. The applicant is the one to the south. I think it's Lakeside, but the south lake, that's in the middle. It's shaped yes, and also two properties on the north part of Snapper Creek.  MR. BEHAR: And let me ask a question.  MS. GARCIA: Yes.  MR. BEHAR: Based on the exhibit you're showing up, these property seems to be double the size of the other property adjacent to it; is that correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	site right now.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. And typically what are the size of the other lots in comparison to these lots?  MS. GARCIA: So Snapper Creek, as subdivided, is one acre lots. Many of them are much larger than one acre.  MR. BEHAR: And this property that we're looking at, how big are those  MS. GARCIA: Two acres plus.  MR. BEHAR: Okay.  MS. GARCIA: Right? Because each platted lot is one acre.  MR. TORRE: To clear up the way that this came about, you're saying that the tennis court made that the two lots together became the one site?  MS. GARCIA: Right.  (Simultaneous speaking.)  MR. TORRE: They're calling it one site because that  MS. RUSSO: When I give my presentation, we will get to that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	because they had a tennis court on one property and that's  MR. WITHERS: I'm sorry, are you saying they were rejected because of what?  MS. GARCIA: It's two properties, and one had a tennis court accessory use to the same house, that is torn down now, the house there. So they were rejected, as far as complying with the requirements for the building site determination.  MR. BEHAR: Okay.  MS. GARCIA: So this text amendment will affect three properties. The applicant is the one to the south. I think it's Lakeside, but the south lake, that's in the middle. It's shaped yes, and also two properties on the north part of Snapper Creek.  MR. BEHAR: And let me ask a question.  MS. GARCIA: Yes.  MR. BEHAR: Based on the exhibit you're showing up, these property seems to be double the size of the other property adjacent to it; is that correct?  MS. GARCIA: Right. So what you're seeing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	site right now.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. And typically what are the size of the other lots in comparison to these lots?  MS. GARCIA: So Snapper Creek, as subdivided, is one acre lots. Many of them are much larger than one acre.  MR. BEHAR: And this property that we're looking at, how big are those  MS. GARCIA: Two acres plus.  MR. BEHAR: Okay.  MS. GARCIA: Right? Because each platted lot is one acre.  MR. TORRE: To clear up the way that this came about, you're saying that the tennis court made that the two lots together became the one site?  MS. GARCIA: Right.  (Simultaneous speaking.)  MR. TORRE: They're calling it one site because that  MS. RUSSO: When I give my presentation, we will get to that.  MR. TORRE: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	because they had a tennis court on one property and that's  MR. WITHERS: I'm sorry, are you saying they were rejected because of what?  MS. GARCIA: It's two properties, and one had a tennis court accessory use to the same house, that is torn down now, the house there. So they were rejected, as far as complying with the requirements for the building site determination.  MR. BEHAR: Okay.  MS. GARCIA: So this text amendment will affect three properties. The applicant is the one to the south. I think it's Lakeside, but the south lake, that's in the middle. It's shaped yes, and also two properties on the north part of Snapper Creek.  MR. BEHAR: And let me ask a question.  MS. GARCIA: Yes.  MR. BEHAR: Based on the exhibit you're showing up, these property seems to be double the size of the other property adjacent to it; is that correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	site right now.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. And typically what are the size of the other lots in comparison to these lots?  MS. GARCIA: So Snapper Creek, as subdivided, is one acre lots. Many of them are much larger than one acre.  MR. BEHAR: And this property that we're looking at, how big are those  MS. GARCIA: Two acres plus.  MR. BEHAR: Okay.  MS. GARCIA: Right? Because each platted lot is one acre.  MR. TORRE: To clear up the way that this came about, you're saying that the tennis court made that the two lots together became the one site?  MS. GARCIA: Right.  (Simultaneous speaking.)  MR. TORRE: They're calling it one site because that  MS. RUSSO: When I give my presentation, we will get to that.

	Page 13		Page 14
1	lot or are they rejecting the overall of	1	this application, is the property owner
2	both	2	immediately next door, which is Lot 7, and that
3	MS. GARCIA: They rejected it as a	3	is owned by Karla Dascal and her attorney, Nina
4	buildable site for just half of it. So they	4	Boniske, is here.
5	came in for Lot 6	5	When my client
6	MS. RUSSO: Building site determination.	6	MR. BEHAR: Let me have Staff finish, and
7	MS. GARCIA: Lot 6, the south part, Lot	7	then I'll ask for your
8	8	8	MS. RUSSO: Okay.
9	MS. RUSSO: My client owns Lot 8 and they	9	MS. GARCIA: No, it's okay. It's okay.
10	said, if you are going to amend the Code	10	So the review time started, obviously, in
11	MR. BEHAR: Laura, speak into the mike, and	11	Planning and Zoning, because it's a Text
12	state your name, for the record.	12	Amendment. It will go to Commission in a
13	MS. RUSSO: Okay. Absolutely.	13	couple of weeks for First Reading.
14	Good evening, Mr. Chairman and Members of	14	Letters to property owners were sent within
15	the Board. For the record, Laura Russo, with	15	Snapper Creek itself, to all of the 127
16	offices at 2334 Ponce de Leon Boulevard. I am	16	properties, and, again, two times for mailings,
17	here this evening representing Alex Alvarez and	17	one time for website posting.
18	Maribety Alvarez, who are the owners of Lot	18	So Staff finds it consistent, based on the
19	7	19	Comprehensive Plan, as far as property rights
20	MR. WITHERS: And that's the one on the	20	go, given the fact of the history of Snapper
21	lake?	21	Creek and the intent when it was annexed in
22	MS. RUSSO: I'm sorry, Lot 8. I don't	22	1996.
23	MR. WITHERS: There it is.	23	We recommend approval with conditions, and
24	MS. RUSSO: There we go. Lot 8, Block 1,	24	the condition is very simple, is to
25	Snapper Creek Subdivision. Also, as part of	25	locate these three sentences, putting existing
	D 1F		
	Page 15		Page 16
1	subparagraphs, subsection, of the Site	1	Page 16 number.
1 2		1 2	
	subparagraphs, subsection, of the Site		number.
2	subparagraphs, subsection, of the Site Specifics, called Building Site, and clarifying	2	number.  MR. TORRE: They were sold to two different
2	subparagraphs, subsection, of the Site Specifics, called Building Site, and clarifying that sentence that kind of explains what	2 3	number.  MR. TORRE: They were sold to two different individuals?
2 3 4	subparagraphs, subsection, of the Site Specifics, called Building Site, and clarifying that sentence that kind of explains what they're trying to do, but not really, striking	2 3 4	number.  MR. TORRE: They were sold to two different individuals?  MS. GARCIA: Correct.
2 3 4 5	subparagraphs, subsection, of the Site Specifics, called Building Site, and clarifying that sentence that kind of explains what they're trying to do, but not really, striking through that and having the three new sentences	2 3 4 5	number.  MR. TORRE: They were sold to two different individuals?  MS. GARCIA: Correct.  MS. RUSSO: Right.
2 3 4 5 6	subparagraphs, subsection, of the Site Specifics, called Building Site, and clarifying that sentence that kind of explains what they're trying to do, but not really, striking through that and having the three new sentences there to clarify the intent.	2 3 4 5 6	number.  MR. TORRE: They were sold to two different individuals?  MS. GARCIA: Correct.  MS. RUSSO: Right.  MR. WITHERS: Okay. I got it. There was
2 3 4 5 6 7	subparagraphs, subsection, of the Site Specifics, called Building Site, and clarifying that sentence that kind of explains what they're trying to do, but not really, striking through that and having the three new sentences there to clarify the intent.  MR. WITHERS: So they're trying to split	2 3 4 5 6 7	number.  MR. TORRE: They were sold to two different individuals?  MS. GARCIA: Correct.  MS. RUSSO: Right.  MR. WITHERS: Okay. I got it. There was no unification of title, so they're not asking
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	subparagraphs, subsection, of the Site Specifics, called Building Site, and clarifying that sentence that kind of explains what they're trying to do, but not really, striking through that and having the three new sentences there to clarify the intent.  MR. WITHERS: So they're trying to split the lots? Is that what you're saying?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	number.  MR. TORRE: They were sold to two different individuals?  MS. GARCIA: Correct.  MS. RUSSO: Right.  MR. WITHERS: Okay. I got it. There was no unification of title, so they're not asking to split the lots, and because there was an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	subparagraphs, subsection, of the Site Specifics, called Building Site, and clarifying that sentence that kind of explains what they're trying to do, but not really, striking through that and having the three new sentences there to clarify the intent.  MR. WITHERS: So they're trying to split the lots? Is that what you're saying?  MS. GARCIA: They're trying to develop the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	number.  MR. TORRE: They were sold to two different individuals?  MS. GARCIA: Correct.  MS. RUSSO: Right.  MR. WITHERS: Okay. I got it. There was no unification of title, so they're not asking to split the lots, and because there was an encumbrance of a tennis court at one time, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	subparagraphs, subsection, of the Site Specifics, called Building Site, and clarifying that sentence that kind of explains what they're trying to do, but not really, striking through that and having the three new sentences there to clarify the intent.  MR. WITHERS: So they're trying to split the lots? Is that what you're saying?  MS. GARCIA: They're trying to develop the platted lots as single lots.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	number.  MR. TORRE: They were sold to two different individuals?  MS. GARCIA: Correct.  MS. RUSSO: Right.  MR. WITHERS: Okay. I got it. There was no unification of title, so they're not asking to split the lots, and because there was an encumbrance of a tennis court at one time, the City is not taking the position that there was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	subparagraphs, subsection, of the Site Specifics, called Building Site, and clarifying that sentence that kind of explains what they're trying to do, but not really, striking through that and having the three new sentences there to clarify the intent.  MR. WITHERS: So they're trying to split the lots? Is that what you're saying?  MS. GARCIA: They're trying to develop the platted lots as single lots.  MR. WITHERS: Right. Well, now it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	number.  MR. TORRE: They were sold to two different individuals?  MS. GARCIA: Correct.  MS. RUSSO: Right.  MR. WITHERS: Okay. I got it. There was no unification of title, so they're not asking to split the lots, and because there was an encumbrance of a tennis court at one time, the City is not taking the position that there was a structure that held the two lots together, is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	subparagraphs, subsection, of the Site Specifics, called Building Site, and clarifying that sentence that kind of explains what they're trying to do, but not really, striking through that and having the three new sentences there to clarify the intent.  MR. WITHERS: So they're trying to split the lots? Is that what you're saying?  MS. GARCIA: They're trying to develop the platted lots as single lots.  MR. WITHERS: Right. Well, now it's together. They want to have two separate buildings.  MR. BEHAR: They're not the lots are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	number.  MR. TORRE: They were sold to two different individuals?  MS. GARCIA: Correct.  MS. RUSSO: Right.  MR. WITHERS: Okay. I got it. There was no unification of title, so they're not asking to split the lots, and because there was an encumbrance of a tennis court at one time, the City is not taking the position that there was a structure that held the two lots together, is that correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	subparagraphs, subsection, of the Site Specifics, called Building Site, and clarifying that sentence that kind of explains what they're trying to do, but not really, striking through that and having the three new sentences there to clarify the intent.  MR. WITHERS: So they're trying to split the lots? Is that what you're saying?  MS. GARCIA: They're trying to develop the platted lots as single lots.  MR. WITHERS: Right. Well, now it's together. They want to have two separate buildings.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	number.  MR. TORRE: They were sold to two different individuals?  MS. GARCIA: Correct.  MS. RUSSO: Right.  MR. WITHERS: Okay. I got it. There was no unification of title, so they're not asking to split the lots, and because there was an encumbrance of a tennis court at one time, the City is not taking the position that there was a structure that held the two lots together, is that correct?  MS. GARCIA: Correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	subparagraphs, subsection, of the Site Specifics, called Building Site, and clarifying that sentence that kind of explains what they're trying to do, but not really, striking through that and having the three new sentences there to clarify the intent.  MR. WITHERS: So they're trying to split the lots? Is that what you're saying?  MS. GARCIA: They're trying to develop the platted lots as single lots.  MR. WITHERS: Right. Well, now it's together. They want to have two separate buildings.  MR. BEHAR: They're not the lots are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	number.  MR. TORRE: They were sold to two different individuals?  MS. GARCIA: Correct.  MS. RUSSO: Right.  MR. WITHERS: Okay. I got it. There was no unification of title, so they're not asking to split the lots, and because there was an encumbrance of a tennis court at one time, the City is not taking the position that there was a structure that held the two lots together, is that correct?  MS. GARCIA: Correct.  MR. WITHERS: So there's no fences or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	subparagraphs, subsection, of the Site Specifics, called Building Site, and clarifying that sentence that kind of explains what they're trying to do, but not really, striking through that and having the three new sentences there to clarify the intent.  MR. WITHERS: So they're trying to split the lots? Is that what you're saying?  MS. GARCIA: They're trying to develop the platted lots as single lots.  MR. WITHERS: Right. Well, now it's together. They want to have two separate buildings.  MR. BEHAR: They're not — the lots are split. They're platted individually.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	number.  MR. TORRE: They were sold to two different individuals?  MS. GARCIA: Correct.  MS. RUSSO: Right.  MR. WITHERS: Okay. I got it. There was no unification of title, so they're not asking to split the lots, and because there was an encumbrance of a tennis court at one time, the City is not taking the position that there was a structure that held the two lots together, is that correct?  MS. GARCIA: Correct.  MR. WITHERS: So there's no fences or driveways or structures. There was an existing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	subparagraphs, subsection, of the Site Specifics, called Building Site, and clarifying that sentence that kind of explains what they're trying to do, but not really, striking through that and having the three new sentences there to clarify the intent.  MR. WITHERS: So they're trying to split the lots? Is that what you're saying?  MS. GARCIA: They're trying to develop the platted lots as single lots.  MR. WITHERS: Right. Well, now it's together. They want to have two separate buildings.  MR. BEHAR: They're not the lots are split. They're platted individually.  MS. RUSSO: Right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	number.  MR. TORRE: They were sold to two different individuals?  MS. GARCIA: Correct.  MS. RUSSO: Right.  MR. WITHERS: Okay. I got it. There was no unification of title, so they're not asking to split the lots, and because there was an encumbrance of a tennis court at one time, the City is not taking the position that there was a structure that held the two lots together, is that correct?  MS. GARCIA: Correct.  MR. WITHERS: So there's no fences or driveways or structures. There was an existing tennis court, that was removed, and now it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	subparagraphs, subsection, of the Site Specifics, called Building Site, and clarifying that sentence that kind of explains what they're trying to do, but not really, striking through that and having the three new sentences there to clarify the intent.  MR. WITHERS: So they're trying to split the lots? Is that what you're saying?  MS. GARCIA: They're trying to develop the platted lots as single lots.  MR. WITHERS: Right. Well, now it's together. They want to have two separate buildings.  MR. BEHAR: They're not the lots are split. They're platted individually.  MS. RUSSO: Right.  MR. REVUELTA: The tennis court platted it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	number.  MR. TORRE: They were sold to two different individuals?  MS. GARCIA: Correct.  MS. RUSSO: Right.  MR. WITHERS: Okay. I got it. There was no unification of title, so they're not asking to split the lots, and because there was an encumbrance of a tennis court at one time, the City is not taking the position that there was a structure that held the two lots together, is that correct?  MS. GARCIA: Correct.  MR. WITHERS: So there's no fences or driveways or structures. There was an existing tennis court, that was removed, and now it's gone.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	subparagraphs, subsection, of the Site Specifics, called Building Site, and clarifying that sentence that kind of explains what they're trying to do, but not really, striking through that and having the three new sentences there to clarify the intent.  MR. WITHERS: So they're trying to split the lots? Is that what you're saying?  MS. GARCIA: They're trying to develop the platted lots as single lots.  MR. WITHERS: Right. Well, now it's together. They want to have two separate buildings.  MR. BEHAR: They're not — the lots are split. They're platted individually.  MS. RUSSO: Right.  MR. REVUELTA: The tennis court platted it together.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	number.  MR. TORRE: They were sold to two different individuals?  MS. GARCIA: Correct.  MS. RUSSO: Right.  MR. WITHERS: Okay. I got it. There was no unification of title, so they're not asking to split the lots, and because there was an encumbrance of a tennis court at one time, the City is not taking the position that there was a structure that held the two lots together, is that correct?  MS. GARCIA: Correct.  MR. WITHERS: So there's no fences or driveways or structures. There was an existing tennis court, that was removed, and now it's gone.  MS. GARCIA: Right. Exactly.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	subparagraphs, subsection, of the Site Specifics, called Building Site, and clarifying that sentence that kind of explains what they're trying to do, but not really, striking through that and having the three new sentences there to clarify the intent.  MR. WITHERS: So they're trying to split the lots? Is that what you're saying?  MS. GARCIA: They're trying to develop the platted lots as single lots.  MR. WITHERS: Right. Well, now it's together. They want to have two separate buildings.  MR. BEHAR: They're not — the lots are split. They're platted individually.  MS. RUSSO: Right.  MR. REVUELTA: The tennis court platted it together.  MR. WITHERS: I understand.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	number.  MR. TORRE: They were sold to two different individuals?  MS. GARCIA: Correct.  MS. RUSSO: Right.  MR. WITHERS: Okay. I got it. There was no unification of title, so they're not asking to split the lots, and because there was an encumbrance of a tennis court at one time, the City is not taking the position that there was a structure that held the two lots together, is that correct?  MS. GARCIA: Correct.  MR. WITHERS: So there's no fences or driveways or structures. There was an existing tennis court, that was removed, and now it's gone.  MS. GARCIA: Right. Exactly.  MR. WITHERS: Okay. But they are two
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	subparagraphs, subsection, of the Site Specifics, called Building Site, and clarifying that sentence that kind of explains what they're trying to do, but not really, striking through that and having the three new sentences there to clarify the intent.  MR. WITHERS: So they're trying to split the lots? Is that what you're saying?  MS. GARCIA: They're trying to develop the platted lots as single lots.  MR. WITHERS: Right. Well, now it's together. They want to have two separate buildings.  MR. BEHAR: They're not the lots are split. They're platted individually.  MS. RUSSO: Right.  MR. REVUELTA: The tennis court platted it together.  MR. WITHERS: I understand.  MS. GARCIA: They're not unified.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	number.  MR. TORRE: They were sold to two different individuals?  MS. GARCIA: Correct.  MS. RUSSO: Right.  MR. WITHERS: Okay. I got it. There was no unification of title, so they're not asking to split the lots, and because there was an encumbrance of a tennis court at one time, the City is not taking the position that there was a structure that held the two lots together, is that correct?  MS. GARCIA: Correct.  MR. WITHERS: So there's no fences or driveways or structures. There was an existing tennis court, that was removed, and now it's gone.  MS. GARCIA: Right. Exactly.  MR. WITHERS: Okay. But they are two separately platted lots?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	subparagraphs, subsection, of the Site Specifics, called Building Site, and clarifying that sentence that kind of explains what they're trying to do, but not really, striking through that and having the three new sentences there to clarify the intent.  MR. WITHERS: So they're trying to split the lots? Is that what you're saying?  MS. GARCIA: They're trying to develop the platted lots as single lots.  MR. WITHERS: Right. Well, now it's together. They want to have two separate buildings.  MR. BEHAR: They're not the lots are split. They're platted individually.  MS. RUSSO: Right.  MR. REVUELTA: The tennis court platted it together.  MR. WITHERS: I understand.  MS. GARCIA: They're not unified.  MR. WITHERS: That there was no unification	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	number.  MR. TORRE: They were sold to two different individuals?  MS. GARCIA: Correct.  MS. RUSSO: Right.  MR. WITHERS: Okay. I got it. There was no unification of title, so they're not asking to split the lots, and because there was an encumbrance of a tennis court at one time, the City is not taking the position that there was a structure that held the two lots together, is that correct?  MS. GARCIA: Correct.  MR. WITHERS: So there's no fences or driveways or structures. There was an existing tennis court, that was removed, and now it's gone.  MS. GARCIA: Right. Exactly.  MR. WITHERS: Okay. But they are two separately platted lots?  MS. GARCIA: With two separate folios.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	subparagraphs, subsection, of the Site Specifics, called Building Site, and clarifying that sentence that kind of explains what they're trying to do, but not really, striking through that and having the three new sentences there to clarify the intent.  MR. WITHERS: So they're trying to split the lots? Is that what you're saying?  MS. GARCIA: They're trying to develop the platted lots as single lots.  MR. WITHERS: Right. Well, now it's together. They want to have two separate buildings.  MR. BEHAR: They're not — the lots are split. They're platted individually.  MS. RUSSO: Right.  MR. REVUELTA: The tennis court platted it together.  MR. WITHERS: I understand.  MS. GARCIA: They're not unified.  MR. WITHERS: That there was no unification of title, I assume.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	number.  MR. TORRE: They were sold to two different individuals?  MS. GARCIA: Correct.  MS. RUSSO: Right.  MR. WITHERS: Okay. I got it. There was no unification of title, so they're not asking to split the lots, and because there was an encumbrance of a tennis court at one time, the City is not taking the position that there was a structure that held the two lots together, is that correct?  MS. GARCIA: Correct.  MR. WITHERS: So there's no fences or driveways or structures. There was an existing tennis court, that was removed, and now it's gone.  MS. GARCIA: Right. Exactly.  MR. WITHERS: Okay. But they are two separately platted lots?  MS. GARCIA: With two separate folios.  MR. WITHERS: Owned by two different
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	subparagraphs, subsection, of the Site Specifics, called Building Site, and clarifying that sentence that kind of explains what they're trying to do, but not really, striking through that and having the three new sentences there to clarify the intent.  MR. WITHERS: So they're trying to split the lots? Is that what you're saying?  MS. GARCIA: They're trying to develop the platted lots as single lots.  MR. WITHERS: Right. Well, now it's together. They want to have two separate buildings.  MR. BEHAR: They're not the lots are split. They're platted individually.  MS. RUSSO: Right.  MR. REVUELTA: The tennis court platted it together.  MR. WITHERS: I understand.  MS. GARCIA: They're not unified.  MR. WITHERS: That there was no unification of title, I assume.  MS. GARCIA: Correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	number.  MR. TORRE: They were sold to two different individuals?  MS. GARCIA: Correct.  MS. RUSSO: Right.  MR. WITHERS: Okay. I got it. There was no unification of title, so they're not asking to split the lots, and because there was an encumbrance of a tennis court at one time, the City is not taking the position that there was a structure that held the two lots together, is that correct?  MS. GARCIA: Correct.  MR. WITHERS: So there's no fences or driveways or structures. There was an existing tennis court, that was removed, and now it's gone.  MS. GARCIA: Right. Exactly.  MR. WITHERS: Okay. But they are two separately platted lots?  MS. GARCIA: With two separate folios.  MR. WITHERS: Owned by two different people?

	Page 17		Page 18
1	MR. BEHAR: Okay.	1	2021. Again, that owner, Karla Dascal, was
2	MS. RUSSO: I'll give you a history.	2	represented by a real estate attorney. There
3	MR. WITHERS: Okay. No, I just want to	3	were no unities of title, no restrictive
4	make sure I'm on Staff's I got it. Okay.	4	covenant, nothing.
5	MR. BEHAR: Does that conclude	5	The property was improved with a house in
6	MS. GARCIA: Yes, it does.	6	1970, and sometime between 1970 a few years
7	MR. BEHAR: Okay. Thank you, Jennifer.	7	later Snapper Creek was annexed in 1996 a
8	Now we're going to open it up to the	8	tennis court was built on the adjacent lot. At
9	applicant. Ms. Russo.	9	no time, did either the house or the tennis
10	MR. RUSSO: So to give a little history,	10	court violate any of the setbacks.
11	that I think will clarify and answer a lot of	11	MR. WITHERS: Violate any of, what?
12	the questions, the subject properties are two	12	MS. RUSSO: Any of the setbacks, any
13	platted lots. They've always been platted	13	setback.
14	lots. My clients' lot is 57,500 square feet	14	MR. WITHERS: Okay.
15	platted, and the neighboring property, the	15	MS. RUSSO: So Snapper Creek has its own
16	other vacant lot, is 62,000 square feet, also a	16	setback restriction.
17	platted lot. So the minimum in Snapper Creek	17	So the owner of the lot, in 2018, applied
18	is one acre, but most of the properties are	18	for a demolition permit, obtained that permit,
19	significantly over an acre as platted lots.	19	demolished both structures, and then put the
20	So my client bought the lot in December of	20	property on the market and sold it. Both
21	2020, and it was a vacant lot. He had a real	21	properties were sold, one each, to different
22	estate attorney represent him. And there was	22	individuals.
23	nothing on title that in any way indicated that	23	They submitted their application to the
24	this property was tied to the adjacent lot.	24	Snapper Creek Homeowners Association, which
25	The adjacent lot was purchased in August of	25	requires approval. They treated each property
23	The adjacent for was parenased in August of		requires approvair. They dedied each property
	Page 19		Page 20
1	as a separate building site. And when my	1	Hammocky nature of Snapper Creek, which they've
1 2	as a separate building site. And when my client hired an architect and had plans	1 2	Hammocky nature of Snapper Creek, which they've never wanted to lose, which was why they were
2	client hired an architect and had plans	2	never wanted to lose, which was why they were
2 3	client hired an architect and had plans processed and submitted his preliminary plans	2 3	never wanted to lose, which was why they were assured that all of their specific requirements
2 3 4	client hired an architect and had plans processed and submitted his preliminary plans to the City of Coral Gables, it was when he was	2 3 4	never wanted to lose, which was why they were assured that all of their specific requirements would be incorporated via the Site Specifics.
2 3 4 5	client hired an architect and had plans processed and submitted his preliminary plans to the City of Coral Gables, it was when he was advised that it could not move forward, because	2 3 4 5	never wanted to lose, which was why they were assured that all of their specific requirements would be incorporated via the Site Specifics.  And so we have this situation where, in
2 3 4 5 6	client hired an architect and had plans processed and submitted his preliminary plans to the City of Coral Gables, it was when he was advised that it could not move forward, because this property was once a part of the adjacent	2 3 4 5 6	never wanted to lose, which was why they were assured that all of their specific requirements would be incorporated via the Site Specifics.  And so we have this situation where, in Dade County, because there was no unity of
2 3 4 5 6 7	client hired an architect and had plans processed and submitted his preliminary plans to the City of Coral Gables, it was when he was advised that it could not move forward, because this property was once a part of the adjacent lot and could not be developed separately. He	2 3 4 5 6 7	never wanted to lose, which was why they were assured that all of their specific requirements would be incorporated via the Site Specifics.  And so we have this situation where, in Dade County, because there was no unity of title, there was nothing that tied the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	client hired an architect and had plans processed and submitted his preliminary plans to the City of Coral Gables, it was when he was advised that it could not move forward, because this property was once a part of the adjacent lot and could not be developed separately. He needed to get a building site determination.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	never wanted to lose, which was why they were assured that all of their specific requirements would be incorporated via the Site Specifics.  And so we have this situation where, in Dade County, because there was no unity of title, there was nothing that tied the properties together, no permits were pulled in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	client hired an architect and had plans processed and submitted his preliminary plans to the City of Coral Gables, it was when he was advised that it could not move forward, because this property was once a part of the adjacent lot and could not be developed separately. He needed to get a building site determination. The architect submitted for a building site	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	never wanted to lose, which was why they were assured that all of their specific requirements would be incorporated via the Site Specifics.  And so we have this situation where, in Dade County, because there was no unity of title, there was nothing that tied the properties together, no permits were pulled in the City of Coral Gables that tied the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	client hired an architect and had plans processed and submitted his preliminary plans to the City of Coral Gables, it was when he was advised that it could not move forward, because this property was once a part of the adjacent lot and could not be developed separately. He needed to get a building site determination. The architect submitted for a building site determination and it was turned down.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	never wanted to lose, which was why they were assured that all of their specific requirements would be incorporated via the Site Specifics.  And so we have this situation where, in Dade County, because there was no unity of title, there was nothing that tied the properties together, no permits were pulled in the City of Coral Gables that tied the properties together
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	client hired an architect and had plans processed and submitted his preliminary plans to the City of Coral Gables, it was when he was advised that it could not move forward, because this property was once a part of the adjacent lot and could not be developed separately. He needed to get a building site determination. The architect submitted for a building site determination and it was turned down. So I went to visit the City Attorney, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	never wanted to lose, which was why they were assured that all of their specific requirements would be incorporated via the Site Specifics.  And so we have this situation where, in Dade County, because there was no unity of title, there was nothing that tied the properties together, no permits were pulled in the City of Coral Gables that tied the properties together  MR. WITHERS: So that was my question. So
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	client hired an architect and had plans processed and submitted his preliminary plans to the City of Coral Gables, it was when he was advised that it could not move forward, because this property was once a part of the adjacent lot and could not be developed separately. He needed to get a building site determination. The architect submitted for a building site determination and it was turned down. So I went to visit the City Attorney, and we discussed how the annexation and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	never wanted to lose, which was why they were assured that all of their specific requirements would be incorporated via the Site Specifics.  And so we have this situation where, in Dade County, because there was no unity of title, there was nothing that tied the properties together, no permits were pulled in the City of Coral Gables that tied the properties together  MR. WITHERS: So that was my question. So the tennis court was built without a permit?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	client hired an architect and had plans processed and submitted his preliminary plans to the City of Coral Gables, it was when he was advised that it could not move forward, because this property was once a part of the adjacent lot and could not be developed separately. He needed to get a building site determination. The architect submitted for a building site determination and it was turned down.  So I went to visit the City Attorney, and we discussed how the annexation and the specific Site Specifics for Snapper Creek were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	never wanted to lose, which was why they were assured that all of their specific requirements would be incorporated via the Site Specifics.  And so we have this situation where, in Dade County, because there was no unity of title, there was nothing that tied the properties together, no permits were pulled in the City of Coral Gables that tied the properties together  MR. WITHERS: So that was my question. So the tennis court was built without a permit?  MR. RUSSO: It was built with a permit, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	client hired an architect and had plans processed and submitted his preliminary plans to the City of Coral Gables, it was when he was advised that it could not move forward, because this property was once a part of the adjacent lot and could not be developed separately. He needed to get a building site determination. The architect submitted for a building site determination and it was turned down.  So I went to visit the City Attorney, and we discussed how the annexation and the specific Site Specifics for Snapper Creek were there, because at the time Snapper Creek was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	never wanted to lose, which was why they were assured that all of their specific requirements would be incorporated via the Site Specifics.  And so we have this situation where, in Dade County, because there was no unity of title, there was nothing that tied the properties together, no permits were pulled in the City of Coral Gables that tied the properties together  MR. WITHERS: So that was my question. So the tennis court was built without a permit?  MR. RUSSO: It was built with a permit, but under the County. It wasn't built it was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	client hired an architect and had plans processed and submitted his preliminary plans to the City of Coral Gables, it was when he was advised that it could not move forward, because this property was once a part of the adjacent lot and could not be developed separately. He needed to get a building site determination. The architect submitted for a building site determination and it was turned down. So I went to visit the City Attorney, and we discussed how the annexation and the specific Site Specifics for Snapper Creek were there, because at the time Snapper Creek was very worried that their way of life and their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	never wanted to lose, which was why they were assured that all of their specific requirements would be incorporated via the Site Specifics.  And so we have this situation where, in Dade County, because there was no unity of title, there was nothing that tied the properties together, no permits were pulled in the City of Coral Gables that tied the properties together  MR. WITHERS: So that was my question. So the tennis court was built without a permit?  MR. RUSSO: It was built with a permit, but under the County. It wasn't built it was built way before the property was annexed.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	client hired an architect and had plans processed and submitted his preliminary plans to the City of Coral Gables, it was when he was advised that it could not move forward, because this property was once a part of the adjacent lot and could not be developed separately. He needed to get a building site determination. The architect submitted for a building site determination and it was turned down.  So I went to visit the City Attorney, and we discussed how the annexation and the specific Site Specifics for Snapper Creek were there, because at the time Snapper Creek was very worried that their way of life and their restrictions, which are much greater than the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	never wanted to lose, which was why they were assured that all of their specific requirements would be incorporated via the Site Specifics.  And so we have this situation where, in Dade County, because there was no unity of title, there was nothing that tied the properties together, no permits were pulled in the City of Coral Gables that tied the properties together  MR. WITHERS: So that was my question. So the tennis court was built without a permit?  MR. RUSSO: It was built with a permit, but under the County. It wasn't built it was built way before the property was annexed.  MR. WITHERS: 1970 something.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	client hired an architect and had plans processed and submitted his preliminary plans to the City of Coral Gables, it was when he was advised that it could not move forward, because this property was once a part of the adjacent lot and could not be developed separately. He needed to get a building site determination. The architect submitted for a building site determination and it was turned down.  So I went to visit the City Attorney, and we discussed how the annexation and the specific Site Specifics for Snapper Creek were there, because at the time Snapper Creek was very worried that their way of life and their restrictions, which are much greater than the City of Coral Gables, would go away. And so	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	never wanted to lose, which was why they were assured that all of their specific requirements would be incorporated via the Site Specifics.  And so we have this situation where, in Dade County, because there was no unity of title, there was nothing that tied the properties together, no permits were pulled in the City of Coral Gables that tied the properties together  MR. WITHERS: So that was my question. So the tennis court was built without a permit?  MR. RUSSO: It was built with a permit, but under the County. It wasn't built it was built way before the property was annexed.  MR. WITHERS: 1970 something.  MS. RUSSO: Yeah, in '70 something.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	client hired an architect and had plans processed and submitted his preliminary plans to the City of Coral Gables, it was when he was advised that it could not move forward, because this property was once a part of the adjacent lot and could not be developed separately. He needed to get a building site determination. The architect submitted for a building site determination and it was turned down.  So I went to visit the City Attorney, and we discussed how the annexation and the specific Site Specifics for Snapper Creek were there, because at the time Snapper Creek was very worried that their way of life and their restrictions, which are much greater than the City of Coral Gables, would go away. And so there is a whole section of Site Specifics for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	never wanted to lose, which was why they were assured that all of their specific requirements would be incorporated via the Site Specifics.  And so we have this situation where, in Dade County, because there was no unity of title, there was nothing that tied the properties together, no permits were pulled in the City of Coral Gables that tied the properties together  MR. WITHERS: So that was my question. So the tennis court was built without a permit?  MR. RUSSO: It was built with a permit, but under the County. It wasn't built it was built way before the property was annexed.  MR. WITHERS: 1970 something.  MS. RUSSO: Yeah, in '70 something.  MR. REVUELTA: And was it built by the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	client hired an architect and had plans processed and submitted his preliminary plans to the City of Coral Gables, it was when he was advised that it could not move forward, because this property was once a part of the adjacent lot and could not be developed separately. He needed to get a building site determination. The architect submitted for a building site determination and it was turned down.  So I went to visit the City Attorney, and we discussed how the annexation and the specific Site Specifics for Snapper Creek were there, because at the time Snapper Creek was very worried that their way of life and their restrictions, which are much greater than the City of Coral Gables, would go away. And so there is a whole section of Site Specifics for Snapper Creek. For example, one of the biggest	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	never wanted to lose, which was why they were assured that all of their specific requirements would be incorporated via the Site Specifics.  And so we have this situation where, in Dade County, because there was no unity of title, there was nothing that tied the properties together, no permits were pulled in the City of Coral Gables that tied the properties together  MR. WITHERS: So that was my question. So the tennis court was built without a permit?  MR. RUSSO: It was built with a permit, but under the County. It wasn't built it was built way before the property was annexed.  MR. WITHERS: 1970 something.  MS. RUSSO: Yeah, in '70 something.  MR. REVUELTA: And was it built by the owner of the lot next to it?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	client hired an architect and had plans processed and submitted his preliminary plans to the City of Coral Gables, it was when he was advised that it could not move forward, because this property was once a part of the adjacent lot and could not be developed separately. He needed to get a building site determination. The architect submitted for a building site determination and it was turned down.  So I went to visit the City Attorney, and we discussed how the annexation and the specific Site Specifics for Snapper Creek were there, because at the time Snapper Creek was very worried that their way of life and their restrictions, which are much greater than the City of Coral Gables, would go away. And so there is a whole section of Site Specifics for Snapper Creek. For example, one of the biggest is, their lot coverage is only 15 percent.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	never wanted to lose, which was why they were assured that all of their specific requirements would be incorporated via the Site Specifics.  And so we have this situation where, in Dade County, because there was no unity of title, there was nothing that tied the properties together, no permits were pulled in the City of Coral Gables that tied the properties together  MR. WITHERS: So that was my question. So the tennis court was built without a permit?  MR. RUSSO: It was built with a permit, but under the County. It wasn't built it was built way before the property was annexed.  MR. WITHERS: 1970 something.  MS. RUSSO: Yeah, in '70 something.  MR. REVUELTA: And was it built by the owner of the lot next to it?  MS. RUSSO: Yes, it was built by the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	client hired an architect and had plans processed and submitted his preliminary plans to the City of Coral Gables, it was when he was advised that it could not move forward, because this property was once a part of the adjacent lot and could not be developed separately. He needed to get a building site determination. The architect submitted for a building site determination and it was turned down.  So I went to visit the City Attorney, and we discussed how the annexation and the specific Site Specifics for Snapper Creek were there, because at the time Snapper Creek was very worried that their way of life and their restrictions, which are much greater than the City of Coral Gables, would go away. And so there is a whole section of Site Specifics for Snapper Creek. For example, one of the biggest is, their lot coverage is only 15 percent.  We're used to, in the rest of Coral Gables,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	never wanted to lose, which was why they were assured that all of their specific requirements would be incorporated via the Site Specifics.  And so we have this situation where, in Dade County, because there was no unity of title, there was nothing that tied the properties together, no permits were pulled in the City of Coral Gables that tied the properties together  MR. WITHERS: So that was my question. So the tennis court was built without a permit?  MR. RUSSO: It was built with a permit, but under the County. It wasn't built it was built way before the property was annexed.  MR. WITHERS: 1970 something.  MS. RUSSO: Yeah, in '70 something.  MR. REVUELTA: And was it built by the owner of the lot next to it?  MS. RUSSO: Yes, it was built by the owner so the house was built in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	client hired an architect and had plans processed and submitted his preliminary plans to the City of Coral Gables, it was when he was advised that it could not move forward, because this property was once a part of the adjacent lot and could not be developed separately. He needed to get a building site determination. The architect submitted for a building site determination and it was turned down.  So I went to visit the City Attorney, and we discussed how the annexation and the specific Site Specifics for Snapper Creek were there, because at the time Snapper Creek was very worried that their way of life and their restrictions, which are much greater than the City of Coral Gables, would go away. And so there is a whole section of Site Specifics for Snapper Creek. For example, one of the biggest is, their lot coverage is only 15 percent.  We're used to, in the rest of Coral Gables, it's 35 percent, and with auxiliary structures,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	never wanted to lose, which was why they were assured that all of their specific requirements would be incorporated via the Site Specifics.  And so we have this situation where, in Dade County, because there was no unity of title, there was nothing that tied the properties together, no permits were pulled in the City of Coral Gables that tied the properties together  MR. WITHERS: So that was my question. So the tennis court was built without a permit?  MR. RUSSO: It was built with a permit, but under the County. It wasn't built it was built way before the property was annexed.  MR. WITHERS: 1970 something.  MS. RUSSO: Yeah, in '70 something.  MR. REVUELTA: And was it built by the owner of the lot next to it?  MS. RUSSO: Yes, it was built by the owner so the house was built in  MR. BEHAR: There's no unity of title
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	client hired an architect and had plans processed and submitted his preliminary plans to the City of Coral Gables, it was when he was advised that it could not move forward, because this property was once a part of the adjacent lot and could not be developed separately. He needed to get a building site determination. The architect submitted for a building site determination and it was turned down.  So I went to visit the City Attorney, and we discussed how the annexation and the specific Site Specifics for Snapper Creek were there, because at the time Snapper Creek was very worried that their way of life and their restrictions, which are much greater than the City of Coral Gables, would go away. And so there is a whole section of Site Specifics for Snapper Creek. For example, one of the biggest is, their lot coverage is only 15 percent.  We're used to, in the rest of Coral Gables, it's 35 percent, and with auxiliary structures, you get 45 percent. In Snapper Creek, it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	never wanted to lose, which was why they were assured that all of their specific requirements would be incorporated via the Site Specifics.  And so we have this situation where, in Dade County, because there was no unity of title, there was nothing that tied the properties together, no permits were pulled in the City of Coral Gables that tied the properties together  MR. WITHERS: So that was my question. So the tennis court was built without a permit?  MR. RUSSO: It was built with a permit, but under the County. It wasn't built it was built way before the property was annexed.  MR. WITHERS: 1970 something.  MS. RUSSO: Yeah, in '70 something.  MR. REVUELTA: And was it built by the owner of the lot next to it?  MS. RUSSO: Yes, it was built by the owner so the house was built in  MR. BEHAR: There's no unity of title attached to

	Page 21		Page 22
1	attorneys. I know them well. There were no	1	two properties, one has a house, one has a
2	unities of title. That obviously would have	2	driveway. I worked with the City Attorney. We
3	alerted them immediately.	3	did a very specific unity of title, because the
4	So, at the time, in the County, if you had	4	only reason he has a driveway is because the
5	a tennis court, and you tore the tennis court	5	gardeners have no other way to access that huge
6	down, you could sell that property and it would	6	lot, because the connection between the two
7	be a buildable lot. Not in the Gables, but in	7	properties sits at the mouth of the lake.
8	the County, you would have.	8	And the other property, you know, when the
9	MR. WITHERS: Okay.	9	time comes right now there is no thought
10	MS. RUSSO: So it was never the intent to	10	that it's going to happen, and
11	take away that ability.	11	MR. BEHAR: You know, we're not going to be
12	Now, if you build like we have here, if	12	looking at those. We're looking at this one.
13	you own one lot and you buy the lot next door	13	MS. RUSSO: Correct.
14	and you build a house that crosses over, okay,	14	MR. BEHAR: To me, it makes no sense,
15	different story, but in Snapper Creek, as long	15	but we know
16	as you build within that property and your	16	MS. RUSSO: Right.
17	accessory use is within, you know, the setback	17	So we are here with a proposal that would
18	lines, at the demolition of the accessory use,	18	exempt the Snapper Creek Subdivision from
19	that becomes a buildable lot.	19	following the lot separation ordinance, which
20	And so, you know, in order to be able to	20	this couldn't the main reason I mean, if
21	have both property owners be able to use their	21	we could just have gone and gone through the
22	property, this was the way to do it. And	22	process, but the process requires you own the
23	there's only three other properties, as	23	property for ten years. And, you know, while
24	Jennifer mentioned, that could possibly be	24	we met that there were unusual circumstances,
25	affected. One of them is a gentleman who owns	25	the fact that there had once been voluntary
	Page 23		Daga 24
			Page 24
1	demolition also took it out of the ability to	1	MR. WITHERS: I understand that.
1 2	demolition also took it out of the ability to get a Conditional Use.	1 2	
	get a Conditional Use.  So it was never the intent, when Snapper		MR. WITHERS: I understand that.
2	get a Conditional Use.	2	MR. WITHERS: I understand that. MR. COLLER: So what this provision does
2	get a Conditional Use.  So it was never the intent, when Snapper	2 3	MR. WITHERS: I understand that.  MR. COLLER: So what this provision does is, it says, any lots that were separately platted as of the date, I guess, 1996  MS. RUSSO: Of annexation in '96.
2 3 4	get a Conditional Use.  So it was never the intent, when Snapper Creek was annexed, that it would be deprived of	2 3 4	MR. WITHERS: I understand that.  MR. COLLER: So what this provision does is, it says, any lots that were separately platted as of the date, I guess, 1996  MS. RUSSO: Of annexation in '96.  MR. COLLER: annexation, all of those
2 3 4 5	get a Conditional Use.  So it was never the intent, when Snapper Creek was annexed, that it would be deprived of the rights that it had at the time.  MR. WITHERS: I don't understand something, Laura.	2 3 4 5	MR. WITHERS: I understand that.  MR. COLLER: So what this provision does is, it says, any lots that were separately platted as of the date, I guess, 1996  MS. RUSSO: Of annexation in '96.  MR. COLLER: annexation, all of those lots that were separately platted, are allowed
2 3 4 5 6	get a Conditional Use.  So it was never the intent, when Snapper Creek was annexed, that it would be deprived of the rights that it had at the time.  MR. WITHERS: I don't understand something, Laura.  MS. RUSSO: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6	MR. WITHERS: I understand that.  MR. COLLER: So what this provision does is, it says, any lots that were separately platted as of the date, I guess, 1996  MS. RUSSO: Of annexation in '96.  MR. COLLER: annexation, all of those lots that were separately platted, are allowed to have separate units on them. They won't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	get a Conditional Use.  So it was never the intent, when Snapper Creek was annexed, that it would be deprived of the rights that it had at the time.  MR. WITHERS: I don't understand something, Laura.  MS. RUSSO: Yes. MR. WITHERS: If they're two separate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. WITHERS: I understand that.  MR. COLLER: So what this provision does is, it says, any lots that were separately platted as of the date, I guess, 1996  MS. RUSSO: Of annexation in '96.  MR. COLLER: annexation, all of those lots that were separately platted, are allowed to have separate units on them. They won't have to go through this process, so and the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	get a Conditional Use.  So it was never the intent, when Snapper Creek was annexed, that it would be deprived of the rights that it had at the time.  MR. WITHERS: I don't understand something, Laura.  MS. RUSSO: Yes.  MR. WITHERS: If they're two separate owners, the lots are already split.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. WITHERS: I understand that.  MR. COLLER: So what this provision does is, it says, any lots that were separately platted as of the date, I guess, 1996  MS. RUSSO: Of annexation in '96.  MR. COLLER: annexation, all of those lots that were separately platted, are allowed to have separate units on them. They won't have to go through this process, so and the reason why this particular property was caught
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	get a Conditional Use.  So it was never the intent, when Snapper Creek was annexed, that it would be deprived of the rights that it had at the time.  MR. WITHERS: I don't understand something, Laura.  MS. RUSSO: Yes.  MR. WITHERS: If they're two separate owners, the lots are already split.  MS. RUSSO: Well, correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. WITHERS: I understand that.  MR. COLLER: So what this provision does is, it says, any lots that were separately platted as of the date, I guess, 1996  MS. RUSSO: Of annexation in '96.  MR. COLLER: annexation, all of those lots that were separately platted, are allowed to have separate units on them. They won't have to go through this process, so and the reason why this particular property was caught up in it is because there was a tennis court,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	get a Conditional Use.  So it was never the intent, when Snapper Creek was annexed, that it would be deprived of the rights that it had at the time.  MR. WITHERS: I don't understand something, Laura.  MS. RUSSO: Yes.  MR. WITHERS: If they're two separate owners, the lots are already split.  MS. RUSSO: Well, correct.  MR. WITHERS: What do you mean you're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. WITHERS: I understand that.  MR. COLLER: So what this provision does is, it says, any lots that were separately platted as of the date, I guess, 1996  MS. RUSSO: Of annexation in '96.  MR. COLLER: annexation, all of those lots that were separately platted, are allowed to have separate units on them. They won't have to go through this process, so and the reason why this particular property was caught up in it is because there was a tennis court, it wasn't a unity of title. It was just that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	get a Conditional Use.  So it was never the intent, when Snapper Creek was annexed, that it would be deprived of the rights that it had at the time.  MR. WITHERS: I don't understand something, Laura.  MS. RUSSO: Yes.  MR. WITHERS: If they're two separate owners, the lots are already split.  MS. RUSSO: Well, correct.  MR. WITHERS: What do you mean you're trying to remove yourself of the requirement of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. WITHERS: I understand that.  MR. COLLER: So what this provision does is, it says, any lots that were separately platted as of the date, I guess, 1996  MS. RUSSO: Of annexation in '96.  MR. COLLER: annexation, all of those lots that were separately platted, are allowed to have separate units on them. They won't have to go through this process, so and the reason why this particular property was caught up in it is because there was a tennis court, it wasn't a unity of title. It was just that he took a separate property and put a tennis
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	get a Conditional Use.  So it was never the intent, when Snapper Creek was annexed, that it would be deprived of the rights that it had at the time.  MR. WITHERS: I don't understand something, Laura.  MS. RUSSO: Yes.  MR. WITHERS: If they're two separate owners, the lots are already split.  MS. RUSSO: Well, correct.  MR. WITHERS: What do you mean you're trying to remove yourself of the requirement of the lot separation process, since they're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. WITHERS: I understand that.  MR. COLLER: So what this provision does is, it says, any lots that were separately platted as of the date, I guess, 1996  MS. RUSSO: Of annexation in '96.  MR. COLLER: annexation, all of those lots that were separately platted, are allowed to have separate units on them. They won't have to go through this process, so and the reason why this particular property was caught up in it is because there was a tennis court, it wasn't a unity of title. It was just that he took a separate property and put a tennis court on it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	get a Conditional Use.  So it was never the intent, when Snapper Creek was annexed, that it would be deprived of the rights that it had at the time.  MR. WITHERS: I don't understand something, Laura.  MS. RUSSO: Yes.  MR. WITHERS: If they're two separate owners, the lots are already split.  MS. RUSSO: Well, correct.  MR. WITHERS: What do you mean you're trying to remove yourself of the requirement of the lot separation process, since they're already split?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. WITHERS: I understand that.  MR. COLLER: So what this provision does is, it says, any lots that were separately platted as of the date, I guess, 1996  MS. RUSSO: Of annexation in '96.  MR. COLLER: annexation, all of those lots that were separately platted, are allowed to have separate units on them. They won't have to go through this process, so and the reason why this particular property was caught up in it is because there was a tennis court, it wasn't a unity of title. It was just that he took a separate property and put a tennis court on it.  But in theory, if he had been under the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	get a Conditional Use.  So it was never the intent, when Snapper Creek was annexed, that it would be deprived of the rights that it had at the time.  MR. WITHERS: I don't understand something, Laura.  MS. RUSSO: Yes.  MR. WITHERS: If they're two separate owners, the lots are already split.  MS. RUSSO: Well, correct.  MR. WITHERS: What do you mean you're trying to remove yourself of the requirement of the lot separation process, since they're already split?  MS. RUSSO: Well, because when they went to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. WITHERS: I understand that.  MR. COLLER: So what this provision does is, it says, any lots that were separately platted as of the date, I guess, 1996  MS. RUSSO: Of annexation in '96.  MR. COLLER: annexation, all of those lots that were separately platted, are allowed to have separate units on them. They won't have to go through this process, so and the reason why this particular property was caught up in it is because there was a tennis court, it wasn't a unity of title. It was just that he took a separate property and put a tennis court on it.  But in theory, if he had been under the County, the County they could have built a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	get a Conditional Use.  So it was never the intent, when Snapper Creek was annexed, that it would be deprived of the rights that it had at the time.  MR. WITHERS: I don't understand something, Laura.  MS. RUSSO: Yes.  MR. WITHERS: If they're two separate owners, the lots are already split.  MS. RUSSO: Well, correct.  MR. WITHERS: What do you mean you're trying to remove yourself of the requirement of the lot separation process, since they're already split?  MS. RUSSO: Well, because when they went to submit the plans for the architectural board	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. WITHERS: I understand that.  MR. COLLER: So what this provision does is, it says, any lots that were separately platted as of the date, I guess, 1996  MS. RUSSO: Of annexation in '96.  MR. COLLER: annexation, all of those lots that were separately platted, are allowed to have separate units on them. They won't have to go through this process, so and the reason why this particular property was caught up in it is because there was a tennis court, it wasn't a unity of title. It was just that he took a separate property and put a tennis court on it.  But in theory, if he had been under the County, the County they could have built a separate building.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	get a Conditional Use.  So it was never the intent, when Snapper Creek was annexed, that it would be deprived of the rights that it had at the time.  MR. WITHERS: I don't understand something, Laura.  MS. RUSSO: Yes.  MR. WITHERS: If they're two separate owners, the lots are already split.  MS. RUSSO: Well, correct.  MR. WITHERS: What do you mean you're trying to remove yourself of the requirement of the lot separation process, since they're already split?  MS. RUSSO: Well, because when they went to submit the plans for the architectural board for one lot, the City said, we will not accept	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. WITHERS: I understand that.  MR. COLLER: So what this provision does is, it says, any lots that were separately platted as of the date, I guess, 1996  MS. RUSSO: Of annexation in '96.  MR. COLLER: annexation, all of those lots that were separately platted, are allowed to have separate units on them. They won't have to go through this process, so and the reason why this particular property was caught up in it is because there was a tennis court, it wasn't a unity of title. It was just that he took a separate property and put a tennis court on it.  But in theory, if he had been under the County, the County they could have built a separate building.  MS. RUSSO: Right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	get a Conditional Use.  So it was never the intent, when Snapper Creek was annexed, that it would be deprived of the rights that it had at the time.  MR. WITHERS: I don't understand something, Laura.  MS. RUSSO: Yes.  MR. WITHERS: If they're two separate owners, the lots are already split.  MS. RUSSO: Well, correct.  MR. WITHERS: What do you mean you're trying to remove yourself of the requirement of the lot separation process, since they're already split?  MS. RUSSO: Well, because when they went to submit the plans for the architectural board for one lot, the City said, we will not accept them, because we still think they are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. WITHERS: I understand that.  MR. COLLER: So what this provision does is, it says, any lots that were separately platted as of the date, I guess, 1996  MS. RUSSO: Of annexation in '96.  MR. COLLER: annexation, all of those lots that were separately platted, are allowed to have separate units on them. They won't have to go through this process, so and the reason why this particular property was caught up in it is because there was a tennis court, it wasn't a unity of title. It was just that he took a separate property and put a tennis court on it.  But in theory, if he had been under the County, the County they could have built a separate building.  MS. RUSSO: Right.  MR. BEHAR: And there was no unity of title
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	get a Conditional Use.  So it was never the intent, when Snapper Creek was annexed, that it would be deprived of the rights that it had at the time.  MR. WITHERS: I don't understand something, Laura.  MS. RUSSO: Yes.  MR. WITHERS: If they're two separate owners, the lots are already split.  MS. RUSSO: Well, correct.  MR. WITHERS: What do you mean you're trying to remove yourself of the requirement of the lot separation process, since they're already split?  MS. RUSSO: Well, because when they went to submit the plans for the architectural board for one lot, the City said, we will not accept them, because we still think they are MR. WITHERS: But	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. WITHERS: I understand that.  MR. COLLER: So what this provision does is, it says, any lots that were separately platted as of the date, I guess, 1996  MS. RUSSO: Of annexation in '96.  MR. COLLER: annexation, all of those lots that were separately platted, are allowed to have separate units on them. They won't have to go through this process, so and the reason why this particular property was caught up in it is because there was a tennis court, it wasn't a unity of title. It was just that he took a separate property and put a tennis court on it.  But in theory, if he had been under the County, the County they could have built a separate building.  MS. RUSSO: Right.  MR. BEHAR: And there was no unity of title for us to tie it together.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	get a Conditional Use.  So it was never the intent, when Snapper Creek was annexed, that it would be deprived of the rights that it had at the time.  MR. WITHERS: I don't understand something, Laura.  MS. RUSSO: Yes.  MR. WITHERS: If they're two separate owners, the lots are already split.  MS. RUSSO: Well, correct.  MR. WITHERS: What do you mean you're trying to remove yourself of the requirement of the lot separation process, since they're already split?  MS. RUSSO: Well, because when they went to submit the plans for the architectural board for one lot, the City said, we will not accept them, because we still think they are MR. WITHERS: But MR. COLLER: I think I can explain it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. WITHERS: I understand that.  MR. COLLER: So what this provision does is, it says, any lots that were separately platted as of the date, I guess, 1996  MS. RUSSO: Of annexation in '96.  MR. COLLER: annexation, all of those lots that were separately platted, are allowed to have separate units on them. They won't have to go through this process, so and the reason why this particular property was caught up in it is because there was a tennis court, it wasn't a unity of title. It was just that he took a separate property and put a tennis court on it.  But in theory, if he had been under the County, the County they could have built a separate building.  MS. RUSSO: Right.  MR. BEHAR: And there was no unity of title for us to tie it together.  MR. COLLER: Exactly. It's only because
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	get a Conditional Use.  So it was never the intent, when Snapper Creek was annexed, that it would be deprived of the rights that it had at the time.  MR. WITHERS: I don't understand something, Laura.  MS. RUSSO: Yes.  MR. WITHERS: If they're two separate owners, the lots are already split.  MS. RUSSO: Well, correct.  MR. WITHERS: What do you mean you're trying to remove yourself of the requirement of the lot separation process, since they're already split?  MS. RUSSO: Well, because when they went to submit the plans for the architectural board for one lot, the City said, we will not accept them, because we still think they are MR. WITHERS: But MR. COLLER: I think I can explain it. There's a provision that if you have a lot that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. WITHERS: I understand that.  MR. COLLER: So what this provision does is, it says, any lots that were separately platted as of the date, I guess, 1996  MS. RUSSO: Of annexation in '96.  MR. COLLER: annexation, all of those lots that were separately platted, are allowed to have separate units on them. They won't have to go through this process, so and the reason why this particular property was caught up in it is because there was a tennis court, it wasn't a unity of title. It was just that he took a separate property and put a tennis court on it.  But in theory, if he had been under the County, the County they could have built a separate building.  MS. RUSSO: Right.  MR. BEHAR: And there was no unity of title for us to tie it together.  MR. COLLER: Exactly. It's only because  MS. RUSSO: Had he built the tennis court
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	get a Conditional Use.  So it was never the intent, when Snapper Creek was annexed, that it would be deprived of the rights that it had at the time.  MR. WITHERS: I don't understand something, Laura.  MS. RUSSO: Yes.  MR. WITHERS: If they're two separate owners, the lots are already split.  MS. RUSSO: Well, correct.  MR. WITHERS: What do you mean you're trying to remove yourself of the requirement of the lot separation process, since they're already split?  MS. RUSSO: Well, because when they went to submit the plans for the architectural board for one lot, the City said, we will not accept them, because we still think they are MR. WITHERS: But MR. COLLER: I think I can explain it. There's a provision that if you have a lot that is an accessory use to your main lot, that you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. WITHERS: I understand that.  MR. COLLER: So what this provision does is, it says, any lots that were separately platted as of the date, I guess, 1996  MS. RUSSO: Of annexation in '96.  MR. COLLER: annexation, all of those lots that were separately platted, are allowed to have separate units on them. They won't have to go through this process, so and the reason why this particular property was caught up in it is because there was a tennis court, it wasn't a unity of title. It was just that he took a separate property and put a tennis court on it.  But in theory, if he had been under the County, the County they could have built a separate building.  MS. RUSSO: Right.  MR. BEHAR: And there was no unity of title for us to tie it together.  MR. COLLER: Exactly. It's only because  MS. RUSSO: Had he built the tennis court after annexation, there would have been a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	get a Conditional Use.  So it was never the intent, when Snapper Creek was annexed, that it would be deprived of the rights that it had at the time.  MR. WITHERS: I don't understand something, Laura.  MS. RUSSO: Yes.  MR. WITHERS: If they're two separate owners, the lots are already split.  MS. RUSSO: Well, correct.  MR. WITHERS: What do you mean you're trying to remove yourself of the requirement of the lot separation process, since they're already split?  MS. RUSSO: Well, because when they went to submit the plans for the architectural board for one lot, the City said, we will not accept them, because we still think they are MR. WITHERS: But MR. COLLER: I think I can explain it. There's a provision that if you have a lot that is an accessory use to your main lot, that you can't split it without an approval.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. WITHERS: I understand that.  MR. COLLER: So what this provision does is, it says, any lots that were separately platted as of the date, I guess, 1996  MS. RUSSO: Of annexation in '96.  MR. COLLER: annexation, all of those lots that were separately platted, are allowed to have separate units on them. They won't have to go through this process, so and the reason why this particular property was caught up in it is because there was a tennis court, it wasn't a unity of title. It was just that he took a separate property and put a tennis court on it.  But in theory, if he had been under the County, the County they could have built a separate building.  MS. RUSSO: Right.  MR. BEHAR: And there was no unity of title for us to tie it together.  MR. COLLER: Exactly. It's only because  MS. RUSSO: Had he built the tennis court after annexation, there would have been a unity. The City would have required it. So
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	get a Conditional Use.  So it was never the intent, when Snapper Creek was annexed, that it would be deprived of the rights that it had at the time.  MR. WITHERS: I don't understand something, Laura.  MS. RUSSO: Yes.  MR. WITHERS: If they're two separate owners, the lots are already split.  MS. RUSSO: Well, correct.  MR. WITHERS: What do you mean you're trying to remove yourself of the requirement of the lot separation process, since they're already split?  MS. RUSSO: Well, because when they went to submit the plans for the architectural board for one lot, the City said, we will not accept them, because we still think they are MR. WITHERS: But MR. COLLER: I think I can explain it. There's a provision that if you have a lot that is an accessory use to your main lot, that you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. WITHERS: I understand that.  MR. COLLER: So what this provision does is, it says, any lots that were separately platted as of the date, I guess, 1996  MS. RUSSO: Of annexation in '96.  MR. COLLER: annexation, all of those lots that were separately platted, are allowed to have separate units on them. They won't have to go through this process, so and the reason why this particular property was caught up in it is because there was a tennis court, it wasn't a unity of title. It was just that he took a separate property and put a tennis court on it.  But in theory, if he had been under the County, the County they could have built a separate building.  MS. RUSSO: Right.  MR. BEHAR: And there was no unity of title for us to tie it together.  MR. COLLER: Exactly. It's only because  MS. RUSSO: Had he built the tennis court after annexation, there would have been a

	Page 25		Page 26
1	MR. TORRE: I think we're saying the same	1	MR. TORRE: Did they have two folio numbers
2	thing. I just want to clarify so I can learn.	2	initially?
3	So somebody had a two-and-a-half acre plat,	3	MR. COLLER: Yes. They were separately
4	whatever, two platted big lots, with the tennis	4	platted lots. They were separately
5	court on the side. They must have had one	5	MR. WITHERS: And do they have separate
6	survey. When they demolished everything and	6	title policies on each one?
7	decided to sell the two lots, the one survey	7	MS. RUSSO: Yes, they have separate
8	really was kind of washed out, and they said,	8	MR. BEHAR: I mean, I don't know why we're
9	we're going to have two platted surveys and	9	here, because, to me, it doesn't make sense why
10	we're going to sell them both? There must have	10	we're here, but let's move on, because this is
11	been, right?	11	not
12	MS. RUSSO: I did not represent either	12	MR. REVUELTA: It seems this wording is
13	owner in the real estate purchase, but I think	13	only requesting that Snapper Creek be exempt.
14	what happened is, they were advertised as	14	It seems to me that, at some point, we will end
15	vacant lots. They went and they hired a	15	up with the same problem in the City, so I
16	surveyor. The surveyor surveyed the lot in	16	don't know if we're addressing
17	question, and they had no idea that, you know,	17	MS. RUSSO: No.
18	there was any possibility. I mean, I think	18	MR. BEHAR: No, the City is different.
19	somebody knew this was vacant, and the other	19	MR. COLLER: And let me just explain one
20	person knew this one was vacant, but I don't	20	thing. The reason why this is kind of a
21	think	21	grandfathered situation, it's because you're
22	MR. REVUELTA: They are separate folio	22	looking at the lots that were platted it's
23	numbers.	23	frozen in time, looking at the lots that were
24	MS. RUSSO: Excuse me? They're separate	24	platted at the time of annexation in 1996.
25	folio numbers, correct.	25	MS. RUSSO: At annexation.
	Page 27		Page 28
1	MR. COLLER: Any other platting, which	1	MR. WITHERS: Percentage and neighborhood
2	hasn't been done, but any other attempt to	2	frontage and all of that, they're stricter than
3	replat properties post 1996, this doesn't	3	we are?
4	apply. So it's really fixed in time as of	4	MS. RUSSO: Oh, way stricter. So their
5	1996, if that's helpful.	5	setbacks are much stricter. Just to give you
6	MR. WITHERS: Doesn't our Ordinance, what	6	an idea, their lot coverage is 15 percent, but
7	does it say, before 1972 or what's the	7	their front setbacks are way more intense.
8	MS. RUSSO: It was approximately the	8	Their idea is to always have a very a
9	original Ordinance was approximately 1972	9	smaller home, much larger lush landscaping.
	MR. WITHERS: '70 something.	10	A CONTRACTOR OF A CONTRACTOR O
10	C		MR. WITHERS: So where does their
10 11	MS. RUSSO: or '74.	11	MR. WITHERS: So where does their homeowner's association weigh in on this?
11	MS. RUSSO: or '74.	11	homeowner's association weigh in on this?
11 12	MS. RUSSO: or '74. MR. WITHERS: But this was never one	11 12	homeowner's association weigh in on this?  MS. RUSSO: Well, just because you know
11 12 13	MS. RUSSO: — or '74.  MR. WITHERS: But this was never one property before 1972. It's never been looked	11 12 13	homeowner's association weigh in on this?  MS. RUSSO: Well, just because you know that I like to do my homework, before I even
11 12 13 14	MS. RUSSO: — or '74.  MR. WITHERS: But this was never one property before 1972. It's never been looked upon as one property.	11 12 13 14	homeowner's association weigh in on this?  MS. RUSSO: Well, just because you know that I like to do my homework, before I even considered an amendment, I called up Heather
11 12 13 14 15	MS. RUSSO: — or '74.  MR. WITHERS: But this was never one property before 1972. It's never been looked upon as one property.  MS. RUSSO: Not by — the County had it as	11 12 13 14 15	homeowner's association weigh in on this?  MS. RUSSO: Well, just because you know that I like to do my homework, before I even considered an amendment, I called up Heather Quinlan, who is here, and Heather is the
11 12 13 14 15	MS. RUSSO: — or '74.  MR. WITHERS: But this was never one property before 1972. It's never been looked upon as one property.  MS. RUSSO: Not by — the County had it as two —	11 12 13 14 15	homeowner's association weigh in on this?  MS. RUSSO: Well, just because you know that I like to do my homework, before I even considered an amendment, I called up Heather Quinlan, who is here, and Heather is the administrator of the Snapper Creek Lakes
11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. RUSSO: — or '74.  MR. WITHERS: But this was never one property before 1972. It's never been looked upon as one property.  MS. RUSSO: Not by — the County had it as two —  MR. WITHERS: I got it. I understand.	11 12 13 14 15 16 17	homeowner's association weigh in on this?  MS. RUSSO: Well, just because you know that I like to do my homework, before I even considered an amendment, I called up Heather Quinlan, who is here, and Heather is the administrator of the Snapper Creek Lakes Homeowners Association and has been for
11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. RUSSO: — or '74.  MR. WITHERS: But this was never one property before 1972. It's never been looked upon as one property.  MS. RUSSO: Not by — the County had it as two —  MR. WITHERS: I got it. I understand.  And so let me ask you this about Snapper —	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	homeowner's association weigh in on this?  MS. RUSSO: Well, just because you know that I like to do my homework, before I even considered an amendment, I called up Heather Quinlan, who is here, and Heather is the administrator of the Snapper Creek Lakes Homeowners Association and has been for approximately fifteen years, and I asked her
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. RUSSO: — or '74.  MR. WITHERS: But this was never one property before 1972. It's never been looked upon as one property.  MS. RUSSO: Not by — the County had it as two —  MR. WITHERS: I got it. I understand.  And so let me ask you this about Snapper — does their lot splitting ordinance mirror ours	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	homeowner's association weigh in on this?  MS. RUSSO: Well, just because you know that I like to do my homework, before I even considered an amendment, I called up Heather Quinlan, who is here, and Heather is the administrator of the Snapper Creek Lakes Homeowners Association and has been for approximately fifteen years, and I asked her what she thought. And after I had the proposed
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. RUSSO: — or '74.  MR. WITHERS: But this was never one property before 1972. It's never been looked upon as one property.  MS. RUSSO: Not by — the County had it as two —  MR. WITHERS: I got it. I understand.  And so let me ask you this about Snapper — does their lot splitting ordinance mirror ours or is it more —	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	homeowner's association weigh in on this?  MS. RUSSO: Well, just because you know that I like to do my homework, before I even considered an amendment, I called up Heather Quinlan, who is here, and Heather is the administrator of the Snapper Creek Lakes Homeowners Association and has been for approximately fifteen years, and I asked her what she thought. And after I had the proposed language approved by the City Attorney's
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. RUSSO: — or '74.  MR. WITHERS: But this was never one property before 1972. It's never been looked upon as one property.  MS. RUSSO: Not by — the County had it as two —  MR. WITHERS: I got it. I understand.  And so let me ask you this about Snapper — does their lot splitting ordinance mirror ours or is it more —  MS. RUSSO: In Snapper Creek?	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	homeowner's association weigh in on this?  MS. RUSSO: Well, just because you know that I like to do my homework, before I even considered an amendment, I called up Heather Quinlan, who is here, and Heather is the administrator of the Snapper Creek Lakes Homeowners Association and has been for approximately fifteen years, and I asked her what she thought. And after I had the proposed language approved by the City Attorney's Office, I then sent it to Heather. Heather
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. RUSSO: — or '74.  MR. WITHERS: But this was never one property before 1972. It's never been looked upon as one property.  MS. RUSSO: Not by — the County had it as two —  MR. WITHERS: I got it. I understand.  And so let me ask you this about Snapper — does their lot splitting ordinance mirror ours or is it more —  MS. RUSSO: In Snapper Creek?  MR. WITHERS: Snapper Creek, yeah.	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	homeowner's association weigh in on this?  MS. RUSSO: Well, just because you know that I like to do my homework, before I even considered an amendment, I called up Heather Quinlan, who is here, and Heather is the administrator of the Snapper Creek Lakes Homeowners Association and has been for approximately fifteen years, and I asked her what she thought. And after I had the proposed language approved by the City Attorney's Office, I then sent it to Heather. Heather vetted it at an annual meeting with the members
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. RUSSO: — or '74.  MR. WITHERS: But this was never one property before 1972. It's never been looked upon as one property.  MS. RUSSO: Not by — the County had it as two —  MR. WITHERS: I got it. I understand.  And so let me ask you this about Snapper — does their lot splitting ordinance mirror ours or is it more —  MS. RUSSO: In Snapper Creek?  MR. WITHERS: Snapper Creek, yeah.  MS. RUSSO: Oh, it's much stricter. In	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	homeowner's association weigh in on this?  MS. RUSSO: Well, just because you know that I like to do my homework, before I even considered an amendment, I called up Heather Quinlan, who is here, and Heather is the administrator of the Snapper Creek Lakes Homeowners Association and has been for approximately fifteen years, and I asked her what she thought. And after I had the proposed language approved by the City Attorney's Office, I then sent it to Heather. Heather vetted it at an annual meeting with the members present, and then the Board of Directors voted

	Page 29		Page 30
1	which the two owners attended, and a handful of	1	you have both of them be building sites
2	neighbors came out to meet them and to find out	2	until all of the encroachments were removed.
3	when they were going to start building, and	3	MR. WITHERS: I've never seen a lot split
4	everybody is in support of this proposed text	4	with two different owners for the same
5	amendment.	5	MR. BEHAR: But this is not a lot split.
6	MR. WITHERS: One more question. Since	6	MR. WITHERS: I know, but she said
7	Heather wasn't sworn in, I'm going ask you this	7	MS. RUSSO: Well, it's not a lot split,
8	question.	8	'cause we're not going through the lot split
9	MS. RUSSO: Yes.	9	ordinance, because the reality is that the
10	MR. WITHERS: If this was owned by one	10	rights that were available to Snapper Creek at
11	person, as opposed to two people, would	11	the time of annexation would have allowed this
12	Heather's position be any different?	12	property to be two separate houses.
13	MS. RUSSO: Well, I think	13	MR. WITHERS: The City is looking at it as
14	MR. WITHERS: You understand my question?	14	one building site.
15	MS. RUSSO: Yes, I understand, and I think	15	MR. BEHAR: But I think that's
16	it would be the same, because there are people	16	MR. COLLER: No, the City is not looking at
17	that own two lots. They have a house on one	17	it as one building site. Let me explain what
18	and the other lot is vacant. So owning two	18	the problem is. The problem was, at one time,
19	properties, unless you do a unity of title,	19	the tennis courts, the City viewed, as an
20	doesn't necessarily tie them together. You own	20	accessory use. So because it had a history of
21	an adjacent property.	21	an accessory use, the feeling was, this
22	Now, if you turn around and you put a	22	language needed to be clarified, because the
23	gazebo and a cabana and stuff and you cross	23	intent was that every platted lot, which has to
24	over the lines, yes, now you've unified the	24	be a minimum of one acre, every platted lot was
25	properties, and Snapper Creek would not have	25	considered a building site, so back in 1996,
İ	_ 21		
	Page 31		Page 32
1	when it was annexed to the City.	1	Page 32  Jill, do we have anybody in the Zoom
1 2		1 2	
	when it was annexed to the City.		Jill, do we have anybody in the Zoom
2	when it was annexed to the City.  What got caught up was this had a use one	2	Jill, do we have anybody in the Zoom platform?
2	when it was annexed to the City.  What got caught up was this had a use one time as a tennis court.	2	Jill, do we have anybody in the Zoom platform?  THE SECRETARY: No, we do not.
2 3 4	when it was annexed to the City.  What got caught up was this had a use one time as a tennis court.  MR. BEHAR: But, Craig, at the end of the	2 3 4	Jill, do we have anybody in the Zoom platform?  THE SECRETARY: No, we do not.  MR. BEHAR: Do we have anybody by phone
2 3 4 5	when it was annexed to the City.  What got caught up was this had a use one time as a tennis court.  MR. BEHAR: But, Craig, at the end of the day, there was no unity of title.  MR. COLLER: No unity of title. These are —	2 3 4 5	Jill, do we have anybody in the Zoom platform?  THE SECRETARY: No, we do not.  MR. BEHAR: Do we have anybody by phone platform?  THE SECRETARY: No. No.  MR. BEHAR: Then, at this time, we're going
2 3 4 5 6	when it was annexed to the City.  What got caught up was this had a use one time as a tennis court.  MR. BEHAR: But, Craig, at the end of the day, there was no unity of title.  MR. COLLER: No unity of title. These are —  MR. BEHAR: So they're not tying the two	2 3 4 5 6	Jill, do we have anybody in the Zoom platform?  THE SECRETARY: No, we do not.  MR. BEHAR: Do we have anybody by phone platform?  THE SECRETARY: No. No.  MR. BEHAR: Then, at this time, we're going to close the public comment and I'm going to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	when it was annexed to the City.  What got caught up was this had a use one time as a tennis court.  MR. BEHAR: But, Craig, at the end of the day, there was no unity of title.  MR. COLLER: No unity of title. These are  MR. BEHAR: So they're not tying the two properties together. As an owner of a property	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Jill, do we have anybody in the Zoom platform?  THE SECRETARY: No, we do not.  MR. BEHAR: Do we have anybody by phone platform?  THE SECRETARY: No. No.  MR. BEHAR: Then, at this time, we're going to close the public comment and I'm going to open it up to the Board discussion.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	when it was annexed to the City.  What got caught up was this had a use one time as a tennis court.  MR. BEHAR: But, Craig, at the end of the day, there was no unity of title.  MR. COLLER: No unity of title. These are —  MR. BEHAR: So they're not tying the two properties together. As an owner of a property in Miami-Dade County, I could probably build a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Jill, do we have anybody in the Zoom platform?  THE SECRETARY: No, we do not.  MR. BEHAR: Do we have anybody by phone platform?  THE SECRETARY: No. No.  MR. BEHAR: Then, at this time, we're going to close the public comment and I'm going to open it up to the Board discussion.  Chip, you want to start?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	when it was annexed to the City.  What got caught up was this had a use one time as a tennis court.  MR. BEHAR: But, Craig, at the end of the day, there was no unity of title.  MR. COLLER: No unity of title. These are  MR. BEHAR: So they're not tying the two properties together. As an owner of a property in Miami-Dade County, I could probably build a tennis court and use that as a tennis court	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Jill, do we have anybody in the Zoom platform?  THE SECRETARY: No, we do not.  MR. BEHAR: Do we have anybody by phone platform?  THE SECRETARY: No. No.  MR. BEHAR: Then, at this time, we're going to close the public comment and I'm going to open it up to the Board discussion.  Chip, you want to start?  MR. WITHERS: I don't have any problem with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	when it was annexed to the City.  What got caught up was this had a use one time as a tennis court.  MR. BEHAR: But, Craig, at the end of the day, there was no unity of title.  MR. COLLER: No unity of title. These are  MR. BEHAR: So they're not tying the two properties together. As an owner of a property in Miami-Dade County, I could probably build a tennis court and use that as a tennis court  MR. COLLER: Absolutely, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Jill, do we have anybody in the Zoom platform?  THE SECRETARY: No, we do not.  MR. BEHAR: Do we have anybody by phone platform?  THE SECRETARY: No. No.  MR. BEHAR: Then, at this time, we're going to close the public comment and I'm going to open it up to the Board discussion.  Chip, you want to start?  MR. WITHERS: I don't have any problem with this. I just don't know that this is the best
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	when it was annexed to the City.  What got caught up was this had a use one time as a tennis court.  MR. BEHAR: But, Craig, at the end of the day, there was no unity of title.  MR. COLLER: No unity of title. These are  MR. BEHAR: So they're not tying the two properties together. As an owner of a property in Miami-Dade County, I could probably build a tennis court and use that as a tennis court  MR. COLLER: Absolutely, yes.  MR. BEHAR: So this makes absolutely no	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Jill, do we have anybody in the Zoom platform?  THE SECRETARY: No, we do not.  MR. BEHAR: Do we have anybody by phone platform?  THE SECRETARY: No. No.  MR. BEHAR: Then, at this time, we're going to close the public comment and I'm going to open it up to the Board discussion.  Chip, you want to start?  MR. WITHERS: I don't have any problem with this. I just don't know that this is the best legal remedy to get to where they need to get
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	when it was annexed to the City.  What got caught up was this had a use one time as a tennis court.  MR. BEHAR: But, Craig, at the end of the day, there was no unity of title.  MR. COLLER: No unity of title. These are —  MR. BEHAR: So they're not tying the two properties together. As an owner of a property in Miami-Dade County, I could probably build a tennis court and use that as a tennis court —  MR. COLLER: Absolutely, yes.  MR. BEHAR: So this makes absolutely no sense. Look, in the interest of time, because	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Jill, do we have anybody in the Zoom platform?  THE SECRETARY: No, we do not.  MR. BEHAR: Do we have anybody by phone platform?  THE SECRETARY: No. No.  MR. BEHAR: Then, at this time, we're going to close the public comment and I'm going to open it up to the Board discussion.  Chip, you want to start?  MR. WITHERS: I don't have any problem with this. I just don't know that this is the best legal remedy to get to where they need to get to. Because what I hear you saying is, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	when it was annexed to the City.  What got caught up was this had a use one time as a tennis court.  MR. BEHAR: But, Craig, at the end of the day, there was no unity of title.  MR. COLLER: No unity of title. These are  MR. BEHAR: So they're not tying the two properties together. As an owner of a property in Miami-Dade County, I could probably build a tennis court and use that as a tennis court  MR. COLLER: Absolutely, yes.  MR. BEHAR: So this makes absolutely no sense. Look, in the interest of time, because we're going over, you know, something Laura,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Jill, do we have anybody in the Zoom platform?  THE SECRETARY: No, we do not. MR. BEHAR: Do we have anybody by phone platform?  THE SECRETARY: No. No. MR. BEHAR: Then, at this time, we're going to close the public comment and I'm going to open it up to the Board discussion.  Chip, you want to start?  MR. WITHERS: I don't have any problem with this. I just don't know that this is the best legal remedy to get to where they need to get to. Because what I hear you saying is, the lot, in the City of Coral Gables' eyes, was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	when it was annexed to the City.  What got caught up was this had a use one time as a tennis court.  MR. BEHAR: But, Craig, at the end of the day, there was no unity of title.  MR. COLLER: No unity of title. These are  MR. BEHAR: So they're not tying the two properties together. As an owner of a property in Miami-Dade County, I could probably build a tennis court and use that as a tennis court  MR. COLLER: Absolutely, yes.  MR. BEHAR: So this makes absolutely no sense. Look, in the interest of time, because we're going over, you know, something Laura, are you concluded with your presentation?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Jill, do we have anybody in the Zoom platform?  THE SECRETARY: No, we do not. MR. BEHAR: Do we have anybody by phone platform?  THE SECRETARY: No. No. MR. BEHAR: Then, at this time, we're going to close the public comment and I'm going to open it up to the Board discussion.  Chip, you want to start?  MR. WITHERS: I don't have any problem with this. I just don't know that this is the best legal remedy to get to where they need to get to. Because what I hear you saying is, the lot, in the City of Coral Gables' eyes, was joined together by the tennis courts.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	when it was annexed to the City.  What got caught up was this had a use one time as a tennis court.  MR. BEHAR: But, Craig, at the end of the day, there was no unity of title.  MR. COLLER: No unity of title. These are  MR. BEHAR: So they're not tying the two properties together. As an owner of a property in Miami-Dade County, I could probably build a tennis court and use that as a tennis court  MR. COLLER: Absolutely, yes.  MR. BEHAR: So this makes absolutely no sense. Look, in the interest of time, because we're going over, you know, something Laura, are you concluded with your presentation?  MS. RUSSO: Yes. Other than answering	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Jill, do we have anybody in the Zoom platform?  THE SECRETARY: No, we do not.  MR. BEHAR: Do we have anybody by phone platform?  THE SECRETARY: No. No.  MR. BEHAR: Then, at this time, we're going to close the public comment and I'm going to open it up to the Board discussion.  Chip, you want to start?  MR. WITHERS: I don't have any problem with this. I just don't know that this is the best legal remedy to get to where they need to get to. Because what I hear you saying is, the lot, in the City of Coral Gables' eyes, was joined together by the tennis courts.  MR. COLLER: No. It was not joined
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	when it was annexed to the City.  What got caught up was this had a use one time as a tennis court.  MR. BEHAR: But, Craig, at the end of the day, there was no unity of title.  MR. COLLER: No unity of title. These are —  MR. BEHAR: So they're not tying the two properties together. As an owner of a property in Miami-Dade County, I could probably build a tennis court and use that as a tennis court —  MR. COLLER: Absolutely, yes.  MR. BEHAR: So this makes absolutely no sense. Look, in the interest of time, because we're going over, you know, something — Laura, are you concluded with your presentation?  MS. RUSSO: Yes. Other than answering questions and asking you to please approve the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Jill, do we have anybody in the Zoom platform?  THE SECRETARY: No, we do not.  MR. BEHAR: Do we have anybody by phone platform?  THE SECRETARY: No. No.  MR. BEHAR: Then, at this time, we're going to close the public comment and I'm going to open it up to the Board discussion.  Chip, you want to start?  MR. WITHERS: I don't have any problem with this. I just don't know that this is the best legal remedy to get to where they need to get to. Because what I hear you saying is, the lot, in the City of Coral Gables' eyes, was joined together by the tennis courts.  MR. COLLER: No. It was not joined together.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	when it was annexed to the City.  What got caught up was this had a use one time as a tennis court.  MR. BEHAR: But, Craig, at the end of the day, there was no unity of title.  MR. COLLER: No unity of title. These are —  MR. BEHAR: So they're not tying the two properties together. As an owner of a property in Miami-Dade County, I could probably build a tennis court and use that as a tennis court —  MR. COLLER: Absolutely, yes.  MR. BEHAR: So this makes absolutely no sense. Look, in the interest of time, because we're going over, you know, something — Laura, are you concluded with your presentation?  MS. RUSSO: Yes. Other than answering questions and asking you to please approve the text amendment as proposed, my presentation is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Jill, do we have anybody in the Zoom platform?  THE SECRETARY: No, we do not.  MR. BEHAR: Do we have anybody by phone platform?  THE SECRETARY: No. No.  MR. BEHAR: Then, at this time, we're going to close the public comment and I'm going to open it up to the Board discussion.  Chip, you want to start?  MR. WITHERS: I don't have any problem with this. I just don't know that this is the best legal remedy to get to where they need to get to. Because what I hear you saying is, the lot, in the City of Coral Gables' eyes, was joined together by the tennis courts.  MR. COLLER: No. It was not joined together.  MR. BEHAR: No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	when it was annexed to the City.  What got caught up was this had a use one time as a tennis court.  MR. BEHAR: But, Craig, at the end of the day, there was no unity of title.  MR. COLLER: No unity of title. These are  MR. BEHAR: So they're not tying the two properties together. As an owner of a property in Miami-Dade County, I could probably build a tennis court and use that as a tennis court  MR. COLLER: Absolutely, yes.  MR. BEHAR: So this makes absolutely no sense. Look, in the interest of time, because we're going over, you know, something Laura, are you concluded with your presentation?  MS. RUSSO: Yes. Other than answering questions and asking you to please approve the text amendment as proposed, my presentation is concluded.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Jill, do we have anybody in the Zoom platform?  THE SECRETARY: No, we do not. MR. BEHAR: Do we have anybody by phone platform?  THE SECRETARY: No. No. MR. BEHAR: Then, at this time, we're going to close the public comment and I'm going to open it up to the Board discussion.  Chip, you want to start?  MR. WITHERS: I don't have any problem with this. I just don't know that this is the best legal remedy to get to where they need to get to. Because what I hear you saying is, the lot, in the City of Coral Gables' eyes, was joined together by the tennis courts.  MR. COLLER: No. It was not joined together.  MR. BEHAR: No. MS. RUSSO: No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	when it was annexed to the City.  What got caught up was this had a use one time as a tennis court.  MR. BEHAR: But, Craig, at the end of the day, there was no unity of title.  MR. COLLER: No unity of title. These are  MR. BEHAR: So they're not tying the two properties together. As an owner of a property in Miami-Dade County, I could probably build a tennis court and use that as a tennis court  MR. COLLER: Absolutely, yes.  MR. BEHAR: So this makes absolutely no sense. Look, in the interest of time, because we're going over, you know, something Laura, are you concluded with your presentation?  MS. RUSSO: Yes. Other than answering questions and asking you to please approve the text amendment as proposed, my presentation is concluded.  MR. BEHAR: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Jill, do we have anybody in the Zoom platform?  THE SECRETARY: No, we do not. MR. BEHAR: Do we have anybody by phone platform?  THE SECRETARY: No. No. MR. BEHAR: Then, at this time, we're going to close the public comment and I'm going to open it up to the Board discussion.  Chip, you want to start?  MR. WITHERS: I don't have any problem with this. I just don't know that this is the best legal remedy to get to where they need to get to. Because what I hear you saying is, the lot, in the City of Coral Gables' eyes, was joined together by the tennis courts.  MR. COLLER: No. It was not joined together.  MR. BEHAR: No. MS. RUSSO: No. MR. COLLER: It was not joined together.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	when it was annexed to the City.  What got caught up was this had a use one time as a tennis court.  MR. BEHAR: But, Craig, at the end of the day, there was no unity of title.  MR. COLLER: No unity of title. These are  MR. BEHAR: So they're not tying the two properties together. As an owner of a property in Miami-Dade County, I could probably build a tennis court and use that as a tennis court  MR. COLLER: Absolutely, yes.  MR. BEHAR: So this makes absolutely no sense. Look, in the interest of time, because we're going over, you know, something Laura, are you concluded with your presentation?  MS. RUSSO: Yes. Other than answering questions and asking you to please approve the text amendment as proposed, my presentation is concluded.  MR. BEHAR: Thank you.  Now, I'm going to open it up to the public	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Jill, do we have anybody in the Zoom platform?  THE SECRETARY: No, we do not. MR. BEHAR: Do we have anybody by phone platform?  THE SECRETARY: No. No. MR. BEHAR: Then, at this time, we're going to close the public comment and I'm going to open it up to the Board discussion.  Chip, you want to start?  MR. WITHERS: I don't have any problem with this. I just don't know that this is the best legal remedy to get to where they need to get to. Because what I hear you saying is, the lot, in the City of Coral Gables' eyes, was joined together by the tennis courts.  MR. COLLER: No. It was not joined together.  MR. BEHAR: No. MS. RUSSO: No. MR. COLLER: It was not joined together. MR. WITHERS: I'm sorry, a buildable site.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	when it was annexed to the City.  What got caught up was this had a use one time as a tennis court.  MR. BEHAR: But, Craig, at the end of the day, there was no unity of title.  MR. COLLER: No unity of title. These are —  MR. BEHAR: So they're not tying the two properties together. As an owner of a property in Miami-Dade County, I could probably build a tennis court and use that as a tennis court —  MR. COLLER: Absolutely, yes.  MR. BEHAR: So this makes absolutely no sense. Look, in the interest of time, because we're going over, you know, something — Laura, are you concluded with your presentation?  MS. RUSSO: Yes. Other than answering questions and asking you to please approve the text amendment as proposed, my presentation is concluded.  MR. BEHAR: Thank you.  Now, I'm going to open it up to the public comments. I don't think we had anybody sworn	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Jill, do we have anybody in the Zoom platform?  THE SECRETARY: No, we do not.  MR. BEHAR: Do we have anybody by phone platform?  THE SECRETARY: No. No.  MR. BEHAR: Then, at this time, we're going to close the public comment and I'm going to open it up to the Board discussion.  Chip, you want to start?  MR. WITHERS: I don't have any problem with this. I just don't know that this is the best legal remedy to get to where they need to get to. Because what I hear you saying is, the lot, in the City of Coral Gables' eyes, was joined together by the tennis courts.  MR. COLLER: No. It was not joined together.  MR. BEHAR: No.  MS. RUSSO: No.  MR. COLLER: It was not joined together.  MR. WITHERS: I'm sorry, a buildable site.  It was looked upon as one buildable site
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	when it was annexed to the City.  What got caught up was this had a use one time as a tennis court.  MR. BEHAR: But, Craig, at the end of the day, there was no unity of title.  MR. COLLER: No unity of title. These are —  MR. BEHAR: So they're not tying the two properties together. As an owner of a property in Miami-Dade County, I could probably build a tennis court and use that as a tennis court —  MR. COLLER: Absolutely, yes.  MR. BEHAR: So this makes absolutely no sense. Look, in the interest of time, because we're going over, you know, something — Laura, are you concluded with your presentation?  MS. RUSSO: Yes. Other than answering questions and asking you to please approve the text amendment as proposed, my presentation is concluded.  MR. BEHAR: Thank you.  Now, I'm going to open it up to the public comments. I don't think we had anybody sworn in at the time? Right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Jill, do we have anybody in the Zoom platform?  THE SECRETARY: No, we do not. MR. BEHAR: Do we have anybody by phone platform?  THE SECRETARY: No. No. MR. BEHAR: Then, at this time, we're going to close the public comment and I'm going to open it up to the Board discussion.  Chip, you want to start?  MR. WITHERS: I don't have any problem with this. I just don't know that this is the best legal remedy to get to where they need to get to. Because what I hear you saying is, the lot, in the City of Coral Gables' eyes, was joined together by the tennis courts.  MR. COLLER: No. It was not joined together.  MR. BEHAR: No. MS. RUSSO: No. MR. COLLER: It was not joined together. MR. WITHERS: I'm sorry, a buildable site. It was looked upon as one buildable site because of the tennis court.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	when it was annexed to the City.  What got caught up was this had a use one time as a tennis court.  MR. BEHAR: But, Craig, at the end of the day, there was no unity of title.  MR. COLLER: No unity of title. These are —  MR. BEHAR: So they're not tying the two properties together. As an owner of a property in Miami-Dade County, I could probably build a tennis court and use that as a tennis court —  MR. COLLER: Absolutely, yes.  MR. BEHAR: So this makes absolutely no sense. Look, in the interest of time, because we're going over, you know, something — Laura, are you concluded with your presentation?  MS. RUSSO: Yes. Other than answering questions and asking you to please approve the text amendment as proposed, my presentation is concluded.  MR. BEHAR: Thank you.  Now, I'm going to open it up to the public comments. I don't think we had anybody sworn	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Jill, do we have anybody in the Zoom platform?  THE SECRETARY: No, we do not.  MR. BEHAR: Do we have anybody by phone platform?  THE SECRETARY: No. No.  MR. BEHAR: Then, at this time, we're going to close the public comment and I'm going to open it up to the Board discussion.  Chip, you want to start?  MR. WITHERS: I don't have any problem with this. I just don't know that this is the best legal remedy to get to where they need to get to. Because what I hear you saying is, the lot, in the City of Coral Gables' eyes, was joined together by the tennis courts.  MR. COLLER: No. It was not joined together.  MR. BEHAR: No.  MS. RUSSO: No.  MR. COLLER: It was not joined together.  MR. WITHERS: I'm sorry, a buildable site.  It was looked upon as one buildable site

	Page 33		Page 34
1	additional site was used at one time as an	1	only thing that could ever be built is a
2	accessory use to the main house. In other	2	separately platted lot. So nothing you're
3	words, the tennis court was an accessory use,	3	going to do here is going to create a future
4	-	4	issue for this community, because all of those
5	but it was on a separately platted lot.	5	-
	MR. WITHERS: Okay.	6	lots were separately platted at the time.
6	MR. COLLER: There were no restrictions		MR. WITHERS: So this is not a lot split?
7	whatsoever. The only reason why this is any	7	MR. COLLER: It is not a lot split.
8	problem at all if this had not been used as	8	MR. WITHERS: So an existing owner, that
9	a tennis court, had been completely vacant the	9	owns both pieces, cannot use this ordinance to
10	entire time	10	split their two lots? Those other two
11	MR. WITHERS: There would be no issue.	11	building sites
12	MR. COLLER: there would be no issue,	12	MR. COLLER: In Snapper Creek, if an owner
13	that's correct. The fact that at one time in	13	owns two separately platted lots and there's no
14	history it was used as a tennis court,	14	unity of title, there's no building structures
15	notwithstanding the fact that it was a	15	on them, they would be able to sell their other
16	separately platted lot, that's what	16	lot.
17	MR. WITHERS: I understand that. So your	17	MR. WITHERS: I got it.
18	opinion is, by simply removing this auxiliary	18	But if there's any unity of title, if
19	use structure, tennis court, by removing that,	19	something's being used as an accessory use, no.
20	it now allows it to be two different building	20	MR. BEHAR: But that is only if there's a
21	sites? That's your position, the City's	21	unity of title.
22	position?	22	MR. COLLER: Only if there's a unity of
23	MR. COLLER: Well, I don't know if the City	23	title.
24	has taken a position, but the point is that, in	24	MR. BEHAR: What the City took here, an
25	1996, these were separately platted lots. The	25	assumption that, you know, we could look at it,
	Page 35		Dago 26
	5		Page 36
1	but the legal matter here is, there was nothing	1	MR. REVUELTA: In my opinion, if the tennis
1 2		1 2	
	but the legal matter here is, there was nothing		MR. REVUELTA: In my opinion, if the tennis
2	but the legal matter here is, there was nothing tying them together.	2	MR. REVUELTA: In my opinion, if the tennis court was there, this is still two lots, two
2 3	but the legal matter here is, there was nothing tying them together.  MR. COLLER: Exactly.	2 3	MR. REVUELTA: In my opinion, if the tennis court was there, this is still two lots, two folio numbers, two taxes.
2 3 4	but the legal matter here is, there was nothing tying them together.  MR. COLLER: Exactly.  MR. BEHAR: So they've always been	2 3 4	MR. REVUELTA: In my opinion, if the tennis court was there, this is still two lots, two folio numbers, two taxes.  MR. WITHERS: No. No, I understand. We
2 3 4 5	but the legal matter here is, there was nothing tying them together.  MR. COLLER: Exactly.  MR. BEHAR: So they've always been independently platted lots.	2 3 4 5	MR. REVUELTA: In my opinion, if the tennis court was there, this is still two lots, two folio numbers, two taxes.  MR. WITHERS: No. No, I understand. We have a very strict lot splitting ordinance in
2 3 4 5 6	but the legal matter here is, there was nothing tying them together.  MR. COLLER: Exactly.  MR. BEHAR: So they've always been independently platted lots.  MR. COLLER: Correct.	2 3 4 5 6	MR. REVUELTA: In my opinion, if the tennis court was there, this is still two lots, two folio numbers, two taxes.  MR. WITHERS: No. No, I understand. We have a very strict lot splitting ordinance in Coral Gables, and when you put something on
2 3 4 5 6 7	but the legal matter here is, there was nothing tying them together.  MR. COLLER: Exactly.  MR. BEHAR: So they've always been independently platted lots.  MR. COLLER: Correct.  MR. BEHAR: That's simple. That's what	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. REVUELTA: In my opinion, if the tennis court was there, this is still two lots, two folio numbers, two taxes.  MR. WITHERS: No. No, I understand. We have a very strict lot splitting ordinance in Coral Gables, and when you put something on those two lots, it joins it together, but what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	but the legal matter here is, there was nothing tying them together.  MR. COLLER: Exactly.  MR. BEHAR: So they've always been independently platted lots.  MR. COLLER: Correct.  MR. BEHAR: That's simple. That's what we're looking at here.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. REVUELTA: In my opinion, if the tennis court was there, this is still two lots, two folio numbers, two taxes.  MR. WITHERS: No. No, I understand. We have a very strict lot splitting ordinance in Coral Gables, and when you put something on those two lots, it joins it together, but what you're saying, if there's no unity of title,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	but the legal matter here is, there was nothing tying them together.  MR. COLLER: Exactly.  MR. BEHAR: So they've always been independently platted lots.  MR. COLLER: Correct.  MR. BEHAR: That's simple. That's what we're looking at here.  MR. COLLER: That is absolutely correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. REVUELTA: In my opinion, if the tennis court was there, this is still two lots, two folio numbers, two taxes.  MR. WITHERS: No. No, I understand. We have a very strict lot splitting ordinance in Coral Gables, and when you put something on those two lots, it joins it together, but what you're saying, if there's no unity of title, even if there is an existing structure on one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	but the legal matter here is, there was nothing tying them together.  MR. COLLER: Exactly.  MR. BEHAR: So they've always been independently platted lots.  MR. COLLER: Correct.  MR. BEHAR: That's simple. That's what we're looking at here.  MR. COLLER: That is absolutely correct.  MR. WITHERS: So if there is no unity of title, but there is an existing structure on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. REVUELTA: In my opinion, if the tennis court was there, this is still two lots, two folio numbers, two taxes.  MR. WITHERS: No. No, I understand. We have a very strict lot splitting ordinance in Coral Gables, and when you put something on those two lots, it joins it together, but what you're saying, if there's no unity of title, even if there is an existing structure on one of those two lots, which I understood there was a house on one of them, if that house is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	but the legal matter here is, there was nothing tying them together.  MR. COLLER: Exactly.  MR. BEHAR: So they've always been independently platted lots.  MR. COLLER: Correct.  MR. BEHAR: That's simple. That's what we're looking at here.  MR. COLLER: That is absolutely correct.  MR. WITHERS: So if there is no unity of title, but there is an existing structure on one of the other two lots, if they tear that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. REVUELTA: In my opinion, if the tennis court was there, this is still two lots, two folio numbers, two taxes.  MR. WITHERS: No. No, I understand. We have a very strict lot splitting ordinance in Coral Gables, and when you put something on those two lots, it joins it together, but what you're saying, if there's no unity of title, even if there is an existing structure on one of those two lots, which I understood there was a house on one of them, if that house is removed, they can have two buildable sites,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	but the legal matter here is, there was nothing tying them together.  MR. COLLER: Exactly.  MR. BEHAR: So they've always been independently platted lots.  MR. COLLER: Correct.  MR. BEHAR: That's simple. That's what we're looking at here.  MR. COLLER: That is absolutely correct.  MR. WITHERS: So if there is no unity of title, but there is an existing structure on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. REVUELTA: In my opinion, if the tennis court was there, this is still two lots, two folio numbers, two taxes.  MR. WITHERS: No. No, I understand. We have a very strict lot splitting ordinance in Coral Gables, and when you put something on those two lots, it joins it together, but what you're saying, if there's no unity of title, even if there is an existing structure on one of those two lots, which I understood there was a house on one of them, if that house is removed, they can have two buildable sites, without having to go through the lot splitting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	but the legal matter here is, there was nothing tying them together.  MR. COLLER: Exactly.  MR. BEHAR: So they've always been independently platted lots.  MR. COLLER: Correct.  MR. BEHAR: That's simple. That's what we're looking at here.  MR. COLLER: That is absolutely correct.  MR. WITHERS: So if there is no unity of title, but there is an existing structure on one of the other two lots, if they tear that structure down, it now becomes two building sites?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. REVUELTA: In my opinion, if the tennis court was there, this is still two lots, two folio numbers, two taxes.  MR. WITHERS: No. No, I understand. We have a very strict lot splitting ordinance in Coral Gables, and when you put something on those two lots, it joins it together, but what you're saying, if there's no unity of title, even if there is an existing structure on one of those two lots, which I understood there was a house on one of them, if that house is removed, they can have two buildable sites, without having to go through the lot splitting ordinance. That's what I understand. Is that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	but the legal matter here is, there was nothing tying them together.  MR. COLLER: Exactly.  MR. BEHAR: So they've always been independently platted lots.  MR. COLLER: Correct.  MR. BEHAR: That's simple. That's what we're looking at here.  MR. COLLER: That is absolutely correct.  MR. WITHERS: So if there is no unity of title, but there is an existing structure on one of the other two lots, if they tear that structure down, it now becomes two building sites?  MR. COLLER: Well	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. REVUELTA: In my opinion, if the tennis court was there, this is still two lots, two folio numbers, two taxes.  MR. WITHERS: No. No, I understand. We have a very strict lot splitting ordinance in Coral Gables, and when you put something on those two lots, it joins it together, but what you're saying, if there's no unity of title, even if there is an existing structure on one of those two lots, which I understood there was a house on one of them, if that house is removed, they can have two buildable sites, without having to go through the lot splitting ordinance. That's what I understand. Is that correct, Laura?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	but the legal matter here is, there was nothing tying them together.  MR. COLLER: Exactly.  MR. BEHAR: So they've always been independently platted lots.  MR. COLLER: Correct.  MR. BEHAR: That's simple. That's what we're looking at here.  MR. COLLER: That is absolutely correct.  MR. WITHERS: So if there is no unity of title, but there is an existing structure on one of the other two lots, if they tear that structure down, it now becomes two building sites?  MR. COLLER: Well  MR. WITHERS: She's saying, yes, and that's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. REVUELTA: In my opinion, if the tennis court was there, this is still two lots, two folio numbers, two taxes.  MR. WITHERS: No. No, I understand. We have a very strict lot splitting ordinance in Coral Gables, and when you put something on those two lots, it joins it together, but what you're saying, if there's no unity of title, even if there is an existing structure on one of those two lots, which I understood there was a house on one of them, if that house is removed, they can have two buildable sites, without having to go through the lot splitting ordinance. That's what I understand. Is that correct, Laura?  MS. RUSSO: That is correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	but the legal matter here is, there was nothing tying them together.  MR. COLLER: Exactly.  MR. BEHAR: So they've always been independently platted lots.  MR. COLLER: Correct.  MR. BEHAR: That's simple. That's what we're looking at here.  MR. COLLER: That is absolutely correct.  MR. WITHERS: So if there is no unity of title, but there is an existing structure on one of the other two lots, if they tear that structure down, it now becomes two building sites?  MR. COLLER: Well  MR. WITHERS: She's saying, yes, and that's why I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. REVUELTA: In my opinion, if the tennis court was there, this is still two lots, two folio numbers, two taxes.  MR. WITHERS: No. No, I understand. We have a very strict lot splitting ordinance in Coral Gables, and when you put something on those two lots, it joins it together, but what you're saying, if there's no unity of title, even if there is an existing structure on one of those two lots, which I understood there was a house on one of them, if that house is removed, they can have two buildable sites, without having to go through the lot splitting ordinance. That's what I understand. Is that correct, Laura?  MS. RUSSO: That is correct.  MR. COLLER: If they're separately platted
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	but the legal matter here is, there was nothing tying them together.  MR. COLLER: Exactly.  MR. BEHAR: So they've always been independently platted lots.  MR. COLLER: Correct.  MR. BEHAR: That's simple. That's what we're looking at here.  MR. COLLER: That is absolutely correct.  MR. WITHERS: So if there is no unity of title, but there is an existing structure on one of the other two lots, if they tear that structure down, it now becomes two building sites?  MR. COLLER: Well  MR. WITHERS: She's saying, yes, and that's why I'm  MR. COLLER: But I want to make sure, if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. REVUELTA: In my opinion, if the tennis court was there, this is still two lots, two folio numbers, two taxes.  MR. WITHERS: No. No, I understand. We have a very strict lot splitting ordinance in Coral Gables, and when you put something on those two lots, it joins it together, but what you're saying, if there's no unity of title, even if there is an existing structure on one of those two lots, which I understood there was a house on one of them, if that house is removed, they can have two buildable sites, without having to go through the lot splitting ordinance. That's what I understand. Is that correct, Laura?  MS. RUSSO: That is correct.  MR. COLLER: If they're separately platted lots as of 1996.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	but the legal matter here is, there was nothing tying them together.  MR. COLLER: Exactly.  MR. BEHAR: So they've always been independently platted lots.  MR. COLLER: Correct.  MR. BEHAR: That's simple. That's what we're looking at here.  MR. COLLER: That is absolutely correct.  MR. WITHERS: So if there is no unity of title, but there is an existing structure on one of the other two lots, if they tear that structure down, it now becomes two building sites?  MR. COLLER: Well  MR. WITHERS: She's saying, yes, and that's why I'm  MR. COLLER: But I want to make sure, if it's an adjacent structure, but it's not tied	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. REVUELTA: In my opinion, if the tennis court was there, this is still two lots, two folio numbers, two taxes.  MR. WITHERS: No. No, I understand. We have a very strict lot splitting ordinance in Coral Gables, and when you put something on those two lots, it joins it together, but what you're saying, if there's no unity of title, even if there is an existing structure on one of those two lots, which I understood there was a house on one of them, if that house is removed, they can have two buildable sites, without having to go through the lot splitting ordinance. That's what I understand. Is that correct, Laura?  MS. RUSSO: That is correct.  MR. COLLER: If they're separately platted lots as of 1996.  MR. WITHERS: Well, I understand the dates,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	but the legal matter here is, there was nothing tying them together.  MR. COLLER: Exactly.  MR. BEHAR: So they've always been independently platted lots.  MR. COLLER: Correct.  MR. BEHAR: That's simple. That's what we're looking at here.  MR. COLLER: That is absolutely correct.  MR. WITHERS: So if there is no unity of title, but there is an existing structure on one of the other two lots, if they tear that structure down, it now becomes two building sites?  MR. COLLER: Well  MR. WITHERS: She's saying, yes, and that's why I'm  MR. COLLER: But I want to make sure, if it's an adjacent structure, but it's not tied into the main house, in other words, it's a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. REVUELTA: In my opinion, if the tennis court was there, this is still two lots, two folio numbers, two taxes.  MR. WITHERS: No. No, I understand. We have a very strict lot splitting ordinance in Coral Gables, and when you put something on those two lots, it joins it together, but what you're saying, if there's no unity of title, even if there is an existing structure on one of those two lots, which I understood there was a house on one of them, if that house is removed, they can have two buildable sites, without having to go through the lot splitting ordinance. That's what I understand. Is that correct, Laura?  MS. RUSSO: That is correct.  MR. COLLER: If they're separately platted lots as of 1996.  MR. WITHERS: Well, I understand the dates, but, I mean — but those two other lots were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	but the legal matter here is, there was nothing tying them together.  MR. COLLER: Exactly.  MR. BEHAR: So they've always been independently platted lots.  MR. COLLER: Correct.  MR. BEHAR: That's simple. That's what we're looking at here.  MR. COLLER: That is absolutely correct.  MR. WITHERS: So if there is no unity of title, but there is an existing structure on one of the other two lots, if they tear that structure down, it now becomes two building sites?  MR. COLLER: Well  MR. WITHERS: She's saying, yes, and that's why I'm  MR. COLLER: But I want to make sure, if it's an adjacent structure, but it's not tied into the main house, in other words, it's a separate structure, and they tear that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. REVUELTA: In my opinion, if the tennis court was there, this is still two lots, two folio numbers, two taxes.  MR. WITHERS: No. No, I understand. We have a very strict lot splitting ordinance in Coral Gables, and when you put something on those two lots, it joins it together, but what you're saying, if there's no unity of title, even if there is an existing structure on one of those two lots, which I understood there was a house on one of them, if that house is removed, they can have two buildable sites, without having to go through the lot splitting ordinance. That's what I understand. Is that correct, Laura?  MS. RUSSO: That is correct.  MR. COLLER: If they're separately platted lots as of 1996.  MR. WITHERS: Well, I understand the dates, but, I mean — but those two other lots were after 1996 —
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	but the legal matter here is, there was nothing tying them together.  MR. COLLER: Exactly.  MR. BEHAR: So they've always been independently platted lots.  MR. COLLER: Correct.  MR. BEHAR: That's simple. That's what we're looking at here.  MR. COLLER: That is absolutely correct.  MR. WITHERS: So if there is no unity of title, but there is an existing structure on one of the other two lots, if they tear that structure down, it now becomes two building sites?  MR. COLLER: Well  MR. WITHERS: She's saying, yes, and that's why I'm  MR. COLLER: But I want to make sure, if it's an adjacent structure, but it's not tied into the main house, in other words, it's a separate structure, and they tear that structure down	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. REVUELTA: In my opinion, if the tennis court was there, this is still two lots, two folio numbers, two taxes.  MR. WITHERS: No. No, I understand. We have a very strict lot splitting ordinance in Coral Gables, and when you put something on those two lots, it joins it together, but what you're saying, if there's no unity of title, even if there is an existing structure on one of those two lots, which I understood there was a house on one of them, if that house is removed, they can have two buildable sites, without having to go through the lot splitting ordinance. That's what I understand. Is that correct, Laura?  MS. RUSSO: That is correct.  MR. COLLER: If they're separately platted lots as of 1996.  MR. WITHERS: Well, I understand the dates, but, I mean — but those two other lots were after 1996 —  MR. COLLER: But I think in this case —
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	but the legal matter here is, there was nothing tying them together.  MR. COLLER: Exactly.  MR. BEHAR: So they've always been independently platted lots.  MR. COLLER: Correct.  MR. BEHAR: That's simple. That's what we're looking at here.  MR. COLLER: That is absolutely correct.  MR. WITHERS: So if there is no unity of title, but there is an existing structure on one of the other two lots, if they tear that structure down, it now becomes two building sites?  MR. COLLER: Well  MR. WITHERS: She's saying, yes, and that's why I'm  MR. COLLER: But I want to make sure, if it's an adjacent structure, but it's not tied into the main house, in other words, it's a separate structure, and they tear that structure down  MR. WITHERS: No, that's not what they're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. REVUELTA: In my opinion, if the tennis court was there, this is still two lots, two folio numbers, two taxes.  MR. WITHERS: No. No, I understand. We have a very strict lot splitting ordinance in Coral Gables, and when you put something on those two lots, it joins it together, but what you're saying, if there's no unity of title, even if there is an existing structure on one of those two lots, which I understood there was a house on one of them, if that house is removed, they can have two buildable sites, without having to go through the lot splitting ordinance. That's what I understand. Is that correct, Laura?  MS. RUSSO: That is correct.  MR. COLLER: If they're separately platted lots as of 1996.  MR. WITHERS: Well, I understand the dates, but, I mean — but those two other lots were after 1996 —  MR. COLLER: But I think in this case —  MS. RUSSO: No, those lots have always
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	but the legal matter here is, there was nothing tying them together.  MR. COLLER: Exactly.  MR. BEHAR: So they've always been independently platted lots.  MR. COLLER: Correct.  MR. BEHAR: That's simple. That's what we're looking at here.  MR. COLLER: That is absolutely correct.  MR. WITHERS: So if there is no unity of title, but there is an existing structure on one of the other two lots, if they tear that structure down, it now becomes two building sites?  MR. COLLER: Well  MR. WITHERS: She's saying, yes, and that's why I'm  MR. COLLER: But I want to make sure, if it's an adjacent structure, but it's not tied into the main house, in other words, it's a separate structure, and they tear that structure down  MR. WITHERS: No, that's not what they're saying.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. REVUELTA: In my opinion, if the tennis court was there, this is still two lots, two folio numbers, two taxes.  MR. WITHERS: No. No, I understand. We have a very strict lot splitting ordinance in Coral Gables, and when you put something on those two lots, it joins it together, but what you're saying, if there's no unity of title, even if there is an existing structure on one of those two lots, which I understood there was a house on one of them, if that house is removed, they can have two buildable sites, without having to go through the lot splitting ordinance. That's what I understand. Is that correct, Laura?  MS. RUSSO: That is correct.  MR. COLLER: If they're separately platted lots as of 1996.  MR. WITHERS: Well, I understand the dates, but, I mean but those two other lots were after 1996  MR. COLLER: But I think in this case  MS. RUSSO: No, those lots have always been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	but the legal matter here is, there was nothing tying them together.  MR. COLLER: Exactly.  MR. BEHAR: So they've always been independently platted lots.  MR. COLLER: Correct.  MR. BEHAR: That's simple. That's what we're looking at here.  MR. COLLER: That is absolutely correct.  MR. WITHERS: So if there is no unity of title, but there is an existing structure on one of the other two lots, if they tear that structure down, it now becomes two building sites?  MR. COLLER: Well  MR. WITHERS: She's saying, yes, and that's why I'm  MR. COLLER: But I want to make sure, if it's an adjacent structure, but it's not tied into the main house, in other words, it's a separate structure, and they tear that structure down  MR. WITHERS: No, that's not what they're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. REVUELTA: In my opinion, if the tennis court was there, this is still two lots, two folio numbers, two taxes.  MR. WITHERS: No. No, I understand. We have a very strict lot splitting ordinance in Coral Gables, and when you put something on those two lots, it joins it together, but what you're saying, if there's no unity of title, even if there is an existing structure on one of those two lots, which I understood there was a house on one of them, if that house is removed, they can have two buildable sites, without having to go through the lot splitting ordinance. That's what I understand. Is that correct, Laura?  MS. RUSSO: That is correct.  MR. COLLER: If they're separately platted lots as of 1996.  MR. WITHERS: Well, I understand the dates, but, I mean — but those two other lots were after 1996 —  MR. COLLER: But I think in this case —  MS. RUSSO: No, those lots have always

	Page 37		Page 38
1	Boniske. I represent Karla Dascal.	1	of Coral Gables," you do that and you ask for
2	MR. BEHAR: State your name and address,	2	your Site Specific regulations, all of the
3	for the record.	3	restrictive covenants that are recorded in
4	MS. BONISKE: Sure. Nina Boniske, 1413	4	Snapper Creek, the fact that you have to apply
5	Sunset Harbor Drive.	5	and get approved to even buy a lot there or
6	MR. BEHAR: Do we need to swear her in?	6	sell it, that's what your lawyer will tell you
7	MS. BONISKE: I'm an attorney.	7	gives the footprint of what somebody can build
8	MR. COLLER: No. She's an attorney.	8	there.
9	MR. BEHAR: Okay.	9	So when you're annexed into Coral Gables,
10	MS. BONISKE: I think Mr. Coller will tell	10	Coral Gables cannot then go and say, "Oh, we're
11	you, and he was the expert at Miami-Dade County	11	going to give you different regulations,"
12	on annexation and municipal annexation from the	12	because that's part of your annexation
13	County, in 1996, when Snapper Creek, its own	13	agreement, and I think he will tell you that.
14	subdivision, they had a certain amount of lots,	14	So I hope that clears it up.
15	that was the expectation. They've never split	15	MR. BEHAR: That does.
16	a lot in Snapper Creek. Every lot is over one	16	MR. WITHERS: Are you sure? I mean, you're
17	acre. You can't go in and say, "I want to	17	smart and I'm not.
18	build on one-half acre" and split it, like you	18	MS. BONISKE: Thirty years of doing this, yeah.
19	can everywhere else in the County, including	19	MR. WITHERS: I thought all of the
20	here.	20	annexation agreements were, that after a period
21	So, again, by a technical aspect of your	21	of time, that you're absorbed into the City of
22	Code, we've fallen into it, but, really, in	22	Coral Gables.
23	1996, when you voluntarily annexed yourself in	23	MS. BONISKE: You're absorbed, but Laura
24	and say, "I don't want to be part of Miami-Dade	24	will finish the answer but you have Site
25	County. I want to have an address in the City	25	Specific regulations that are part of your
	Page 39		Page 40
1	annexation ordinance, and we pulled it for	1	occurred prior to that, that's why the
2	1996, there's recorded covenants, there's	2	ordinance
3	restrictive covenants on the entire subdivision	3	MR. WITHERS: Okay. I'm good.
4	and the plat.	4	MR. BEHAR: Venny.
5	MR. BEHAR: Okay. We're not doing a lot	5	MR. TORRE: I'm ready to make a motion.
6	split. The lots are split. They're platted	6	MR. BEHAR: Luis before you do do you
7	individual lots. So, I mean, it's not like	7	have any comment?
8	you're splitting a lot.	8	MR. REVUELTA: I do, but I'm not going to
-			WIK. KE V CELTA. Tuo, but Till not going to
9	MR. WITHERS: I'm not worried about this	9	make it.
	MR. WITHERS: I'm not worried about this one. I'm worried about the other two.	9	
9			make it.
9 10	one. I'm worried about the other two.	10	make it. MR. BEHAR: Thank you very much. I will
9 10 11	one. I'm worried about the other two.  MS. RUSSO: I'm going to give the answer	10 11	make it.  MR. BEHAR: Thank you very much. I will accept a motion.
9 10 11 12	one. I'm worried about the other two.  MS. RUSSO: I'm going to give the answer that Chip is looking for. If someone were to	10 11 12	make it.  MR. BEHAR: Thank you very much. I will accept a motion.  MR. WITHERS: I'll move it, with the
9 10 11 12 13	one. I'm worried about the other two.  MS. RUSSO: I'm going to give the answer that Chip is looking for. If someone were to have bought a vacant lot or a house, in 2000,	10 11 12 13	make it.  MR. BEHAR: Thank you very much. I will accept a motion.  MR. WITHERS: I'll move it, with the conditions, though, with the Staff conditions.
9 10 11 12 13	one. I'm worried about the other two.  MS. RUSSO: I'm going to give the answer that Chip is looking for. If someone were to have bought a vacant lot or a house, in 2000, okay, and then bought the lot next door, and	10 11 12 13 14	make it.  MR. BEHAR: Thank you very much. I will accept a motion.  MR. WITHERS: I'll move it, with the conditions, though, with the Staff conditions.  Are you okay with the Staff conditions?
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	one. I'm worried about the other two.  MS. RUSSO: I'm going to give the answer that Chip is looking for. If someone were to have bought a vacant lot or a house, in 2000, okay, and then bought the lot next door, and then put a tennis court or a swimming pool or a	10 11 12 13 14 15	make it.  MR. BEHAR: Thank you very much. I will accept a motion.  MR. WITHERS: I'll move it, with the conditions, though, with the Staff conditions.  Are you okay with the Staff conditions?  MR. BEHAR: Do we have a second?
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	one. I'm worried about the other two.  MS. RUSSO: I'm going to give the answer that Chip is looking for. If someone were to have bought a vacant lot or a house, in 2000, okay, and then bought the lot next door, and then put a tennis court or a swimming pool or a cabana or whatever, the City of Coral Gables	10 11 12 13 14 15	make it.  MR. BEHAR: Thank you very much. I will accept a motion.  MR. WITHERS: I'll move it, with the conditions, though, with the Staff conditions.  Are you okay with the Staff conditions?  MR. BEHAR: Do we have a second?  MR. TORRE: I'll make a second.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	one. I'm worried about the other two.  MS. RUSSO: I'm going to give the answer that Chip is looking for. If someone were to have bought a vacant lot or a house, in 2000, okay, and then bought the lot next door, and then put a tennis court or a swimming pool or a cabana or whatever, the City of Coral Gables would have required a unity of title.	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	make it.  MR. BEHAR: Thank you very much. I will accept a motion.  MR. WITHERS: I'll move it, with the conditions, though, with the Staff conditions.  Are you okay with the Staff conditions?  MR. BEHAR: Do we have a second?  MR. TORRE: I'll make a second.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. Jill, can you please
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	one. I'm worried about the other two.  MS. RUSSO: I'm going to give the answer that Chip is looking for. If someone were to have bought a vacant lot or a house, in 2000, okay, and then bought the lot next door, and then put a tennis court or a swimming pool or a cabana or whatever, the City of Coral Gables would have required a unity of title.  MR. WITHERS: Unification of title.	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	make it.  MR. BEHAR: Thank you very much. I will accept a motion.  MR. WITHERS: I'll move it, with the conditions, though, with the Staff conditions.  Are you okay with the Staff conditions?  MR. BEHAR: Do we have a second?  MR. TORRE: I'll make a second.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. Jill, can you please call the roll?
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	one. I'm worried about the other two.  MS. RUSSO: I'm going to give the answer that Chip is looking for. If someone were to have bought a vacant lot or a house, in 2000, okay, and then bought the lot next door, and then put a tennis court or a swimming pool or a cabana or whatever, the City of Coral Gables would have required a unity of title.  MR. WITHERS: Unification of title.  MS. RUSSO: So, then, if they then decided	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	make it.  MR. BEHAR: Thank you very much. I will accept a motion.  MR. WITHERS: I'll move it, with the conditions, though, with the Staff conditions.  Are you okay with the Staff conditions?  MR. BEHAR: Do we have a second?  MR. TORRE: I'll make a second.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. Jill, can you please call the roll?  THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	one. I'm worried about the other two.  MS. RUSSO: I'm going to give the answer that Chip is looking for. If someone were to have bought a vacant lot or a house, in 2000, okay, and then bought the lot next door, and then put a tennis court or a swimming pool or a cabana or whatever, the City of Coral Gables would have required a unity of title.  MR. WITHERS: Unification of title.  MS. RUSSO: So, then, if they then decided to demolish everything and sell it, the unity	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	make it.  MR. BEHAR: Thank you very much. I will accept a motion.  MR. WITHERS: I'll move it, with the conditions, though, with the Staff conditions.  Are you okay with the Staff conditions?  MR. BEHAR: Do we have a second?  MR. TORRE: I'll make a second.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. Jill, can you please call the roll?  THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?  MR. WITHERS: Yes.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	one. I'm worried about the other two.  MS. RUSSO: I'm going to give the answer that Chip is looking for. If someone were to have bought a vacant lot or a house, in 2000, okay, and then bought the lot next door, and then put a tennis court or a swimming pool or a cabana or whatever, the City of Coral Gables would have required a unity of title.  MR. WITHERS: Unification of title.  MS. RUSSO: So, then, if they then decided to demolish everything and sell it, the unity of title doesn't go away.	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	make it.  MR. BEHAR: Thank you very much. I will accept a motion.  MR. WITHERS: I'll move it, with the conditions, though, with the Staff conditions.  Are you okay with the Staff conditions?  MR. BEHAR: Do we have a second?  MR. TORRE: I'll make a second.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. Jill, can you please call the roll?  THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?  MR. WITHERS: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	one. I'm worried about the other two.  MS. RUSSO: I'm going to give the answer that Chip is looking for. If someone were to have bought a vacant lot or a house, in 2000, okay, and then bought the lot next door, and then put a tennis court or a swimming pool or a cabana or whatever, the City of Coral Gables would have required a unity of title.  MR. WITHERS: Unification of title.  MS. RUSSO: So, then, if they then decided to demolish everything and sell it, the unity of title doesn't go away.  MR. WITHERS: Because they removed	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	make it.  MR. BEHAR: Thank you very much. I will accept a motion.  MR. WITHERS: I'll move it, with the conditions, though, with the Staff conditions.  Are you okay with the Staff conditions?  MR. BEHAR: Do we have a second?  MR. TORRE: I'll make a second.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. Jill, can you please call the roll?  THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?  MR. WITHERS: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?  MR. REVUELTA: Yes.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	one. I'm worried about the other two.  MS. RUSSO: I'm going to give the answer that Chip is looking for. If someone were to have bought a vacant lot or a house, in 2000, okay, and then bought the lot next door, and then put a tennis court or a swimming pool or a cabana or whatever, the City of Coral Gables would have required a unity of title.  MR. WITHERS: Unification of title.  MS. RUSSO: So, then, if they then decided to demolish everything and sell it, the unity of title doesn't go away.  MR. WITHERS: Because they removed  MS. RUSSO: the structure. So someone	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	make it.  MR. BEHAR: Thank you very much. I will accept a motion.  MR. WITHERS: I'll move it, with the conditions, though, with the Staff conditions.  Are you okay with the Staff conditions?  MR. BEHAR: Do we have a second?  MR. TORRE: I'll make a second.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. Jill, can you please call the roll?  THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?  MR. WITHERS: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?  MR. REVUELTA: Yes.  THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?

	Page 41		Page 42
1	MR. BEHAR: Yes.	1	get approval, you're basically tied to these
2	MS. RUSSO: Thank you very much.	2	four conditions of approval. One of the
3	MR. TORRE: These are all learning	3	conditions of approval says, "The total square
4	experiences, so we take it as that.	4	footage of the residences allowed on a
5	MR. BEHAR: Okay. Mr. Coller, can you read	5	separated building site shall be equal to or
6	the next item?	6	less than the total square footage that could
7	MR. COLLER: Item E-2, an Ordinance of the	7	be constructed on the property if developed as
8	City Commission providing for text amendments	8	a single building site."
9	to the City of Coral Gables Official Zoning	9	So when 601 Sunset I'm going to be very
10	Code, by amending Article 14, "Process",	10	transparent 601 Sunset went to Commission,
11	Section 14-200 "Procedures", Section 14-202.6,	11	they brought up this issue. The Commission's
12	"Building Site Determination" by eliminating	12	reaction was, why is that condition in here?
13	size restrictions on residences in a separated	13	They want it to be removed. So Staff is
14		14	•
15	building site based on what was permitted as a	15	stricking through that, and we want your
	single building site; providing for	16	opinion on it.
16	severability clause, repeater provision,		MR. TORRE: Let me try to understand
17	codification, and providing for an effective	17	(inaudible) which make it the opposite of what
18	date. Item E-2, public hearing.	18	I believe is true.
19	MS. GARCIA: All right. So we have this	19	I'm going to use an example, a very easy
20	item right after Laura's item, which is	20	example, using your table at the bottom. If I
21	related, right, and you're very familiar with	21	have 10,000 square feet, and my first 5,000 is
22	this, I'm sure.	2.2	measured at 48 percent, and I have 10,000 feet
23	So there's four conditions of approval that	23	and I build exactly 48 percent, I have a 4,800
24	are listed in the Zoning Code. Whenever you	24	square foot house.
25	split a lot, you have to go to Commission, you	25	I split the lot. Then, do the rules
	Page 43		Page 44
1	you're saying that the next house had to apply	1	you could build when it was combined as one,
2	by the next 35 percent, because I already ate	2	which is either the 35 percent or the 30
3	up to 48 percent?	3	percent.
4	MS. GARCIA: No, by whatever for	4	THE SECRETARY: Excuse me, we also have
5	example, it would be about a 10,000 square foot	5	Development Services Director Suramy Cabrera
6	property, your 35 percent maximum building	6	that would like to speak.
7	floor area, you split it, so it's no longer	7	MR. TORRE: No, I think I understand,
8	35	8	because the original house could have eaten up
9	MR. BEHAR: Each lot could be 3,500.	9	a lot of square footage, and, then, if you put
10	MS. GARCIA: Each lot could be 48 percent	10	another one, you have this massive house left
11	now, based on the new split lots.	11	over in the old lot, that would not have
12	MR. TORRE: But the old rule would only	12	happened
13	allow you to build what was left?	13	MS. CABRERA: No. Actually, no, because
14	MS. GARCIA: No, what was allowed before.	14	you would not be able to split the lot
15	So if you had I should have had some	15	MR. BEHAR: Wait. Do we need to
16	numbers, but	16	MR. COLLER: We need to actually have the
17	MR. TORRE: Allowed before the Code change,	17	person put their name and address in the
18	is that what you're saying?	18	record.
19	MS. GARCIA: No, before the lot was split.	19	MR. BEHAR: And do we have to swear her in?
20	So if you could build they could do the	20	MR. COLLER: Yes, we do, because she's
21	calculations, as far as you how much you could	21	actually a fact witness, a Staff witness. So
22	build on your combined 10,000 square foot lot.	22	we need to swear you in. Can we get you on the
23	You want to go and you split it. The	23	screen, Suramy?
24	Commission approves it. The maximum you can	24	MS. CABRERA: Oh, boy. Yeah. Sorry, I was
	Jos Can	1 -	
25	build within those two properties is how much	25	biking, but I'll put on my camera.

1	Page 45		Page 46
	MR. COLLER: You're what?	1	tiny lot.
2	MS. CABRERA: I was biking and listening.	2	MR. TORRE: Right.
3	MR. BEHAR: We had a Board Member, Rene	3	MS. CABRERA: But you would not be able to
4	Murai	4	split the lot if you would create a
5	MS. CABRERA: This is being recorded, too.	5	non-conformity of the lot that has the house.
6	This is horrible, but okay.	6	So if that house was under the square footage,
7	MR. COLLER: Would you swear in the	7	we wouldn't approve and, Jennifer, please
8	witness, please?	8	correct me if I'm wrong, but we wouldn't
9	(Thereupon, the participant was sworn.)	9	approve a lot split, because we would be
10	MS. CABRERA: Yes, I do.	10	creating this non-conformity of being over the
11	MR. COLLER: Suramy, you need to state your	11	FAR.
12	name, for the record, if you would.	12	MS. GARCIA: Correct.
13	MS. CABRERA: Sure. Suramy Cabrera, I'm	13	MS. CABRERA: What's really ridiculous
14	the Development Services Director.	14	about this ordinance is that, let's say that
15	MR. BEHAR: Do we have to keep her on the	15	now I have this huge lot, and I split it, and I
16	video?	16	sell one of the lots, whoever builds first
17	MR. COLLER: No. We've seen her for	17	could max out their lot, and now the other guy
18	purposes of being sworn in. We can relieve her	18	is left with whatever is left from the lot next
19	from having to actually see her.	19	to his, and it's how do you do that? It's
20	MR. BEHAR: Okay.	20	separate owners. People have a right to
21	MS. CABRERA: So the question that I heard	21	develop their property to whatever everybody
22	was that, it was probably done because if you	22	else in that neighborhood has a right to
23	had a massive house on these two lots, right,	23	develop it to.
24	that were a single lot, and then you do a lot	24	So it's really like the Commission, I,
25	split, you may have a massive home on a little	25	everybody was like, what is this, what is the
			,,
	Page 47		Page 48
1	purpose of this, and when we looked at it,	1	MR. BEHAR: Right?
2	and an		THE BEHALT TUBER
	apparently the only purpose was to try to	2	MS. REDILA: Arceli Redila, Zoning
3	apparently the only purpose was to try to discourage lot splits, but we're not really	2 3	-
			MS. REDILA: Arceli Redila, Zoning
3	discourage lot splits, but we're not really	3	MS. REDILA: Arceli Redila, Zoning Administrator.
3 4	discourage lot splits, but we're not really discouraging lot splits, we're really creating	3 4	MS. REDILA: Arceli Redila, Zoning Administrator. (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.)
3 4 5	discourage lot splits, but we're not really discouraging lot splits, we're really creating an issue for people who really should be able	3 4 5	MS. REDILA: Arceli Redila, Zoning Administrator.  (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.)  MS. REDILA: I do.
3 4 5 6	discourage lot splits, but we're not really discouraging lot splits, we're really creating an issue for people who really should be able to get a lot split. And the lot split process	3 4 5 6	MS. REDILA: Arceli Redila, Zoning Administrator.  (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.)  MS. REDILA: I do. So let's do the two scenarios. So you have
3 4 5 6 7	discourage lot splits, but we're not really discouraging lot splits, we're really creating an issue for people who really should be able to get a lot split. And the lot split process is very vigorous, right. We just don't give	3 4 5 6 7	MS. REDILA: Arceli Redila, Zoning Administrator.  (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.)  MS. REDILA: I do.  So let's do the two scenarios. So you have the 5,000 square feet. The maximum you can
3 4 5 6 7 8	discourage lot splits, but we're not really discouraging lot splits, we're really creating an issue for people who really should be able to get a lot split. And the lot split process is very vigorous, right. We just don't give lots splits all of the time.	3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. REDILA: Arceli Redila, Zoning Administrator.  (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.)  MS. REDILA: I do.  So let's do the two scenarios. So you have the 5,000 square feet. The maximum you can give is 48 percent, right. So that's 2,400
3 4 5 6 7 8	discourage lot splits, but we're not really discouraging lot splits, we're really creating an issue for people who really should be able to get a lot split. And the lot split process is very vigorous, right. We just don't give lots splits all of the time.  So the Commission wanted us, because of	3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. REDILA: Arceli Redila, Zoning Administrator.  (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.)  MS. REDILA: I do.  So let's do the two scenarios. So you have the 5,000 square feet. The maximum you can give is 48 percent, right. So that's 2,400 square feet. So now let's say you have two
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	discourage lot splits, but we're not really discouraging lot splits, we're really creating an issue for people who really should be able to get a lot split. And the lot split process is very vigorous, right. We just don't give lots splits all of the time.  So the Commission wanted us, because of that 601 property that Jennifer spoke about and	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. REDILA: Arceli Redila, Zoning Administrator.  (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.)  MS. REDILA: I do.  So let's do the two scenarios. So you have the 5,000 square feet. The maximum you can give is 48 percent, right. So that's 2,400 square feet. So now let's say you have two 5,000 square feet, totaling two lots, totaling
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	discourage lot splits, but we're not really discouraging lot splits, we're really creating an issue for people who really should be able to get a lot split. And the lot split process is very vigorous, right. We just don't give lots splits all of the time.  So the Commission wanted us, because of that 601 property that Jennifer spoke about and everybody learned that this was actually in the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS. REDILA: Arceli Redila, Zoning Administrator.  (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.)  MS. REDILA: I do.  So let's do the two scenarios. So you have the 5,000 square feet. The maximum you can give is 48 percent, right. So that's 2,400 square feet. So now let's say you have two 5,000 square feet, totaling two lots, totaling 10,000. The way it is, is that the first 5,000
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	discourage lot splits, but we're not really discouraging lot splits, we're really creating an issue for people who really should be able to get a lot split. And the lot split process is very vigorous, right. We just don't give lots splits all of the time.  So the Commission wanted us, because of that 601 property that Jennifer spoke about and everybody learned that this was actually in the Code, wanted us to go back and correct this,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. REDILA: Arceli Redila, Zoning Administrator.  (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.)  MS. REDILA: I do.  So let's do the two scenarios. So you have the 5,000 square feet. The maximum you can give is 48 percent, right. So that's 2,400 square feet. So now let's say you have two 5,000 square feet, totaling two lots, totaling 10,000. The way it is, is that the first 5,000 square feet, you can do 48 percent. The next
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	discourage lot splits, but we're not really discouraging lot splits, we're really creating an issue for people who really should be able to get a lot split. And the lot split process is very vigorous, right. We just don't give lots splits all of the time.  So the Commission wanted us, because of that 601 property that Jennifer spoke about and everybody learned that this was actually in the Code, wanted us to go back and correct this, because it really doesn't make any sense.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. REDILA: Arceli Redila, Zoning Administrator.  (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.)  MS. REDILA: I do.  So let's do the two scenarios. So you have the 5,000 square feet. The maximum you can give is 48 percent, right. So that's 2,400 square feet. So now let's say you have two 5,000 square feet, totaling two lots, totaling 10,000. The way it is, is that the first 5,000 square feet, you can do 48 percent. The next 5,000, you can only do 35 percent.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	discourage lot splits, but we're not really discouraging lot splits, we're really creating an issue for people who really should be able to get a lot split. And the lot split process is very vigorous, right. We just don't give lots splits all of the time.  So the Commission wanted us, because of that 601 property that Jennifer spoke about and everybody learned that this was actually in the Code, wanted us to go back and correct this, because it really doesn't make any sense.  MR. BEHAR: So, at the end of the day,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. REDILA: Arceli Redila, Zoning Administrator.  (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.)  MS. REDILA: I do.  So let's do the two scenarios. So you have the 5,000 square feet. The maximum you can give is 48 percent, right. So that's 2,400 square feet. So now let's say you have two 5,000 square feet, totaling two lots, totaling 10,000. The way it is, is that the first 5,000 square feet, you can do 48 percent. The next 5,000, you can only do 35 percent.  So if you have a single building site that
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	discourage lot splits, but we're not really discouraging lot splits, we're really creating an issue for people who really should be able to get a lot split. And the lot split process is very vigorous, right. We just don't give lots splits all of the time.  So the Commission wanted us, because of that 601 property that Jennifer spoke about and everybody learned that this was actually in the Code, wanted us to go back and correct this, because it really doesn't make any sense.  MR. BEHAR: So, at the end of the day, really, if you have a 10,000 square foot lot	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. REDILA: Arceli Redila, Zoning Administrator.  (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.)  MS. REDILA: I do.  So let's do the two scenarios. So you have the 5,000 square feet. The maximum you can give is 48 percent, right. So that's 2,400 square feet. So now let's say you have two 5,000 square feet, totaling two lots, totaling 10,000. The way it is, is that the first 5,000 square feet, you can do 48 percent. The next 5,000, you can only do 35 percent.  So if you have a single building site that is 10,000 square feet, the maximum you can do
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	discourage lot splits, but we're not really discouraging lot splits, we're really creating an issue for people who really should be able to get a lot split. And the lot split process is very vigorous, right. We just don't give lots splits all of the time.  So the Commission wanted us, because of that 601 property that Jennifer spoke about and everybody learned that this was actually in the Code, wanted us to go back and correct this, because it really doesn't make any sense.  MR. BEHAR: So, at the end of the day, really, if you have a 10,000 square foot lot and you put a maximum of 4,800 square feet, if	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. REDILA: Arceli Redila, Zoning Administrator.  (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.)  MS. REDILA: I do.  So let's do the two scenarios. So you have the 5,000 square feet. The maximum you can give is 48 percent, right. So that's 2,400 square feet. So now let's say you have two 5,000 square feet, totaling two lots, totaling 10,000. The way it is, is that the first 5,000 square feet, you can do 48 percent. The next 5,000, you can only do 35 percent.  So if you have a single building site that is 10,000 square feet, the maximum you can do in that one is only 4,150 square feet. With
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	discourage lot splits, but we're not really discouraging lot splits, we're really creating an issue for people who really should be able to get a lot split. And the lot split process is very vigorous, right. We just don't give lots splits all of the time.  So the Commission wanted us, because of that 601 property that Jennifer spoke about and everybody learned that this was actually in the Code, wanted us to go back and correct this, because it really doesn't make any sense.  MR. BEHAR: So, at the end of the day, really, if you have a 10,000 square foot lot and you put a maximum of 4,800 square feet, if I take a 5,000 square foot lot at 48 percent,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. REDILA: Arceli Redila, Zoning Administrator.  (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.)  MS. REDILA: I do.  So let's do the two scenarios. So you have the 5,000 square feet. The maximum you can give is 48 percent, right. So that's 2,400 square feet. So now let's say you have two 5,000 square feet, totaling two lots, totaling 10,000. The way it is, is that the first 5,000 square feet, you can do 48 percent. The next 5,000, you can only do 35 percent.  So if you have a single building site that is 10,000 square feet, the maximum you can do in that one is only 4,150 square feet. With the current regulation, we have divided —
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	discourage lot splits, but we're not really discouraging lot splits, we're really creating an issue for people who really should be able to get a lot split. And the lot split process is very vigorous, right. We just don't give lots splits all of the time.  So the Commission wanted us, because of that 601 property that Jennifer spoke about and everybody learned that this was actually in the Code, wanted us to go back and correct this, because it really doesn't make any sense.  MR. BEHAR: So, at the end of the day, really, if you have a 10,000 square foot lot and you put a maximum of 4,800 square feet, if I take a 5,000 square foot lot at 48 percent, it's 2,400 square feet.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. REDILA: Arceli Redila, Zoning Administrator.  (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.) MS. REDILA: I do. So let's do the two scenarios. So you have the 5,000 square feet. The maximum you can give is 48 percent, right. So that's 2,400 square feet. So now let's say you have two 5,000 square feet, totaling two lots, totaling 10,000. The way it is, is that the first 5,000 square feet, you can do 48 percent. The next 5,000, you can only do 35 percent. So if you have a single building site that is 10,000 square feet, the maximum you can do in that one is only 4,150 square feet. With the current regulation, we have divided — that's the maximum you can do even if you split
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	discourage lot splits, but we're not really discouraging lot splits, we're really creating an issue for people who really should be able to get a lot split. And the lot split process is very vigorous, right. We just don't give lots splits all of the time.  So the Commission wanted us, because of that 601 property that Jennifer spoke about and everybody learned that this was actually in the Code, wanted us to go back and correct this, because it really doesn't make any sense.  MR. BEHAR: So, at the end of the day, really, if you have a 10,000 square foot lot and you put a maximum of 4,800 square feet, if I take a 5,000 square foot lot at 48 percent, it's 2,400 square feet.  MR. REVUELTA: The math is the same.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. REDILA: Arceli Redila, Zoning Administrator.  (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.) MS. REDILA: I do. So let's do the two scenarios. So you have the 5,000 square feet. The maximum you can give is 48 percent, right. So that's 2,400 square feet. So now let's say you have two 5,000 square feet, totaling two lots, totaling 10,000. The way it is, is that the first 5,000 square feet, you can do 48 percent. The next 5,000, you can only do 35 percent. So if you have a single building site that is 10,000 square feet, the maximum you can do in that one is only 4,150 square feet. With the current regulation, we have divided—that's the maximum you can do even if you split it. Therefore, when there's two lots together,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	discourage lot splits, but we're not really discouraging lot splits, we're really creating an issue for people who really should be able to get a lot split. And the lot split process is very vigorous, right. We just don't give lots splits all of the time.  So the Commission wanted us, because of that 601 property that Jennifer spoke about and everybody learned that this was actually in the Code, wanted us to go back and correct this, because it really doesn't make any sense.  MR. BEHAR: So, at the end of the day, really, if you have a 10,000 square foot lot and you put a maximum of 4,800 square feet, if I take a 5,000 square foot lot at 48 percent, it's 2,400 square feet.  MR. REVUELTA: The math is the same.  MR. BEHAR: It's the same, right?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. REDILA: Arceli Redila, Zoning Administrator.  (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.) MS. REDILA: I do. So let's do the two scenarios. So you have the 5,000 square feet. The maximum you can give is 48 percent, right. So that's 2,400 square feet. So now let's say you have two 5,000 square feet, totaling two lots, totaling 10,000. The way it is, is that the first 5,000 square feet, you can do 48 percent. The next 5,000, you can only do 35 percent. So if you have a single building site that is 10,000 square feet, the maximum you can do in that one is only 4,150 square feet. With the current regulation, we have divided — that's the maximum you can do even if you split it. Therefore, when there's two lots together, if we are to evenly distribute it, you can only
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	discourage lot splits, but we're not really discouraging lot splits, we're really creating an issue for people who really should be able to get a lot split. And the lot split process is very vigorous, right. We just don't give lots splits all of the time.  So the Commission wanted us, because of that 601 property that Jennifer spoke about and everybody learned that this was actually in the Code, wanted us to go back and correct this, because it really doesn't make any sense.  MR. BEHAR: So, at the end of the day, really, if you have a 10,000 square foot lot and you put a maximum of 4,800 square feet, if I take a 5,000 square foot lot at 48 percent, it's 2,400 square feet.  MR. REVUELTA: The math is the same.  MR. BEHAR: It's the same, right?  So what you're saying, that lot — before,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. REDILA: Arceli Redila, Zoning Administrator.  (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.) MS. REDILA: I do. So let's do the two scenarios. So you have the 5,000 square feet. The maximum you can give is 48 percent, right. So that's 2,400 square feet. So now let's say you have two 5,000 square feet, totaling two lots, totaling 10,000. The way it is, is that the first 5,000 square feet, you can do 48 percent. The next 5,000, you can only do 35 percent. So if you have a single building site that is 10,000 square feet, the maximum you can do in that one is only 4,150 square feet. With the current regulation, we have divided—that's the maximum you can do even if you split it. Therefore, when there's two lots together, if we are to evenly distribute it, you can only do 2,075 square feet on both lots, after you
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	discourage lot splits, but we're not really discouraging lot splits, we're really creating an issue for people who really should be able to get a lot split. And the lot split process is very vigorous, right. We just don't give lots splits all of the time.  So the Commission wanted us, because of that 601 property that Jennifer spoke about and everybody learned that this was actually in the Code, wanted us to go back and correct this, because it really doesn't make any sense.  MR. BEHAR: So, at the end of the day, really, if you have a 10,000 square foot lot and you put a maximum of 4,800 square feet, if I take a 5,000 square foot lot at 48 percent, it's 2,400 square feet.  MR. REVUELTA: The math is the same.  MR. BEHAR: It's the same, right?  So what you're saying, that lot — before, the original lot could go up to 48 percent of	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. REDILA: Arceli Redila, Zoning Administrator.  (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.) MS. REDILA: I do. So let's do the two scenarios. So you have the 5,000 square feet. The maximum you can give is 48 percent, right. So that's 2,400 square feet. So now let's say you have two 5,000 square feet, totaling two lots, totaling 10,000. The way it is, is that the first 5,000 square feet, you can do 48 percent. The next 5,000, you can only do 35 percent.  So if you have a single building site that is 10,000 square feet, the maximum you can do in that one is only 4,150 square feet. With the current regulation, we have divided—that's the maximum you can do even if you split it. Therefore, when there's two lots together, if we are to evenly distribute it, you can only do 2,075 square feet on both lots, after you subdivide it.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	discourage lot splits, but we're not really discouraging lot splits, we're really creating an issue for people who really should be able to get a lot split. And the lot split process is very vigorous, right. We just don't give lots splits all of the time.  So the Commission wanted us, because of that 601 property that Jennifer spoke about and everybody learned that this was actually in the Code, wanted us to go back and correct this, because it really doesn't make any sense.  MR. BEHAR: So, at the end of the day, really, if you have a 10,000 square foot lot and you put a maximum of 4,800 square feet, if I take a 5,000 square foot lot at 48 percent, it's 2,400 square feet.  MR. REVUELTA: The math is the same.  MR. BEHAR: It's the same, right?  So what you're saying, that lot — before, the original lot could go up to 48 percent of the total and leave the second lot with barely	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. REDILA: Arceli Redila, Zoning Administrator.  (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.) MS. REDILA: I do. So let's do the two scenarios. So you have the 5,000 square feet. The maximum you can give is 48 percent, right. So that's 2,400 square feet. So now let's say you have two 5,000 square feet, totaling two lots, totaling 10,000. The way it is, is that the first 5,000 square feet, you can do 48 percent. The next 5,000, you can only do 35 percent. So if you have a single building site that is 10,000 square feet, the maximum you can do in that one is only 4,150 square feet. With the current regulation, we have divided—that's the maximum you can do even if you split it. Therefore, when there's two lots together, if we are to evenly distribute it, you can only do 2,075 square feet on both lots, after you subdivide it.  If you treat it with what we are

	Page 49		Page 50
1	5,000 square feet, which would allow 2,400	1	MR. WITHERS: Yeah, I know, but what were
2	square feet.	2	you confirming?
3	MR. REVUELTA: I'm fine with that.	3	MR. REVUELTA: That if you have a 10,000
4	MR. BEHAR: Okay. Perfect. Thank you.	4	square foot and you divide the lot into two
5	At this time, I'm going to open it up to	5	5,000 square feet and you sell them, somebody
6	public comment.	6	can apply for a permit for 48 percent of the
7	Seeing no one in the public, I'm going to	7	5,000 square feet of one and 48 percent of the
8	close the Chamber.	8	5,000 square feet on the other one. That's
9	Anybody in Zoom? No? At this time, then	9	what the ordinance is correcting?
10	we will close the public comment and we will	10	MS. GARCIA: Yes, what's being proposed. Yes.
11	open it up to Board discussion or a motion.	11	MR. WITHERS: This affects the people that
12	MR. REVUELTA: To confirm, it's that if you	12	have a large lot now, that have an existing
13	have a 10,000 square foot lot	13	home on their lot. They want to sell and split
14	MR. COLLER: You need to speak into the	14	their lot, so they can sell one of the lots
15	mike.	15	off. They're restricted on how big a house can
16	MR. REVUELTA: I'm sorry, if you have a	16	be built
17	10,000 square foot lot and you separate the	17	MS. GARCIA: On the new lot.
18	lots, you will be able to build 48 percent on	18	MR. WITHERS: on the new lot. So that's
19	each 5,000 square foot lot, where, in the	19	the impetus
20	current Ordinance, it doesn't allow that?	20	MS. GARCIA: As long as the first lot is
21	MR. WITHERS: I'm sorry, what was the	21	conforming.
22	second part of your point, in the current	22	MR. WITHERS: I understand. So that's
23	what	23	where, when you said it's kind of an anti-lot
24	MR. REVUELTA: I wasn't making a point. I	24	splitting ordinance or whatever, it's not
25	was just trying to confirm what I heard.	25	really dissuading the undeveloped lots, as it
23	was just trying to confirm what I heard.	23	reany dissuading the undeveloped fors, as it
	Page 51		Page 52
1	is dissuading those that might have an existing	1	as every other lot on that block. There's no
2	home and want to sell the vacant lot next to	2	restriction that you have to be smaller.
3	them. Is that the thought behind it? I'm	3	MR. WITHERS: So if you tore the house down
4	trying to understand, because if you have a big	4	and you split the lot, could you start
5	lot, you can build you know, it's easier to	5	you're starting from zero, then, right?
6	build from the ground up, like a spec person	6	MS. CABRERA: Yes, each
7	would buy a lot and tear down the house.	7	MR. BEHAR: But then you have to go through
8	MS. GARCIA: Yes, but your percentage of	8	the unity of title
9	the building floor area is reduced, the bigger	9	MR. WITHERS: Yeah, I understand. You have
10	lot you have.	10	to go through what we just went through.
11	MS. CABRERA: Yeah, but what he's saying	11	Okay. I understand. I understand the
12	and I understand what he's saying, because when	12	philosophy behind it.
13	I was looking at this, I thought the same	13	MR. BEHAR: Okay. Do we have a motion?
14	thing; that let's say now you build you	14	MR. REVUELTA: I move.
15	didn't max out for the 10,000 square feet, but	15	MR. TORRE: Second here.
16	you built more than would be allowed on the	16	MR. BEHAR: Jill, can you please call the
17	5,000 square feet, but we wouldn't let you	17	roll?
18	split that lot, because then you will create a	18	THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?
19	non-conformity.	19	MR. REVUELTA: Yes.
20	MR. WITHERS: Right. That's what I'm	20	THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?
-	saying.	21	MR. TORRE: Yes.
21		I	
21 22		22	THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?
	MS. CABRERA: Right, you would not be able	22 23	THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? MR. WITHERS: Yes.
22	MS. CABRERA: Right, you would not be able to split it. So the only thing that this does		
22 23	MS. CABRERA: Right, you would not be able	23	MR. WITHERS: Yes.

	Page 53		Page 54
1	MR. COLLER: In accordance with Department	1	of title. It's allowing a noncontiguous unity
2	recommendation.	2	of title, if a park is provided, in one of
3	MR. REVUELTA: Yes.	3	those parcels.
4	MR. TORRE: I agree.	4	So the intent for the owner that's going to
5	MR. REVUELTA: Yes. Do I need to revise my	5	unify these parcels together, obviously, would
6	motion?	6	be to move both, the density and intensity, to
7	MR. COLLER: No. I clarified the motion,	7	the developed parcel.
8	that it was in accordance with Department	8	So if you go to Page 2 of my Staff Report,
9	recommendation.	9	you can see a diagram that kind of illustrates
10	MR. BEHAR: Next item.	10	that, as well as seven criteria they would have
11	MR. COLLER: Item E-3, an Ordinance of the	11	to meet to make this work.
12	City Commission of Coral Gables, Florida	12	MR. BEHAR: I don't have it printed out.
13	providing for a text amendment to the City of	13	Can you put it up on the screen? Is it
14	Coral Gables Official Zoning Code by amending	14	possible, please?
15	Article 14, "Process," Section 14-205,	15	MS. GARCIA: Sure.
16	"Declaration of Restrictive Covenant in Lieu of	16	MR. BEHAR: And while they do that, if
17	a Unity of Title" to encourage the creation of	17	somebody has a lot that they want to do a unity
18	City Parks by allowing noncontiguous building	18	of title and transfer the density and
19	sites with dedicated park space; providing for	19	intensity, they're going to get the full
20	severability, repeater, codification, and an	20	density and intensity allowed on that lot moved
21	effective date. Item E-3, public hearing.	21	over to the property they want to develop?
22	MR. BEHAR: Jennifer.	22	MS. GARCIA: As proposed.
23	MS. GARCIA: Yes. So this is a	23	MR. BEHAR: Is that
24	City-sponsored Text Amendment to the Zoning	24	MS. GARCIA: Yes. Uh-huh.
25	Code, and it's basically allowing, again, unity	25	Not increasing the height and still within
	Page 55		Page 56
1	the development envelope.	1	First Reading, that was the restriction.
2	MD DELLAD, Olsov, And that let will become		
2	MR. BEHAR: Okay. And that lot will become	2	MR. BEHAR: I mean, if we're going to
3	a park, City park?	2 3	
	-		MR. BEHAR: I mean, if we're going to
3	a park, City park?	3	MR. BEHAR: I mean, if we're going to incentivize, you know, somebody to buy a piece
3 4	a park, City park?  MS. GARCIA: Right. Uh-huh.	3 4	MR. BEHAR: I mean, if we're going to incentivize, you know, somebody to buy a piece of property and you're going to limit it to cap
3 4 5	a park, City park?  MS. GARCIA: Right. Uh-huh.  MR. TORRE: Is there a cap in the amount of	3 4 5	MR. BEHAR: I mean, if we're going to incentivize, you know, somebody to buy a piece of property and you're going to limit it to cap it at 4.375 on the new parcel, there's no
3 4 5 6	a park, City park?  MS. GARCIA: Right. Uh-huh.  MR. TORRE: Is there a cap in the amount of right to be developed?	3 4 5 6	MR. BEHAR: I mean, if we're going to incentivize, you know, somebody to buy a piece of property and you're going to limit it to cap it at 4.375 on the new parcel, there's no advantage. What's the incentive?
3 4 5 6 7	a park, City park?  MS. GARCIA: Right. Uh-huh.  MR. TORRE: Is there a cap in the amount of right to be developed?  MS. GARCIA: So, as presented at the City	3 4 5 6 7	MR. BEHAR: I mean, if we're going to incentivize, you know, somebody to buy a piece of property and you're going to limit it to cap it at 4.375 on the new parcel, there's no advantage. What's the incentive?  MR. TORRE: There's no cap
3 4 5 6 7 8	a park, City park?  MS. GARCIA: Right. Uh-huh.  MR. TORRE: Is there a cap in the amount of right to be developed?  MS. GARCIA: So, as presented at the City  Commission for First Reading a couple of weeks	3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. BEHAR: I mean, if we're going to incentivize, you know, somebody to buy a piece of property and you're going to limit it to cap it at 4.375 on the new parcel, there's no advantage. What's the incentive?  MR. TORRE: There's no cap MR. BEHAR: No. No. You're saying, at
3 4 5 6 7 8	a park, City park?  MS. GARCIA: Right. Uh-huh.  MR. TORRE: Is there a cap in the amount of right to be developed?  MS. GARCIA: So, as presented at the City Commission for First Reading a couple of weeks ago, there was a cap of 4.375, which is the	3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. BEHAR: I mean, if we're going to incentivize, you know, somebody to buy a piece of property and you're going to limit it to cap it at 4.375 on the new parcel, there's no advantage. What's the incentive?  MR. TORRE: There's no cap MR. BEHAR: No. No. You're saying, at First Reading, we did have it.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a park, City park?  MS. GARCIA: Right. Uh-huh.  MR. TORRE: Is there a cap in the amount of right to be developed?  MS. GARCIA: So, as presented at the City Commission for First Reading a couple of weeks ago, there was a cap of 4.375, which is the magical FAR number if you receive TDR. This	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. BEHAR: I mean, if we're going to incentivize, you know, somebody to buy a piece of property and you're going to limit it to cap it at 4.375 on the new parcel, there's no advantage. What's the incentive?  MR. TORRE: There's no cap  MR. BEHAR: No. No. You're saying, at First Reading, we did have it.  MS. GARCIA: At First Reading, there was a
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	a park, City park?  MS. GARCIA: Right. Uh-huh.  MR. TORRE: Is there a cap in the amount of right to be developed?  MS. GARCIA: So, as presented at the City Commission for First Reading a couple of weeks ago, there was a cap of 4.375, which is the magical FAR number if you receive TDR. This isn't really a TDR. That's just a hypethetical	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. BEHAR: I mean, if we're going to incentivize, you know, somebody to buy a piece of property and you're going to limit it to cap it at 4.375 on the new parcel, there's no advantage. What's the incentive?  MR. TORRE: There's no cap MR. BEHAR: No. No. You're saying, at First Reading, we did have it.  MS. GARCIA: At First Reading, there was a cap, yes.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	a park, City park?  MS. GARCIA: Right. Uh-huh.  MR. TORRE: Is there a cap in the amount of right to be developed?  MS. GARCIA: So, as presented at the City Commission for First Reading a couple of weeks ago, there was a cap of 4.375, which is the magical FAR number if you receive TDR. This isn't really a TDR. That's just a hypethetical FAR number to, you know, control development.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. BEHAR: I mean, if we're going to incentivize, you know, somebody to buy a piece of property and you're going to limit it to cap it at 4.375 on the new parcel, there's no advantage. What's the incentive?  MR. TORRE: There's no cap MR. BEHAR: No. No. You're saying, at First Reading, we did have it.  MS. GARCIA: At First Reading, there was a cap, yes.  MR. BEHAR: I agree with this. You know,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	a park, City park?  MS. GARCIA: Right. Uh-huh.  MR. TORRE: Is there a cap in the amount of right to be developed?  MS. GARCIA: So, as presented at the City Commission for First Reading a couple of weeks ago, there was a cap of 4.375, which is the magical FAR number if you receive TDR. This isn't really a TDR. That's just a hypethetical FAR number to, you know, control development. Since then, the sponsor requested to have that	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. BEHAR: I mean, if we're going to incentivize, you know, somebody to buy a piece of property and you're going to limit it to cap it at 4.375 on the new parcel, there's no advantage. What's the incentive?  MR. TORRE: There's no cap  MR. BEHAR: No. No. You're saying, at First Reading, we did have it.  MS. GARCIA: At First Reading, there was a cap, yes.  MR. BEHAR: I agree with this. You know, I'm totally in agreement with this.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	a park, City park?  MS. GARCIA: Right. Uh-huh.  MR. TORRE: Is there a cap in the amount of right to be developed?  MS. GARCIA: So, as presented at the City Commission for First Reading a couple of weeks ago, there was a cap of 4.375, which is the magical FAR number if you receive TDR. This isn't really a TDR. That's just a hypethetical FAR number to, you know, control development. Since then, the sponsor requested to have that removed, so it would be the full intensity and	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. BEHAR: I mean, if we're going to incentivize, you know, somebody to buy a piece of property and you're going to limit it to cap it at 4.375 on the new parcel, there's no advantage. What's the incentive?  MR. TORRE: There's no cap  MR. BEHAR: No. No. You're saying, at First Reading, we did have it.  MS. GARCIA: At First Reading, there was a cap, yes.  MR. BEHAR: I agree with this. You know, I'm totally in agreement with this.  MS. GARCIA: Yeah, the First Reading had
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	a park, City park?  MS. GARCIA: Right. Uh-huh.  MR. TORRE: Is there a cap in the amount of right to be developed?  MS. GARCIA: So, as presented at the City Commission for First Reading a couple of weeks ago, there was a cap of 4.375, which is the magical FAR number if you receive TDR. This isn't really a TDR. That's just a hypethetical FAR number to, you know, control development. Since then, the sponsor requested to have that removed, so it would be the full intensity and density.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. BEHAR: I mean, if we're going to incentivize, you know, somebody to buy a piece of property and you're going to limit it to cap it at 4.375 on the new parcel, there's no advantage. What's the incentive?  MR. TORRE: There's no cap MR. BEHAR: No. No. You're saying, at First Reading, we did have it.  MS. GARCIA: At First Reading, there was a cap, yes.  MR. BEHAR: I agree with this. You know, I'm totally in agreement with this.  MS. GARCIA: Yeah, the First Reading had a cap of 4.375 for the FAR and the density or
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a park, City park?  MS. GARCIA: Right. Uh-huh.  MR. TORRE: Is there a cap in the amount of right to be developed?  MS. GARCIA: So, as presented at the City Commission for First Reading a couple of weeks ago, there was a cap of 4.375, which is the magical FAR number if you receive TDR. This isn't really a TDR. That's just a hypethetical FAR number to, you know, control development. Since then, the sponsor requested to have that removed, so it would be the full intensity and density.  MR. BEHAR: It was being limited at 4.375.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. BEHAR: I mean, if we're going to incentivize, you know, somebody to buy a piece of property and you're going to limit it to cap it at 4.375 on the new parcel, there's no advantage. What's the incentive?  MR. TORRE: There's no cap MR. BEHAR: No. No. You're saying, at First Reading, we did have it.  MS. GARCIA: At First Reading, there was a cap, yes.  MR. BEHAR: I agree with this. You know, I'm totally in agreement with this.  MS. GARCIA: Yeah, the First Reading had a cap of 4.375 for the FAR and the density or the number of units to be transferred without
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a park, City park?  MS. GARCIA: Right. Uh-huh.  MR. TORRE: Is there a cap in the amount of right to be developed?  MS. GARCIA: So, as presented at the City  Commission for First Reading a couple of weeks ago, there was a cap of 4.375, which is the magical FAR number if you receive TDR. This isn't really a TDR. That's just a hypethetical  FAR number to, you know, control development. Since then, the sponsor requested to have that removed, so it would be the full intensity and density.  MR. BEHAR: It was being limited at 4.375.  MS. GARCIA: 4.375 for that development parcel.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. BEHAR: I mean, if we're going to incentivize, you know, somebody to buy a piece of property and you're going to limit it to cap it at 4.375 on the new parcel, there's no advantage. What's the incentive?  MR. TORRE: There's no cap MR. BEHAR: No. No. You're saying, at First Reading, we did have it.  MS. GARCIA: At First Reading, there was a cap, yes.  MR. BEHAR: I agree with this. You know, I'm totally in agreement with this.  MS. GARCIA: Yeah, the First Reading had a cap of 4.375 for the FAR and the density or the number of units to be transferred without any issue.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a park, City park?  MS. GARCIA: Right. Uh-huh.  MR. TORRE: Is there a cap in the amount of right to be developed?  MS. GARCIA: So, as presented at the City  Commission for First Reading a couple of weeks ago, there was a cap of 4.375, which is the magical FAR number if you receive TDR. This isn't really a TDR. That's just a hypethetical FAR number to, you know, control development. Since then, the sponsor requested to have that removed, so it would be the full intensity and density.  MR. BEHAR: It was being limited at 4.375.  MS. GARCIA: 4.375 for that development parcel.  MR. BEHAR: So, essentially you're going to	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. BEHAR: I mean, if we're going to incentivize, you know, somebody to buy a piece of property and you're going to limit it to cap it at 4.375 on the new parcel, there's no advantage. What's the incentive?  MR. TORRE: There's no cap  MR. BEHAR: No. No. You're saying, at First Reading, we did have it.  MS. GARCIA: At First Reading, there was a cap, yes.  MR. BEHAR: I agree with this. You know, I'm totally in agreement with this.  MS. GARCIA: Yeah, the First Reading had a cap of 4.375 for the FAR and the density or the number of units to be transferred without any issue.  MR. TORRE: And are those transferable
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a park, City park?  MS. GARCIA: Right. Uh-huh.  MR. TORRE: Is there a cap in the amount of right to be developed?  MS. GARCIA: So, as presented at the City Commission for First Reading a couple of weeks ago, there was a cap of 4.375, which is the magical FAR number if you receive TDR. This isn't really a TDR. That's just a hypethetical FAR number to, you know, control development. Since then, the sponsor requested to have that removed, so it would be the full intensity and density.  MR. BEHAR: It was being limited at 4.375.  MS. GARCIA: 4.375 for that development parcel.  MR. BEHAR: So, essentially you're going to limit it at .87, because you have the right to	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. BEHAR: I mean, if we're going to incentivize, you know, somebody to buy a piece of property and you're going to limit it to cap it at 4.375 on the new parcel, there's no advantage. What's the incentive?  MR. TORRE: There's no cap MR. BEHAR: No. No. You're saying, at First Reading, we did have it.  MS. GARCIA: At First Reading, there was a cap, yes.  MR. BEHAR: I agree with this. You know, I'm totally in agreement with this.  MS. GARCIA: Yeah, the First Reading had a cap of 4.375 for the FAR and the density or the number of units to be transferred without any issue.  MR. TORRE: And are those transferable rights subject to an acceptance of the park
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a park, City park?  MS. GARCIA: Right. Uh-huh.  MR. TORRE: Is there a cap in the amount of right to be developed?  MS. GARCIA: So, as presented at the City Commission for First Reading a couple of weeks ago, there was a cap of 4.375, which is the magical FAR number if you receive TDR. This isn't really a TDR. That's just a hypethetical FAR number to, you know, control development. Since then, the sponsor requested to have that removed, so it would be the full intensity and density.  MR. BEHAR: It was being limited at 4.375.  MS. GARCIA: 4.375 for that development parcel.  MR. BEHAR: So, essentially you're going to limit it at .87, because you have the right to do, in most cases, 3.5, with Med Bonus. So if	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. BEHAR: I mean, if we're going to incentivize, you know, somebody to buy a piece of property and you're going to limit it to cap it at 4.375 on the new parcel, there's no advantage. What's the incentive?  MR. TORRE: There's no cap MR. BEHAR: No. No. You're saying, at First Reading, we did have it.  MS. GARCIA: At First Reading, there was a cap, yes.  MR. BEHAR: I agree with this. You know, I'm totally in agreement with this.  MS. GARCIA: Yeah, the First Reading had a cap of 4.375 for the FAR and the density or the number of units to be transferred without any issue.  MR. TORRE: And are those transferable rights subject to an acceptance of the park location?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	a park, City park?  MS. GARCIA: Right. Uh-huh.  MR. TORRE: Is there a cap in the amount of right to be developed?  MS. GARCIA: So, as presented at the City Commission for First Reading a couple of weeks ago, there was a cap of 4.375, which is the magical FAR number if you receive TDR. This isn't really a TDR. That's just a hypethetical FAR number to, you know, control development. Since then, the sponsor requested to have that removed, so it would be the full intensity and density.  MR. BEHAR: It was being limited at 4.375.  MS. GARCIA: 4.375 for that development parcel.  MR. BEHAR: So, essentially you're going to limit it at .87, because you have the right to do, in most cases, 3.5, with Med Bonus. So if you capped it at 4.375, you're really limiting	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. BEHAR: I mean, if we're going to incentivize, you know, somebody to buy a piece of property and you're going to limit it to cap it at 4.375 on the new parcel, there's no advantage. What's the incentive?  MR. TORRE: There's no cap MR. BEHAR: No. No. You're saying, at First Reading, we did have it.  MS. GARCIA: At First Reading, there was a cap, yes.  MR. BEHAR: I agree with this. You know, I'm totally in agreement with this.  MS. GARCIA: Yeah, the First Reading had a cap of 4.375 for the FAR and the density or the number of units to be transferred without any issue.  MR. TORRE: And are those transferable rights subject to an acceptance of the park location?  MS. GARCIA: Yeah. Yeah, it's reviewed,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	a park, City park?  MS. GARCIA: Right. Uh-huh.  MR. TORRE: Is there a cap in the amount of right to be developed?  MS. GARCIA: So, as presented at the City Commission for First Reading a couple of weeks ago, there was a cap of 4.375, which is the magical FAR number if you receive TDR. This isn't really a TDR. That's just a hypethetical FAR number to, you know, control development. Since then, the sponsor requested to have that removed, so it would be the full intensity and density.  MR. BEHAR: It was being limited at 4.375.  MS. GARCIA: 4.375 for that development parcel.  MR. BEHAR: So, essentially you're going to limit it at .87, because you have the right to do, in most cases, 3.5, with Med Bonus. So if you capped it at 4.375, you're really limiting the transferable FAR to .87, right?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. BEHAR: I mean, if we're going to incentivize, you know, somebody to buy a piece of property and you're going to limit it to cap it at 4.375 on the new parcel, there's no advantage. What's the incentive?  MR. TORRE: There's no cap MR. BEHAR: No. No. You're saying, at First Reading, we did have it.  MS. GARCIA: At First Reading, there was a cap, yes.  MR. BEHAR: I agree with this. You know, I'm totally in agreement with this.  MS. GARCIA: Yeah, the First Reading had a cap of 4.375 for the FAR and the density or the number of units to be transferred without any issue.  MR. TORRE: And are those transferable rights subject to an acceptance of the park location?  MS. GARCIA: Yeah. Yeah, it's reviewed, obviously, by the Commission and approves it,

	Page 57		Page 58
1	very I'm not going to say the word lousy,	1	Codina's property.
2	but less than substandard properties trying	2	MR. WITHERS: That's the one I was thinking
3	to be offered in exchange for a park so the	3	about.
4	quality of the park, I guess, is up for	4	MR. TORRE: So. I mean, how would that have
5	discussion as well?	5	changed if this had been applied in that case?
6	MS. GARCIA: So one of the criteria here is	6	Can you kind of illustrate that or
7	a minimum of 5,000 square feet for that park.	7	MS. GARCIA: I think it's exactly the same.
8	MR. WITHERS: That's big, 5,000 square	8	They're considered a contiguous site.
9	feet.	9	MR. TORRE: No. No. But, for example, how
10	MR. TORRE: Well, there could be lines	10	much FAR could have impacted that building
11	above you and it doesn't serve any other	11	where would that FAR I'm using FAR, because
12	purpose and that's really the best choice for	12	density may have not been how would that
13	that property, is to be a park anyway, because	13	have given additional benefit?
14	you can't build a lot or there are other	14	MR. BEHAR: I think they came and asked for
15	restrictions of 45 feet but I guess that can	15	the FAR. If I remember, in their application,
16	be captured with the TDRs, but, yeah, I get it.	16	they asked for the FAR and density to be
17	MR. BEHAR: And is there a distance that	17	transferred to their development site.
18		18	-
	you could be or I could look at a property in		MR. TORRE: That's done that way?
19	South Gables	19	MS. GARCIA: Right. Yeah.
20	MR. TORRE: A thousand feet.	20	MR. COLLER: Arceli, come up to the
21	MR. BEHAR: Okay. I don't have that	21	microphone, because she can't take you down,
22	presentation in front of me.	22	all right. I'm trying to help her out.
23	MS. GARCIA: Right.	23	MS. REDILA: Yes, the park was calculated
24	MR. BEHAR: My apologies. Okay.	24	as part of the overall building site, since it
25	MR. TORRE: The one that comes to mind is	25	is considered a contiguous
	Page 59		Page 60
1	MR. BEHAR: So why we're doing this,	1	through the process of review here, it goes
2	really, is to clarify what that process did.	2	through the process of the Commission, and at
3	MS. GARCIA: It's similar, yes.	3	the end of the day, it's vetted and it's agreed
4	MR. WITHERS: We're doing remote parking,	4	to, because of what you're producing and what
5	is what we're doing	5	you're bringing to the table, but what I see
6		6	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
6 7	MR. BEHAR: No, because you still have to	6	and, again, I'm not this is not a critique,
7	MR. BEHAR: No, because you still have to do it. You still have to go back	7	and, again, I'm not this is not a critique, but it's a point, that we keep doing what I
7	MR. BEHAR: No, because you still have to do it. You still have to go back MR. TORRE: No, I know. But 5,000 feet is	7 8	and, again, I'm not this is not a critique, but it's a point, that we keep doing what I think already exists, which I bring up every
7 8 9	MR. BEHAR: No, because you still have to do it. You still have to go back MR. TORRE: No, I know. But 5,000 feet is the minimum building site anyway, right?	7 8 9	and, again, I'm not this is not a critique, but it's a point, that we keep doing what I think already exists, which I bring up every once in a while, is that every project we look
7 8 9 10	MR. BEHAR: No, because you still have to do it. You still have to go back MR. TORRE: No, I know. But 5,000 feet is the minimum building site anyway, right? MS. GARCIA: For a house, but not for	7 8 9	and, again, I'm not this is not a critique, but it's a point, that we keep doing what I think already exists, which I bring up every once in a while, is that every project we look at has that measure of back and forth, has a
7 8 9 10 11	MR. BEHAR: No, because you still have to do it. You still have to go back MR. TORRE: No, I know. But 5,000 feet is the minimum building site anyway, right? MS. GARCIA: For a house, but not for Commercial. This is only being applied in a	7 8 9 10 11	and, again, I'm not this is not a critique, but it's a point, that we keep doing what I think already exists, which I bring up every once in a while, is that every project we look at has that measure of back and forth, has a measure of you know, so a lot of folks want
7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. BEHAR: No, because you still have to do it. You still have to go back MR. TORRE: No, I know. But 5,000 feet is the minimum building site anyway, right? MS. GARCIA: For a house, but not for Commercial. This is only being applied in a Mixed-Use District, so to clarify that. This	7 8 9 10 11	and, again, I'm not this is not a critique, but it's a point, that we keep doing what I think already exists, which I bring up every once in a while, is that every project we look at has that measure of back and forth, has a measure of you know, so a lot of folks want to see things black and white, when it really
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. BEHAR: No, because you still have to do it. You still have to go back MR. TORRE: No, I know. But 5,000 feet is the minimum building site anyway, right? MS. GARCIA: For a house, but not for Commercial. This is only being applied in a Mixed-Use District, so to clarify that. This isn't going to happen in single-family	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and, again, I'm not this is not a critique, but it's a point, that we keep doing what I think already exists, which I bring up every once in a while, is that every project we look at has that measure of back and forth, has a measure of you know, so a lot of folks want to see things black and white, when it really doesn't play off that way most of the time,
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. BEHAR: No, because you still have to do it. You still have to go back MR. TORRE: No, I know. But 5,000 feet is the minimum building site anyway, right? MS. GARCIA: For a house, but not for Commercial. This is only being applied in a Mixed-Use District, so to clarify that. This isn't going to happen in single-family neighborhoods. This is just going to be in the	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and, again, I'm not this is not a critique, but it's a point, that we keep doing what I think already exists, which I bring up every once in a while, is that every project we look at has that measure of back and forth, has a measure of you know, so a lot of folks want to see things black and white, when it really doesn't play off that way most of the time, because of these sort of things that we're
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. BEHAR: No, because you still have to do it. You still have to go back MR. TORRE: No, I know. But 5,000 feet is the minimum building site anyway, right? MS. GARCIA: For a house, but not for Commercial. This is only being applied in a Mixed-Use District, so to clarify that. This isn't going to happen in single-family neighborhoods. This is just going to be in the Downtown area, with the Mixed-Use.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and, again, I'm not this is not a critique, but it's a point, that we keep doing what I think already exists, which I bring up every once in a while, is that every project we look at has that measure of back and forth, has a measure of you know, so a lot of folks want to see things black and white, when it really doesn't play off that way most of the time, because of these sort of things that we're doing, it continuous to be where there has to
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. BEHAR: No, because you still have to do it. You still have to go back MR. TORRE: No, I know. But 5,000 feet is the minimum building site anyway, right? MS. GARCIA: For a house, but not for Commercial. This is only being applied in a Mixed-Use District, so to clarify that. This isn't going to happen in single-family neighborhoods. This is just going to be in the Downtown area, with the Mixed-Use. MR. WITHERS: The CBD or	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and, again, I'm not this is not a critique, but it's a point, that we keep doing what I think already exists, which I bring up every once in a while, is that every project we look at has that measure of back and forth, has a measure of you know, so a lot of folks want to see things black and white, when it really doesn't play off that way most of the time, because of these sort of things that we're doing, it continuous to be where there has to be a back and forth, there's a back and forth,
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. BEHAR: No, because you still have to do it. You still have to go back MR. TORRE: No, I know. But 5,000 feet is the minimum building site anyway, right? MS. GARCIA: For a house, but not for Commercial. This is only being applied in a Mixed-Use District, so to clarify that. This isn't going to happen in single-family neighborhoods. This is just going to be in the Downtown area, with the Mixed-Use. MR. WITHERS: The CBD or MS. GARCIA: This is City-wide. So if it's	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	and, again, I'm not this is not a critique, but it's a point, that we keep doing what I think already exists, which I bring up every once in a while, is that every project we look at has that measure of back and forth, has a measure of you know, so a lot of folks want to see things black and white, when it really doesn't play off that way most of the time, because of these sort of things that we're doing, it continuous to be where there has to be a back and forth, there's a back and forth, and there's a level of what's right and what's
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. BEHAR: No, because you still have to do it. You still have to go back MR. TORRE: No, I know. But 5,000 feet is the minimum building site anyway, right? MS. GARCIA: For a house, but not for Commercial. This is only being applied in a Mixed-Use District, so to clarify that. This isn't going to happen in single-family neighborhoods. This is just going to be in the Downtown area, with the Mixed-Use. MR. WITHERS: The CBD or MS. GARCIA: This is City-wide. So if it's Zoned Mixed-Use 1, 2 or 3.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	and, again, I'm not this is not a critique, but it's a point, that we keep doing what I think already exists, which I bring up every once in a while, is that every project we look at has that measure of back and forth, has a measure of you know, so a lot of folks want to see things black and white, when it really doesn't play off that way most of the time, because of these sort of things that we're doing, it continuous to be where there has to be a back and forth, there's a back and forth, and there's a level of what's right and what's good and what's bad, and I see that happening,
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. BEHAR: No, because you still have to do it. You still have to go back MR. TORRE: No, I know. But 5,000 feet is the minimum building site anyway, right? MS. GARCIA: For a house, but not for Commercial. This is only being applied in a Mixed-Use District, so to clarify that. This isn't going to happen in single-family neighborhoods. This is just going to be in the Downtown area, with the Mixed-Use. MR. WITHERS: The CBD or MS. GARCIA: This is City-wide. So if it's Zoned Mixed-Use 1, 2 or 3. MR. BEHAR: It's not for single-family;	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and, again, I'm not — this is not a critique, but it's a point, that we keep doing what I think already exists, which I bring up every once in a while, is that every project we look at has that measure of back and forth, has a measure of — you know, so a lot of folks want to see things black and white, when it really doesn't play off that way most of the time, because of these sort of things that we're doing, it continuous to be where there has to be a back and forth, there's a back and forth, and there's a level of what's right and what's good and what's bad, and I see that happening, but people sometimes have a problem with it not
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. BEHAR: No, because you still have to do it. You still have to go back MR. TORRE: No, I know. But 5,000 feet is the minimum building site anyway, right? MS. GARCIA: For a house, but not for Commercial. This is only being applied in a Mixed-Use District, so to clarify that. This isn't going to happen in single-family neighborhoods. This is just going to be in the Downtown area, with the Mixed-Use. MR. WITHERS: The CBD or MS. GARCIA: This is City-wide. So if it's Zoned Mixed-Use 1, 2 or 3. MR. BEHAR: It's not for single-family; Mixed-Use projects.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and, again, I'm not this is not a critique, but it's a point, that we keep doing what I think already exists, which I bring up every once in a while, is that every project we look at has that measure of back and forth, has a measure of you know, so a lot of folks want to see things black and white, when it really doesn't play off that way most of the time, because of these sort of things that we're doing, it continuous to be where there has to be a back and forth, there's a back and forth, and there's a level of what's right and what's good and what's bad, and I see that happening, but people sometimes have a problem with it not being black and white.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. BEHAR: No, because you still have to do it. You still have to go back MR. TORRE: No, I know. But 5,000 feet is the minimum building site anyway, right? MS. GARCIA: For a house, but not for Commercial. This is only being applied in a Mixed-Use District, so to clarify that. This isn't going to happen in single-family neighborhoods. This is just going to be in the Downtown area, with the Mixed-Use. MR. WITHERS: The CBD or MS. GARCIA: This is City-wide. So if it's Zoned Mixed-Use 1, 2 or 3. MR. BEHAR: It's not for single-family; Mixed-Use projects. MS. REDILA: Yes, because a single-family	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and, again, I'm not this is not a critique, but it's a point, that we keep doing what I think already exists, which I bring up every once in a while, is that every project we look at has that measure of back and forth, has a measure of you know, so a lot of folks want to see things black and white, when it really doesn't play off that way most of the time, because of these sort of things that we're doing, it continuous to be where there has to be a back and forth, there's a back and forth, and there's a level of what's right and what's good and what's bad, and I see that happening, but people sometimes have a problem with it not being black and white.  MR. BEHAR: You know, I think this makes it
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. BEHAR: No, because you still have to do it. You still have to go back MR. TORRE: No, I know. But 5,000 feet is the minimum building site anyway, right? MS. GARCIA: For a house, but not for Commercial. This is only being applied in a Mixed-Use District, so to clarify that. This isn't going to happen in single-family neighborhoods. This is just going to be in the Downtown area, with the Mixed-Use. MR. WITHERS: The CBD or MS. GARCIA: This is City-wide. So if it's Zoned Mixed-Use 1, 2 or 3. MR. BEHAR: It's not for single-family; Mixed-Use projects. MS. REDILA: Yes, because a single-family would not have their FAR of 3.5 that they can	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and, again, I'm not this is not a critique, but it's a point, that we keep doing what I think already exists, which I bring up every once in a while, is that every project we look at has that measure of back and forth, has a measure of you know, so a lot of folks want to see things black and white, when it really doesn't play off that way most of the time, because of these sort of things that we're doing, it continuous to be where there has to be a back and forth, there's a back and forth, and there's a level of what's right and what's good and what's bad, and I see that happening, but people sometimes have a problem with it not being black and white.  MR. BEHAR: You know, I think this makes it clear that you get a public benefit out of it,
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. BEHAR: No, because you still have to do it. You still have to go back MR. TORRE: No, I know. But 5,000 feet is the minimum building site anyway, right? MS. GARCIA: For a house, but not for Commercial. This is only being applied in a Mixed-Use District, so to clarify that. This isn't going to happen in single-family neighborhoods. This is just going to be in the Downtown area, with the Mixed-Use. MR. WITHERS: The CBD or MS. GARCIA: This is City-wide. So if it's Zoned Mixed-Use 1, 2 or 3. MR. BEHAR: It's not for single-family; Mixed-Use projects. MS. REDILA: Yes, because a single-family would not have their FAR of 3.5 that they can transfer for the development.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and, again, I'm not this is not a critique, but it's a point, that we keep doing what I think already exists, which I bring up every once in a while, is that every project we look at has that measure of back and forth, has a measure of you know, so a lot of folks want to see things black and white, when it really doesn't play off that way most of the time, because of these sort of things that we're doing, it continuous to be where there has to be a back and forth, there's a back and forth, and there's a level of what's right and what's good and what's bad, and I see that happening, but people sometimes have a problem with it not being black and white.  MR. BEHAR: You know, I think this makes it clear that you get a public benefit out of it, right, because you are
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. BEHAR: No, because you still have to do it. You still have to go back MR. TORRE: No, I know. But 5,000 feet is the minimum building site anyway, right? MS. GARCIA: For a house, but not for Commercial. This is only being applied in a Mixed-Use District, so to clarify that. This isn't going to happen in single-family neighborhoods. This is just going to be in the Downtown area, with the Mixed-Use. MR. WITHERS: The CBD or MS. GARCIA: This is City-wide. So if it's Zoned Mixed-Use 1, 2 or 3. MR. BEHAR: It's not for single-family; Mixed-Use projects. MS. REDILA: Yes, because a single-family would not have their FAR of 3.5 that they can transfer for the development. MR. TORRE: I view this as, this is a good	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and, again, I'm not this is not a critique, but it's a point, that we keep doing what I think already exists, which I bring up every once in a while, is that every project we look at has that measure of back and forth, has a measure of you know, so a lot of folks want to see things black and white, when it really doesn't play off that way most of the time, because of these sort of things that we're doing, it continuous to be where there has to be a back and forth, there's a back and forth, and there's a level of what's right and what's good and what's bad, and I see that happening, but people sometimes have a problem with it not being black and white.  MR. BEHAR: You know, I think this makes it clear that you get a public benefit out of it, right, because you are
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. BEHAR: No, because you still have to do it. You still have to go back MR. TORRE: No, I know. But 5,000 feet is the minimum building site anyway, right? MS. GARCIA: For a house, but not for Commercial. This is only being applied in a Mixed-Use District, so to clarify that. This isn't going to happen in single-family neighborhoods. This is just going to be in the Downtown area, with the Mixed-Use. MR. WITHERS: The CBD or MS. GARCIA: This is City-wide. So if it's Zoned Mixed-Use 1, 2 or 3. MR. BEHAR: It's not for single-family; Mixed-Use projects. MS. REDILA: Yes, because a single-family would not have their FAR of 3.5 that they can transfer for the development.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and, again, I'm not this is not a critique, but it's a point, that we keep doing what I think already exists, which I bring up every once in a while, is that every project we look at has that measure of back and forth, has a measure of you know, so a lot of folks want to see things black and white, when it really doesn't play off that way most of the time, because of these sort of things that we're doing, it continuous to be where there has to be a back and forth, there's a back and forth, and there's a level of what's right and what's good and what's bad, and I see that happening, but people sometimes have a problem with it not being black and white.  MR. BEHAR: You know, I think this makes it clear that you get a public benefit out of it, right, because you are

BEHAR: Exactly. I think, in that it clarifies that it's a public  TORRE: The only question I would have of discuss is the thousand feet and would this be really used more than g, maybe Downtown, right? What would be don't know, where else how do you ethis being used?  GARCIA: I think it will be used more notwn, because it would be worth having rise, and it's mostly along Ponce, g, you know, Downtown area, that you have you need to have the height of welopment parcel if you want to pull tem again if you need to have that to be able to move that FAR into ling.  BEHAR: But it doesn't have to be ling.  GARCIA: Yes, absolutely.  BEHAR: I mean, it could be in Merrick but know.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	again, this is for discussion  MR. BEHAR: Let's do that when we open it up to the Board. Anything else from Staff on this?  MS. GARCIA: No. So this is the diagram that kind of explains on the left this is right now your unity of title requirements. So if those two properties, red and orange property, would not be considered a contiguous unity of title or building site. On the right, it's showing the park parcel in that corner and the yellow is kind of the transfer of density and intensity. Not extra height, but filling up that envelope, as you're allowed to have.  MR. WITHERS: So who maintains that park? MS. GARCIA: I think that would be part of the Conditions of Approval, what the Commission wants, because, again, this is a Conditional Use option.  MR. WITHERS: I mean, who regulates activity in that park, who regulates hours of operation, who maintains it?  MS. GARCIA: Yeah, so I think that would be
TORRE: The only question I would have obtained by the condition of the con	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. BEHAR: Let's do that when we open it up to the Board. Anything else from Staff on this?  MS. GARCIA: No. So this is the diagram that kind of explains on the left — this is — right now — your unity of title requirements. So if those two properties, red and orange property, would not be considered a contiguous unity of title or building site. On the right, it's showing the park parcel in that corner and the yellow is kind of the transfer of density and intensity. Not extra height, but filling up that envelope, as you're allowed to have.  MR. WITHERS: So who maintains that park?  MS. GARCIA: I think that would be part of the Conditions of Approval, what the Commission wants, because, again, this is a Conditional Use option.  MR. WITHERS: I mean, who regulates activity in that park, who regulates hours of operation, who maintains it?
TORRE: The only question I would have of discuss is the thousand feet and would this be really used more than g, maybe Downtown, right? What would be don't know, where else how do you et his being used?  GARCIA: I think it will be used more not only because it would be worth having rise, and it's mostly along Ponce, you know, Downtown area, that you have you need to have the height of velopment parcel if you want to pull tem again if you need to have that to be able to move that FAR into nig.  BEHAR: But it doesn't have to be win. It could be in any MX district.  GARCIA: Yes, absolutely.  BEHAR: I mean, it could be in Merrick	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	up to the Board. Anything else from Staff on this?  MS. GARCIA: No. So this is the diagram that kind of explains on the left — this is — right now — your unity of title requirements. So if those two properties, red and orange property, would not be considered a contiguous unity of title or building site. On the right, it's showing the park parcel in that corner and the yellow is kind of the transfer of density and intensity. Not extra height, but filling up that envelope, as you're allowed to have.  MR. WITHERS: So who maintains that park?  MS. GARCIA: I think that would be part of the Conditions of Approval, what the Commission wants, because, again, this is a Conditional Use option.  MR. WITHERS: I mean, who regulates activity in that park, who regulates hours of operation, who maintains it?
TORRE: The only question I would have o discuss is the thousand feet and yould this be really used more than g, maybe Downtown, right? What would be don't know, where else how do you e this being used?  GARCIA: I think it will be used more mown, because it would be worth having rise, and it's mostly along Ponce, you know, Downtown area, that you have you need to have the height of evelopment parcel if you want to pull tem again if you need to have that to be able to move that FAR into he able to move that FAR into he.  BEHAR: But it doesn't have to be win. It could be in any MX district.  GARCIA: Yes, absolutely.  BEHAR: I mean, it could be in Merrick	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	this?  MS. GARCIA: No. So this is the diagram that kind of explains on the left this is right now your unity of title requirements. So if those two properties, red and orange property, would not be considered a contiguous unity of title or building site. On the right, it's showing the park parcel in that corner and the yellow is kind of the transfer of density and intensity. Not extra height, but filling up that envelope, as you're allowed to have.  MR. WITHERS: So who maintains that park?  MS. GARCIA: I think that would be part of the Conditions of Approval, what the Commission wants, because, again, this is a Conditional Use option.  MR. WITHERS: I mean, who regulates activity in that park, who regulates hours of operation, who maintains it?
TORRE: The only question I would have o discuss is the thousand feet and yould this be really used more than g, maybe Downtown, right? What would be don't know, where else how do you e this being used?  GARCIA: I think it will be used more mown, because it would be worth having rise, and it's mostly along Ponce, you know, Downtown area, that you have you need to have the height of evelopment parcel if you want to pull tem again if you need to have that to be able to move that FAR into he able to move that FAR into he.  BEHAR: But it doesn't have to be win. It could be in any MX district.  GARCIA: Yes, absolutely.  BEHAR: I mean, it could be in Merrick	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. GARCIA: No. So this is the diagram that kind of explains on the left this is right now your unity of title requirements. So if those two properties, red and orange property, would not be considered a contiguous unity of title or building site. On the right, it's showing the park parcel in that corner and the yellow is kind of the transfer of density and intensity. Not extra height, but filling up that envelope, as you're allowed to have.  MR. WITHERS: So who maintains that park?  MS. GARCIA: I think that would be part of the Conditions of Approval, what the Commission wants, because, again, this is a Conditional Use option.  MR. WITHERS: I mean, who regulates activity in that park, who regulates hours of operation, who maintains it?
o discuss is the thousand feet and yould this be really used more than g, maybe Downtown, right? What would be don't know, where else how do you e this being used?  GARCIA: I think it will be used more ntown, because it would be worth having -rise, and it's mostly along Ponce, you know, Downtown area, that you have you need to have the height of evelopment parcel if you want to pull tem again if you need to have that to be able to move that FAR into ong.  BEHAR: But it doesn't have to be win. It could be in any MX district.  GARCIA: Yes, absolutely.  BEHAR: I mean, it could be in Merrick	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that kind of explains on the left this is right now your unity of title requirements. So if those two properties, red and orange property, would not be considered a contiguous unity of title or building site. On the right, it's showing the park parcel in that corner and the yellow is kind of the transfer of density and intensity. Not extra height, but filling up that envelope, as you're allowed to have. MR. WITHERS: So who maintains that park? MS. GARCIA: I think that would be part of the Conditions of Approval, what the Commission wants, because, again, this is a Conditional Use option. MR. WITHERS: I mean, who regulates activity in that park, who regulates hours of operation, who maintains it?
yould this be really used more than g, maybe Downtown, right? What would be don't know, where else how do you e this being used?  GARCIA: I think it will be used more ntown, because it would be worth having -rise, and it's mostly along Ponce, g, you know, Downtown area, that you have you need to have the height of evelopment parcel if you want to pull tem again if you need to have that to be able to move that FAR into ng.  BEHAR: But it doesn't have to be win. It could be in any MX district. GARCIA: Yes, absolutely.  BEHAR: I mean, it could be in Merrick	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	right now your unity of title requirements.  So if those two properties, red and orange property, would not be considered a contiguous unity of title or building site. On the right, it's showing the park parcel in that corner and the yellow is kind of the transfer of density and intensity. Not extra height, but filling up that envelope, as you're allowed to have.  MR. WITHERS: So who maintains that park?  MS. GARCIA: I think that would be part of the Conditions of Approval, what the Commission wants, because, again, this is a Conditional Use option.  MR. WITHERS: I mean, who regulates activity in that park, who regulates hours of operation, who maintains it?
g, maybe Downtown, right? What would be don't know, where else how do you e this being used?  GARCIA: I think it will be used more nown, because it would be worth having rise, and it's mostly along Ponce, you know, Downtown area, that you have you need to have the height of velopment parcel if you want to pull tem again if you need to have that to be able to move that FAR into ng.  BEHAR: But it doesn't have to be win. It could be in any MX district.  GARCIA: Yes, absolutely.  BEHAR: I mean, it could be in Merrick	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So if those two properties, red and orange property, would not be considered a contiguous unity of title or building site. On the right, it's showing the park parcel in that corner and the yellow is kind of the transfer of density and intensity. Not extra height, but filling up that envelope, as you're allowed to have.  MR. WITHERS: So who maintains that park?  MS. GARCIA: I think that would be part of the Conditions of Approval, what the Commission wants, because, again, this is a Conditional Use option.  MR. WITHERS: I mean, who regulates activity in that park, who regulates hours of operation, who maintains it?
don't know, where else how do you e this being used?  GARCIA: I think it will be used more nown, because it would be worth having entewn, because it would be worth having entewn, because it would be worth having entewn. Downtown area, that you have you need to have the height of evelopment parcel if you want to pull tem again if you need to have that to be able to move that FAR into he have the height of evelopment parcel if you want to pull tem again if you need to have that he have to be able to move that FAR into he.  BEHAR: But it doesn't have to be win. It could be in any MX district.  GARCIA: Yes, absolutely.  BEHAR: I mean, it could be in Merrick	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	property, would not be considered a contiguous unity of title or building site. On the right, it's showing the park parcel in that corner and the yellow is kind of the transfer of density and intensity. Not extra height, but filling up that envelope, as you're allowed to have.  MR. WITHERS: So who maintains that park?  MS. GARCIA: I think that would be part of the Conditions of Approval, what the Commission wants, because, again, this is a Conditional Use option.  MR. WITHERS: I mean, who regulates activity in that park, who regulates hours of operation, who maintains it?
e this being used?  GARCIA: I think it will be used more nown, because it would be worth having rise, and it's mostly along Ponce, you know, Downtown area, that you have you need to have the height of evelopment parcel if you want to pull tem again if you need to have that to be able to move that FAR into hig.  BEHAR: But it doesn't have to be win. It could be in any MX district.  GARCIA: Yes, absolutely.  BEHAR: I mean, it could be in Merrick	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	unity of title or building site. On the right, it's showing the park parcel in that corner and the yellow is kind of the transfer of density and intensity. Not extra height, but filling up that envelope, as you're allowed to have.  MR. WITHERS: So who maintains that park?  MS. GARCIA: I think that would be part of the Conditions of Approval, what the Commission wants, because, again, this is a Conditional Use option.  MR. WITHERS: I mean, who regulates activity in that park, who regulates hours of operation, who maintains it?
GARCIA: I think it will be used more ntown, because it would be worth having rrise, and it's mostly along Ponce, you know, Downtown area, that you have you need to have the height of evelopment parcel if you want to pull tem again if you need to have that to be able to move that FAR into one.  BEHAR: But it doesn't have to be win. It could be in any MX district.  GARCIA: Yes, absolutely.  BEHAR: I mean, it could be in Merrick	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	it's showing the park parcel in that corner and the yellow is kind of the transfer of density and intensity. Not extra height, but filling up that envelope, as you're allowed to have.  MR. WITHERS: So who maintains that park?  MS. GARCIA: I think that would be part of the Conditions of Approval, what the Commission wants, because, again, this is a Conditional Use option.  MR. WITHERS: I mean, who regulates activity in that park, who regulates hours of operation, who maintains it?
ntown, because it would be worth having rise, and it's mostly along Ponce, you know, Downtown area, that you have you need to have the height of evelopment parcel if you want to pull tem again if you need to have that to be able to move that FAR into one.  BEHAR: But it doesn't have to be win. It could be in any MX district.  GARCIA: Yes, absolutely.  BEHAR: I mean, it could be in Merrick	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the yellow is kind of the transfer of density and intensity. Not extra height, but filling up that envelope, as you're allowed to have.  MR. WITHERS: So who maintains that park?  MS. GARCIA: I think that would be part of the Conditions of Approval, what the Commission wants, because, again, this is a Conditional Use option.  MR. WITHERS: I mean, who regulates activity in that park, who regulates hours of operation, who maintains it?
rise, and it's mostly along Ponce, , you know, Downtown area, that you ave you need to have the height of velopment parcel if you want to pull tem again if you need to have that be able to move that FAR into ng.  BEHAR: But it doesn't have to be wn. It could be in any MX district.  GARCIA: Yes, absolutely.  BEHAR: I mean, it could be in Merrick	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and intensity. Not extra height, but filling up that envelope, as you're allowed to have.  MR. WITHERS: So who maintains that park?  MS. GARCIA: I think that would be part of the Conditions of Approval, what the Commission wants, because, again, this is a Conditional Use option.  MR. WITHERS: I mean, who regulates activity in that park, who regulates hours of operation, who maintains it?
you know, Downtown area, that you have you need to have the height of velopment parcel if you want to pull tem again if you need to have that to be able to move that FAR into hig.  BEHAR: But it doesn't have to be win. It could be in any MX district.  GARCIA: Yes, absolutely.  BEHAR: I mean, it could be in Merrick	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	up that envelope, as you're allowed to have.  MR. WITHERS: So who maintains that park?  MS. GARCIA: I think that would be part of the Conditions of Approval, what the Commission wants, because, again, this is a Conditional Use option.  MR. WITHERS: I mean, who regulates activity in that park, who regulates hours of operation, who maintains it?
ave you need to have the height of velopment parcel if you want to pull tem again if you need to have that to be able to move that FAR into ng.  BEHAR: But it doesn't have to be wn. It could be in any MX district.  GARCIA: Yes, absolutely.  BEHAR: I mean, it could be in Merrick	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. WITHERS: So who maintains that park?  MS. GARCIA: I think that would be part of the Conditions of Approval, what the Commission wants, because, again, this is a Conditional Use option.  MR. WITHERS: I mean, who regulates activity in that park, who regulates hours of operation, who maintains it?
velopment parcel if you want to pull tem again if you need to have that o be able to move that FAR into ng. BEHAR: But it doesn't have to be wn. It could be in any MX district. GARCIA: Yes, absolutely. BEHAR: I mean, it could be in Merrick	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. GARCIA: I think that would be part of the Conditions of Approval, what the Commission wants, because, again, this is a Conditional Use option.  MR. WITHERS: I mean, who regulates activity in that park, who regulates hours of operation, who maintains it?
tem again if you need to have that be able to move that FAR into ng. BEHAR: But it doesn't have to be wn. It could be in any MX district. GARCIA: Yes, absolutely. BEHAR: I mean, it could be in Merrick	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the Conditions of Approval, what the Commission wants, because, again, this is a Conditional Use option.  MR. WITHERS: I mean, who regulates activity in that park, who regulates hours of operation, who maintains it?
be able to move that FAR into ng.  BEHAR: But it doesn't have to be wn. It could be in any MX district.  GARCIA: Yes, absolutely.  BEHAR: I mean, it could be in Merrick	18 19 20 21 22 23	wants, because, again, this is a Conditional Use option.  MR. WITHERS: I mean, who regulates activity in that park, who regulates hours of operation, who maintains it?
ng. BEHAR: But it doesn't have to be wn. It could be in any MX district. GARCIA: Yes, absolutely. BEHAR: I mean, it could be in Merrick	19 20 21 22 23	Use option.  MR. WITHERS: I mean, who regulates activity in that park, who regulates hours of operation, who maintains it?
BEHAR: But it doesn't have to be wn. It could be in any MX district.  GARCIA: Yes, absolutely.  BEHAR: I mean, it could be in Merrick	20 21 22 23	MR. WITHERS: I mean, who regulates activity in that park, who regulates hours of operation, who maintains it?
wn. It could be in any MX district.  GARCIA: Yes, absolutely.  BEHAR: I mean, it could be in Merrick	21 22 23	activity in that park, who regulates hours of operation, who maintains it?
GARCIA: Yes, absolutely. BEHAR: I mean, it could be in Merrick	22 23	operation, who maintains it?
BEHAR: I mean, it could be in Merrick	23	-
		MS. CARCIA: Yean so I think that would be
ou know.	24	
TORRE: So it's a thousand feet	25	clarified in the Condition of Approval based on
TORRE: So it's a mousand feet	25	the project. If the project, the Commission
Page 63		Page 64
t should be maintained by a developer,	1	properties.
nat's just outlined in the Condition of	2	MR. REDILA: Yeah, when it's not touching,
val that they'll get from the Commission,	3	when there is no property line
e Commission wants it deeded to them,	4	MS. GARCIA: When it's not abutting and
ney can outline that out.	5	contiguous.
. WITHERS: So that project that we	6	MR. BEHAR: When they're not adjacent
at up in the North Ponce, where they had	7	properties.
ear park on the east side, do you	8	MR. WITHERS: So the rights are the same to
ber that project?	9	the people that are next to it, that are
GARCIA: The Madeira project.	10	adjacent, and the ones that are part of their
. WITHERS: It had that long linear park	11	site, it's the same benefit?
	12	MS. GARCIA: Yes. Yeah, this is basically
	13	expanding that idea of unifying different
. BEHAR: The 1505 Ponce.	14	parcels
. WITHERS: 1505 Ponce. So that could	15	MR. WITHERS: So you're trying to encourage
een used to allow additional	16	people to buy green space somewhere else in the
	17	City to be used?
ig	18	MS. GARCIA: That is the intent of this, yeah.
_	19	MR. BEHAR: But it has to be within a
THE RESERVE OF THE STATE OF THE	20	thousand
. WITHERS: Because it was one site.	21	MR. WITHERS: Yeah.
	22	MR. BEHAR: Right now, it has to be within
. WITHERS: Because it was one site.	23	a thousand
. WITHERS: Because it was one site. REDILA: Yes. GARCIA: Correct.	1	ı
. WITHERS: Because it was one site. REDILA: Yes.	24	MR. TORRE: So here's what I think. So you
	withers: 1505 Ponce. So that could been used to allow additional GARCIA: No, because it was all g REDILA: It's all one WITHERS: Because it was one site. REDILA: Yes. GARCIA: Correct.	BEHAR: The 1505 Ponce.  WITHERS: 1505 Ponce. So that could een used to allow additional  GARCIA: No, because it was all g  REDILA: It's all one  WITHERS: Because it was one site.  REDILA: Yes.  GARCIA: Correct.

	Page 65		Page 66
1	make your project be bigger and you want to go	1	
			MS. GARCIA: As far as adding the park to
2	through the discussions with the architects about what buildings you're going to and	2 3	their building site?  MR. TORRE: There must have been early
<i>3</i>	have all of the mathematics to do and all of	4	discussions on that, I would think.
5		5	MS. REDILA: There was a lot of back and
6	this sketching to do, dah, dah, dah. If you	6	
7	haven't proposed the site to the Commissioners, are you kind of going down a path, and then,	7	forth.
8	you know, that's not going to work, we don't	8	MR. TORRE: Right? Because, again, it's
9			subject to Commission approval, and does this balance what we're going give you, dah, dah,
10	like that site or I mean, is there a way to	9	
11	control that or deal with that, because how	11	dah. So I think that and I'm just bringing
12	would you guys handle a site that is	12	it up, because I think it's relevant, but
13	contaminated later on or the City says,	13	and I'm not opposed to this, I'm just bringing
	absolutely never going to work, but you guys	14	it up because
14 15	have done all of your math, all of your work? That's a tough one.	15	MS. REDILA: Yeah, but the Codina park, I think, has that condition, that it will be
16	MR. BEHAR: Well, it is, but there's	16	developed it could be developed as a park
17		17	
18	remedies to that. If I'm going to turn over a	18	when it is going to be given to the City.  MR. TORRE: And sometimes it's not even a
	site to the City and it's contaminated, I think	19	
19 20	part of the agreement would be that you have to	20	purchased park, it's something you have an
	give the City a land that is clean. I mean,	21	option to buy, to be able to do your project.
21 22	that's one of the Conditions of Approval	22	The developer in this case, I think, hasn't even closed on the lot.
23	MR. TORRE: Can I ask it a different way?	23	
24	How early was Codina's park discussed in	24	MR. REVUELTA: Is there not a conceptual
25	their maybe it's not public, but, I mean, is	25	approval phase that you come with what you're
45	that an example?	25	planning to do and you're proposing to mitigate
	Dogo 67		
	Page 67		Page 68
1		1	Page 68  MS. REDILA: Or that we could add it as a
1 2	(unintelligible) and you just come to the City	1 2	MS. REDILA: Or that we could add it as a
	(unintelligible) and you just come to the City and state, "I want to do this project. This is		MS. REDILA: Or that we could add it as a condition to the development approvals to make
2	(unintelligible) and you just come to the City and state, "I want to do this project. This is the park or the site that I'm thinking of	2	MS. REDILA: Or that we could add it as a condition to the development approvals to make sure that you develop the park first before
2	(unintelligible) and you just come to the City and state, "I want to do this project. This is	2 3	MS. REDILA: Or that we could add it as a condition to the development approvals to make
2 3 4	(unintelligible) and you just come to the City and state, "I want to do this project. This is the park or the site that I'm thinking of doing," and then either you go through an	2 3 4	MS. REDILA: Or that we could add it as a condition to the development approvals to make sure that you develop the park first before maybe developing your project or things like
2 3 4 5	(unintelligible) and you just come to the City and state, "I want to do this project. This is the park or the site that I'm thinking of doing," and then either you go through an administrative process or a public process to	2 3 4 5	MS. REDILA: Or that we could add it as a condition to the development approvals to make sure that you develop the park first before maybe developing your project or things like that. There are a lot of things, that we can
2 3 4 5 6	(unintelligible) and you just come to the City and state, "I want to do this project. This is the park or the site that I'm thinking of doing," and then either you go through an administrative process or a public process to validate and to avoid what you're saying, which is that working in a vacuum and then all of a	2 3 4 5 6	MS. REDILA: Or that we could add it as a condition to the development approvals to make sure that you develop the park first before maybe developing your project or things like that. There are a lot of things, that we can be creative in the development conditions.
2 3 4 5 6 7	(unintelligible) and you just come to the City and state, "I want to do this project. This is the park or the site that I'm thinking of doing," and then either you go through an administrative process or a public process to validate and to avoid what you're saying, which is that working in a vacuum and then all of a sudden, "Hey, here's a park."	2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. REDILA: Or that we could add it as a condition to the development approvals to make sure that you develop the park first before maybe developing your project or things like that. There are a lot of things, that we can be creative in the development conditions.  MR. WITHERS: But from a simple business
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	(unintelligible) and you just come to the City and state, "I want to do this project. This is the park or the site that I'm thinking of doing," and then either you go through an administrative process or a public process to validate and to avoid what you're saying, which is that working in a vacuum and then all of a sudden, "Hey, here's a park."  MR. TORRE: I just see the negotiations	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. REDILA: Or that we could add it as a condition to the development approvals to make sure that you develop the park first before maybe developing your project or things like that. There are a lot of things, that we can be creative in the development conditions.  MR. WITHERS: But from a simple business perspective, the developer says, "This is my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	(unintelligible) and you just come to the City and state, "I want to do this project. This is the park or the site that I'm thinking of doing," and then either you go through an administrative process or a public process to validate and to avoid what you're saying, which is that working in a vacuum and then all of a sudden, "Hey, here's a park."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. REDILA: Or that we could add it as a condition to the development approvals to make sure that you develop the park first before maybe developing your project or things like that. There are a lot of things, that we can be creative in the development conditions.  MR. WITHERS: But from a simple business perspective, the developer says, "This is my baseline here, and if I get it, that's even better. If not, I just base my business plan
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	(unintelligible) and you just come to the City and state, "I want to do this project. This is the park or the site that I'm thinking of doing," and then either you go through an administrative process or a public process to validate and to avoid what you're saying, which is that working in a vacuum and then all of a sudden, "Hey, here's a park."  MR. TORRE: I just see the negotiations happening really early if that's the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. REDILA: Or that we could add it as a condition to the development approvals to make sure that you develop the park first before maybe developing your project or things like that. There are a lot of things, that we can be creative in the development conditions.  MR. WITHERS: But from a simple business perspective, the developer says, "This is my baseline here, and if I get it, that's even
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	(unintelligible) and you just come to the City and state, "I want to do this project. This is the park or the site that I'm thinking of doing," and then either you go through an administrative process or a public process to validate and to avoid what you're saying, which is that working in a vacuum and then all of a sudden, "Hey, here's a park."  MR. TORRE: I just see the negotiations happening really early if that's the commitment	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS. REDILA: Or that we could add it as a condition to the development approvals to make sure that you develop the park first before maybe developing your project or things like that. There are a lot of things, that we can be creative in the development conditions.  MR. WITHERS: But from a simple business perspective, the developer says, "This is my baseline here, and if I get it, that's even better. If not, I just base my business plan on not getting it." Leave it to the business
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	(unintelligible) and you just come to the City and state, "I want to do this project. This is the park or the site that I'm thinking of doing," and then either you go through an administrative process or a public process to validate and to avoid what you're saying, which is that working in a vacuum and then all of a sudden, "Hey, here's a park."  MR. TORRE: I just see the negotiations happening really early if that's the commitment  MR. REVUELTA: I think informally people	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. REDILA: Or that we could add it as a condition to the development approvals to make sure that you develop the park first before maybe developing your project or things like that. There are a lot of things, that we can be creative in the development conditions.  MR. WITHERS: But from a simple business perspective, the developer says, "This is my baseline here, and if I get it, that's even better. If not, I just base my business plan on not getting it." Leave it to the business decision, I mean
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	(unintelligible) and you just come to the City and state, "I want to do this project. This is the park or the site that I'm thinking of doing," and then either you go through an administrative process or a public process to validate and to avoid what you're saying, which is that working in a vacuum and then all of a sudden, "Hey, here's a park."  MR. TORRE: I just see the negotiations happening really early if that's the commitment  MR. REVUELTA: I think informally people will cover their tracks to avoid any surprise,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. REDILA: Or that we could add it as a condition to the development approvals to make sure that you develop the park first before maybe developing your project or things like that. There are a lot of things, that we can be creative in the development conditions.  MR. WITHERS: But from a simple business perspective, the developer says, "This is my baseline here, and if I get it, that's even better. If not, I just base my business plan on not getting it." Leave it to the business decision, I mean  MR. BEHAR: Yeah. And, look, at the end of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	(unintelligible) and you just come to the City and state, "I want to do this project. This is the park or the site that I'm thinking of doing," and then either you go through an administrative process or a public process to validate and to avoid what you're saying, which is that working in a vacuum and then all of a sudden, "Hey, here's a park."  MR. TORRE: I just see the negotiations happening really early if that's the commitment  MR. REVUELTA: I think informally people will cover their tracks to avoid any surprise, but is there an informal process now, along	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. REDILA: Or that we could add it as a condition to the development approvals to make sure that you develop the park first before maybe developing your project or things like that. There are a lot of things, that we can be creative in the development conditions.  MR. WITHERS: But from a simple business perspective, the developer says, "This is my baseline here, and if I get it, that's even better. If not, I just base my business plan on not getting it." Leave it to the business decision, I mean  MR. BEHAR: Yeah. And, look, at the end of the day, it's going to create, which I think is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	(unintelligible) and you just come to the City and state, "I want to do this project. This is the park or the site that I'm thinking of doing," and then either you go through an administrative process or a public process to validate and to avoid what you're saying, which is that working in a vacuum and then all of a sudden, "Hey, here's a park."  MR. TORRE: I just see the negotiations happening really early if that's the commitment  MR. REVUELTA: I think informally people will cover their tracks to avoid any surprise, but is there an informal process now, along with this, that somebody can go ahead and get	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. REDILA: Or that we could add it as a condition to the development approvals to make sure that you develop the park first before maybe developing your project or things like that. There are a lot of things, that we can be creative in the development conditions.  MR. WITHERS: But from a simple business perspective, the developer says, "This is my baseline here, and if I get it, that's even better. If not, I just base my business plan on not getting it." Leave it to the business decision, I mean  MR. BEHAR: Yeah. And, look, at the end of the day, it's going to create, which I think is the intent, more, more green space, more park
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	(unintelligible) and you just come to the City and state, "I want to do this project. This is the park or the site that I'm thinking of doing," and then either you go through an administrative process or a public process to validate and to avoid what you're saying, which is that working in a vacuum and then all of a sudden, "Hey, here's a park."  MR. TORRE: I just see the negotiations happening really early if that's the commitment  MR. REVUELTA: I think informally people will cover their tracks to avoid any surprise, but is there an informal process now, along with this, that somebody can go ahead and get some comfort level that there is not going to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. REDILA: Or that we could add it as a condition to the development approvals to make sure that you develop the park first before maybe developing your project or things like that. There are a lot of things, that we can be creative in the development conditions.  MR. WITHERS: But from a simple business perspective, the developer says, "This is my baseline here, and if I get it, that's even better. If not, I just base my business plan on not getting it." Leave it to the business decision, I mean  MR. BEHAR: Yeah. And, look, at the end of the day, it's going to create, which I think is the intent, more, more green space, more park area, and what you're doing is, you know,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	(unintelligible) and you just come to the City and state, "I want to do this project. This is the park or the site that I'm thinking of doing," and then either you go through an administrative process or a public process to validate and to avoid what you're saying, which is that working in a vacuum and then all of a sudden, "Hey, here's a park."  MR. TORRE: I just see the negotiations happening really early if that's the commitment  MR. REVUELTA: I think informally people will cover their tracks to avoid any surprise, but is there an informal process now, along with this, that somebody can go ahead and get some comfort level that there is not going to be a surprise?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. REDILA: Or that we could add it as a condition to the development approvals to make sure that you develop the park first before maybe developing your project or things like that. There are a lot of things, that we can be creative in the development conditions.  MR. WITHERS: But from a simple business perspective, the developer says, "This is my baseline here, and if I get it, that's even better. If not, I just base my business plan on not getting it." Leave it to the business decision, I mean  MR. BEHAR: Yeah. And, look, at the end of the day, it's going to create, which I think is the intent, more, more green space, more park area, and what you're doing is, you know, instead of putting that the entitlement that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	(unintelligible) and you just come to the City and state, "I want to do this project. This is the park or the site that I'm thinking of doing," and then either you go through an administrative process or a public process to validate and to avoid what you're saying, which is that working in a vacuum and then all of a sudden, "Hey, here's a park."  MR. TORRE: I just see the negotiations happening really early if that's the commitment  MR. REVUELTA: I think informally people will cover their tracks to avoid any surprise, but is there an informal process now, along with this, that somebody can go ahead and get some comfort level that there is not going to be a surprise?  MR. BEHAR: I'm sure	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. REDILA: Or that we could add it as a condition to the development approvals to make sure that you develop the park first before maybe developing your project or things like that. There are a lot of things, that we can be creative in the development conditions.  MR. WITHERS: But from a simple business perspective, the developer says, "This is my baseline here, and if I get it, that's even better. If not, I just base my business plan on not getting it." Leave it to the business decision, I mean  MR. BEHAR: Yeah. And, look, at the end of the day, it's going to create, which I think is the intent, more, more green space, more park area, and what you're doing is, you know, instead of putting that the entitlement that the intensity and density there, you're going to move it over, you know. So it's not and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	(unintelligible) and you just come to the City and state, "I want to do this project. This is the park or the site that I'm thinking of doing," and then either you go through an administrative process or a public process to validate and to avoid what you're saying, which is that working in a vacuum and then all of a sudden, "Hey, here's a park."  MR. TORRE: I just see the negotiations happening really early if that's the commitment  MR. REVUELTA: I think informally people will cover their tracks to avoid any surprise, but is there an informal process now, along with this, that somebody can go ahead and get some comfort level that there is not going to be a surprise?  MR. BEHAR: I'm sure  MS. REDILA: We're just proposing, so we don't have any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. REDILA: Or that we could add it as a condition to the development approvals to make sure that you develop the park first before maybe developing your project or things like that. There are a lot of things, that we can be creative in the development conditions.  MR. WITHERS: But from a simple business perspective, the developer says, "This is my baseline here, and if I get it, that's even better. If not, I just base my business plan on not getting it." Leave it to the business decision, I mean  MR. BEHAR: Yeah. And, look, at the end of the day, it's going to create, which I think is the intent, more, more green space, more park area, and what you're doing is, you know, instead of putting that the entitlement that the intensity and density there, you're going to move it over, you know. So it's not and obviously, it has to be in an area that you're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	(unintelligible) and you just come to the City and state, "I want to do this project. This is the park or the site that I'm thinking of doing," and then either you go through an administrative process or a public process to validate and to avoid what you're saying, which is that working in a vacuum and then all of a sudden, "Hey, here's a park."  MR. TORRE: I just see the negotiations happening really early if that's the commitment  MR. REVUELTA: I think informally people will cover their tracks to avoid any surprise, but is there an informal process now, along with this, that somebody can go ahead and get some comfort level that there is not going to be a surprise?  MR. BEHAR: I'm sure  MS. REDILA: We're just proposing, so we don't have any  MR. BEHAR: I'm sure that before that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. REDILA: Or that we could add it as a condition to the development approvals to make sure that you develop the park first before maybe developing your project or things like that. There are a lot of things, that we can be creative in the development conditions.  MR. WITHERS: But from a simple business perspective, the developer says, "This is my baseline here, and if I get it, that's even better. If not, I just base my business plan on not getting it." Leave it to the business decision, I mean  MR. BEHAR: Yeah. And, look, at the end of the day, it's going to create, which I think is the intent, more, more green space, more park area, and what you're doing is, you know, instead of putting that the entitlement that the intensity and density there, you're going to move it over, you know. So it's not and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	(unintelligible) and you just come to the City and state, "I want to do this project. This is the park or the site that I'm thinking of doing," and then either you go through an administrative process or a public process to validate and to avoid what you're saying, which is that working in a vacuum and then all of a sudden, "Hey, here's a park."  MR. TORRE: I just see the negotiations happening really early if that's the commitment  MR. REVUELTA: I think informally people will cover their tracks to avoid any surprise, but is there an informal process now, along with this, that somebody can go ahead and get some comfort level that there is not going to be a surprise?  MR. BEHAR: I'm sure  MS. REDILA: We're just proposing, so we don't have any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. REDILA: Or that we could add it as a condition to the development approvals to make sure that you develop the park first before maybe developing your project or things like that. There are a lot of things, that we can be creative in the development conditions.  MR. WITHERS: But from a simple business perspective, the developer says, "This is my baseline here, and if I get it, that's even better. If not, I just base my business plan on not getting it." Leave it to the business decision, I mean  MR. BEHAR: Yeah. And, look, at the end of the day, it's going to create, which I think is the intent, more, more green space, more park area, and what you're doing is, you know, instead of putting that the entitlement that the intensity and density there, you're going to move it over, you know. So it's not and obviously, it has to be in an area that you're not going to exceed the height permitted,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	(unintelligible) and you just come to the City and state, "I want to do this project. This is the park or the site that I'm thinking of doing," and then either you go through an administrative process or a public process to validate and to avoid what you're saying, which is that working in a vacuum and then all of a sudden, "Hey, here's a park."  MR. TORRE: I just see the negotiations happening really early if that's the commitment  MR. REVUELTA: I think informally people will cover their tracks to avoid any surprise, but is there an informal process now, along with this, that somebody can go ahead and get some comfort level that there is not going to be a surprise?  MR. BEHAR: I'm sure  MS. REDILA: We're just proposing, so we don't have any  MR. BEHAR: I'm sure that before that developer buys, you have the homework done.  MR. TORRE: I think most of it is an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. REDILA: Or that we could add it as a condition to the development approvals to make sure that you develop the park first before maybe developing your project or things like that. There are a lot of things, that we can be creative in the development conditions.  MR. WITHERS: But from a simple business perspective, the developer says, "This is my baseline here, and if I get it, that's even better. If not, I just base my business plan on not getting it." Leave it to the business decision, I mean  MR. BEHAR: Yeah. And, look, at the end of the day, it's going to create, which I think is the intent, more, more green space, more park area, and what you're doing is, you know, instead of putting that the entitlement that the intensity and density there, you're going to move it over, you know. So it's not and obviously, it has to be in an area that you're not going to not exceed anything that is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	(unintelligible) and you just come to the City and state, "I want to do this project. This is the park or the site that I'm thinking of doing," and then either you go through an administrative process or a public process to validate and to avoid what you're saying, which is that working in a vacuum and then all of a sudden, "Hey, here's a park."  MR. TORRE: I just see the negotiations happening really early if that's the commitment  MR. REVUELTA: I think informally people will cover their tracks to avoid any surprise, but is there an informal process now, along with this, that somebody can go ahead and get some comfort level that there is not going to be a surprise?  MR. BEHAR: I'm sure  MS. REDILA: We're just proposing, so we don't have any  MR. BEHAR: I'm sure that before that developer buys, you have the homework done.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. REDILA: Or that we could add it as a condition to the development approvals to make sure that you develop the park first before maybe developing your project or things like that. There are a lot of things, that we can be creative in the development conditions.  MR. WITHERS: But from a simple business perspective, the developer says, "This is my baseline here, and if I get it, that's even better. If not, I just base my business plan on not getting it." Leave it to the business decision, I mean  MR. BEHAR: Yeah. And, look, at the end of the day, it's going to create, which I think is the intent, more, more green space, more park area, and what you're doing is, you know, instead of putting that the entitlement that the intensity and density there, you're going to move it over, you know. So it's not and obviously, it has to be in an area that you're not going to exceed the height permitted, you're not going to not exceed anything that is and I think I'm just trying to and

	Page 69		Page 70
1	mechanism to be able to allow for that, and yet	1	there that have a couple of empty corners lots.
2	create, you know, the parks.	2	MR. BEHAR: But it has to be within the
3	All right. So we're going to close the	3	Mixed-Use designation area. You cannot buy a
4	presentation by Staff. Do we have any	4	property, even if maybe not
5	public open it to the public. Any public	5	MR. TORRE: Can you cross the line, for
6	comments?	6	example, into a residential area and put a park
7	THE SECRETARY: No.	7	in the Residential area?
8	MR. BEHAR: I'm going to close the public	8	MS. GARCIA: No, this only applies to
9	comments.	9	Mixed-Use districts.
10	I'm going to bring it back to the Board.	10	MR. TORRE: So you have to be within the
11	Any other additional comments by the Board?	11	MR. WITHERS: I mean, maybe there's some up
12	Do we have a motion from the Board?	12	in the North Ponce Gables area.
13	MR. WITHERS: I'll move it. Do you want to	13	MR. TORRE: Look, I think giving a thousand
14	discuss it? I mean there was a discussion	14	feet gives more options and more ability for
15	about the thousand feet, but I don't see a lot	15	this to work, I think. If you want to make it
16	of opportunity for people to buy green space in	16	work, what's the rationale in keeping it
17	Downtown, anyway. Do you, Venny? I really	17	tighter? It's a park. Whether it's closer or
18	don't.	18	further, it doesn't matter.
19	MR. TORRE: I was thinking, and, again,	19	MR. BEHAR: I mean, I don't think you
20	using Codina, and where would there have been	20	know, I know, within a thousand feet, but it
21	property and that would have been over across	21	would be maybe even more beneficial if that
22	by Salzedo maybe or	22	distance is greater.
23	MR. WITHERS: Where? There's not a whole	23	MR. TORRE: Give it further.
24	lot unless someone	24	MR. BEHAR: Yeah.
25	MR. TORRE: There's duplex properties over	25	MR. TORRE: You just want a park. I'm not
	Page 71		Page 72
1	just saying, just a park, but the park is the	1 1	
		1	garages, different things are happening. When
2	incentive. Whether closer or not closer,	2	garages, different things are happening. When you get to the North, there's some already big
2			
	incentive. Whether closer or not closer,	2	you get to the North, there's some already big
3	incentive. Whether closer or not closer, that's not so much the problem. Like TDRs come	2 3	you get to the North, there's some already big buildings that we already know are making lots
3 4	incentive. Whether closer or not closer, that's not so much the problem. Like TDRs come from many different places.	2 3 4	you get to the North, there's some already big buildings that we already know are making lots of havoc in the North Ponce area. So I don't
3 4 5	incentive. Whether closer or not closer, that's not so much the problem. Like TDRs come from many different places.  MR. BEHAR: But not necessarily, because	2 3 4 5	you get to the North, there's some already big buildings that we already know are making lots of havoc in the North Ponce area. So I don't know if getting to a 5.5 FAR there is going to
3 4 5 6	incentive. Whether closer or not closer, that's not so much the problem. Like TDRs come from many different places.  MR. BEHAR: But not necessarily, because the TDRs, if you're going to transfer it, you	2 3 4 5 6	you get to the North, there's some already big buildings that we already know are making lots of havoc in the North Ponce area. So I don't know if getting to a 5.5 FAR there is going to be what the
3 4 5 6 7	incentive. Whether closer or not closer, that's not so much the problem. Like TDRs come from many different places.  MR. BEHAR: But not necessarily, because the TDRs, if you're going to transfer it, you have to have the receiving site and the	2 3 4 5 6 7	you get to the North, there's some already big buildings that we already know are making lots of havoc in the North Ponce area. So I don't know if getting to a 5.5 FAR there is going to be what the  MR. BEHAR: So it may not apply in the
3 4 5 6 7 8	incentive. Whether closer or not closer, that's not so much the problem. Like TDRs come from many different places.  MR. BEHAR: But not necessarily, because the TDRs, if you're going to transfer it, you have to have — the receiving site and the sending site has to qualify. This is like,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	you get to the North, there's some already big buildings that we already know are making lots of havoc in the North Ponce area. So I don't know if getting to a 5.5 FAR there is going to be what the  MR. BEHAR: So it may not apply in the (unintelligible). I mean, I don't really
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	incentive. Whether closer or not closer, that's not so much the problem. Like TDRs come from many different places.  MR. BEHAR: But not necessarily, because the TDRs, if you're going to transfer it, you have to have the receiving site and the sending site has to qualify. This is like, okay, we're going to take the FAR and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	you get to the North, there's some already big buildings that we already know are making lots of havoc in the North Ponce area. So I don't know if getting to a 5.5 FAR there is going to be what the  MR. BEHAR: So it may not apply in the (unintelligible). I mean, I don't really think have we done the analysis? I don't
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	incentive. Whether closer or not closer, that's not so much the problem. Like TDRs come from many different places.  MR. BEHAR: But not necessarily, because the TDRs, if you're going to transfer it, you have to have the receiving site and the sending site has to qualify. This is like, okay, we're going to take the FAR and the intensity and the density and we're going to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you get to the North, there's some already big buildings that we already know are making lots of havoc in the North Ponce area. So I don't know if getting to a 5.5 FAR there is going to be what the  MR. BEHAR: So it may not apply in the (unintelligible). I mean, I don't really think have we done the analysis? I don't think that gets affected at the end of the day.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	incentive. Whether closer or not closer, that's not so much the problem. Like TDRs come from many different places.  MR. BEHAR: But not necessarily, because the TDRs, if you're going to transfer it, you have to have the receiving site and the sending site has to qualify. This is like, okay, we're going to take the FAR and the intensity and the density and we're going to transfer it over, and that becomes the park,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	you get to the North, there's some already big buildings that we already know are making lots of havoc in the North Ponce area. So I don't know if getting to a 5.5 FAR there is going to be what the  MR. BEHAR: So it may not apply in the (unintelligible). I mean, I don't really think have we done the analysis? I don't think that gets affected at the end of the day.  MR. WITHERS: But you guys do this every
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	incentive. Whether closer or not closer, that's not so much the problem. Like TDRs come from many different places.  MR. BEHAR: But not necessarily, because the TDRs, if you're going to transfer it, you have to have the receiving site and the sending site has to qualify. This is like, okay, we're going to take the FAR and the intensity and the density and we're going to transfer it over, and that becomes the park, without having to go through the other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	you get to the North, there's some already big buildings that we already know are making lots of havoc in the North Ponce area. So I don't know if getting to a 5.5 FAR there is going to be what the  MR. BEHAR: So it may not apply in the (unintelligible). I mean, I don't really think have we done the analysis? I don't think that gets affected at the end of the day.  MR. WITHERS: But you guys do this every day of your life. If you have a 10,000 square
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	incentive. Whether closer or not closer, that's not so much the problem. Like TDRs come from many different places.  MR. BEHAR: But not necessarily, because the TDRs, if you're going to transfer it, you have to have the receiving site and the sending site has to qualify. This is like, okay, we're going to take the FAR and the intensity and the density and we're going to transfer it over, and that becomes the park, without having to go through the other requirements, right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	you get to the North, there's some already big buildings that we already know are making lots of havoc in the North Ponce area. So I don't know if getting to a 5.5 FAR there is going to be what the  MR. BEHAR: So it may not apply in the (unintelligible). I mean, I don't really think have we done the analysis? I don't think that gets affected at the end of the day.  MR. WITHERS: But you guys do this every day of your life. If you have a 10,000 square foot parcel that you're going to think about
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	incentive. Whether closer or not closer, that's not so much the problem. Like TDRs come from many different places.  MR. BEHAR: But not necessarily, because the TDRs, if you're going to transfer it, you have to have the receiving site and the sending site has to qualify. This is like, okay, we're going to take the FAR and the intensity and the density and we're going to transfer it over, and that becomes the park, without having to go through the other requirements, right?  MS. GARCIA: Right. And this one is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	you get to the North, there's some already big buildings that we already know are making lots of havoc in the North Ponce area. So I don't know if getting to a 5.5 FAR there is going to be what the  MR. BEHAR: So it may not apply in the (unintelligible). I mean, I don't really think have we done the analysis? I don't think that gets affected at the end of the day.  MR. WITHERS: But you guys do this every day of your life. If you have a 10,000 square foot parcel that you're going to think about dedicating it to a park, it's better for you to
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	incentive. Whether closer or not closer, that's not so much the problem. Like TDRs come from many different places.  MR. BEHAR: But not necessarily, because the TDRs, if you're going to transfer it, you have to have the receiving site and the sending site has to qualify. This is like, okay, we're going to take the FAR and the intensity and the density and we're going to transfer it over, and that becomes the park, without having to go through the other requirements, right?  MS. GARCIA: Right. And this one is transferring both, intensity, like the TDRs do,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	you get to the North, there's some already big buildings that we already know are making lots of havoc in the North Ponce area. So I don't know if getting to a 5.5 FAR there is going to be what the  MR. BEHAR: So it may not apply in the (unintelligible). I mean, I don't really think have we done the analysis? I don't think that gets affected at the end of the day.  MR. WITHERS: But you guys do this every day of your life. If you have a 10,000 square foot parcel that you're going to think about dedicating it to a park, it's better for you to build on that 10,000 square feet than try to
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	incentive. Whether closer or not closer, that's not so much the problem. Like TDRs come from many different places.  MR. BEHAR: But not necessarily, because the TDRs, if you're going to transfer it, you have to have the receiving site and the sending site has to qualify. This is like, okay, we're going to take the FAR and the intensity and the density and we're going to transfer it over, and that becomes the park, without having to go through the other requirements, right?  MS. GARCIA: Right. And this one is transferring both, intensity, like the TDRs do, and density, which is the number of units per acre, which the TDR currently doesn't have right now. It's just square feet.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	you get to the North, there's some already big buildings that we already know are making lots of havoc in the North Ponce area. So I don't know if getting to a 5.5 FAR there is going to be what the  MR. BEHAR: So it may not apply in the (unintelligible). I mean, I don't really think have we done the analysis? I don't think that gets affected at the end of the day.  MR. WITHERS: But you guys do this every day of your life. If you have a 10,000 square foot parcel that you're going to think about dedicating it to a park, it's better for you to build on that 10,000 square feet than try to get additional FAR in the building next door to
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	incentive. Whether closer or not closer, that's not so much the problem. Like TDRs come from many different places.  MR. BEHAR: But not necessarily, because the TDRs, if you're going to transfer it, you have to have — the receiving site and the sending site has to qualify. This is like, okay, we're going to take the FAR and the intensity and the density and we're going to transfer it over, and that becomes the park, without having to go through the other requirements, right?  MS. GARCIA: Right. And this one is transferring both, intensity, like the TDRs do, and density, which is the number of units per acre, which the TDR currently doesn't have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	you get to the North, there's some already big buildings that we already know are making lots of havoc in the North Ponce area. So I don't know if getting to a 5.5 FAR there is going to be what the  MR. BEHAR: So it may not apply in the (unintelligible). I mean, I don't really think have we done the analysis? I don't think that gets affected at the end of the day.  MR. WITHERS: But you guys do this every day of your life. If you have a 10,000 square foot parcel that you're going to think about dedicating it to a park, it's better for you to build on that 10,000 square feet than try to get additional FAR in the building next door to that?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	incentive. Whether closer or not closer, that's not so much the problem. Like TDRs come from many different places.  MR. BEHAR: But not necessarily, because the TDRs, if you're going to transfer it, you have to have the receiving site and the sending site has to qualify. This is like, okay, we're going to take the FAR and the intensity and the density and we're going to transfer it over, and that becomes the park, without having to go through the other requirements, right?  MS. GARCIA: Right. And this one is transferring both, intensity, like the TDRs do, and density, which is the number of units per acre, which the TDR currently doesn't have right now. It's just square feet.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	you get to the North, there's some already big buildings that we already know are making lots of havoc in the North Ponce area. So I don't know if getting to a 5.5 FAR there is going to be what the  MR. BEHAR: So it may not apply in the (unintelligible). I mean, I don't really think have we done the analysis? I don't think that gets affected at the end of the day.  MR. WITHERS: But you guys do this every day of your life. If you have a 10,000 square foot parcel that you're going to think about dedicating it to a park, it's better for you to build on that 10,000 square feet than try to get additional FAR in the building next door to that?  MR. BEHAR: At the end of the day, you're
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	incentive. Whether closer or not closer, that's not so much the problem. Like TDRs come from many different places.  MR. BEHAR: But not necessarily, because the TDRs, if you're going to transfer it, you have to have the receiving site and the sending site has to qualify. This is like, okay, we're going to take the FAR and the intensity and the density and we're going to transfer it over, and that becomes the park, without having to go through the other requirements, right?  MS. GARCIA: Right. And this one is transferring both, intensity, like the TDRs do, and density, which is the number of units per acre, which the TDR currently doesn't have right now. It's just square feet.  MR. TORRE: I'm thinking a little harder.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	you get to the North, there's some already big buildings that we already know are making lots of havoc in the North Ponce area. So I don't know if getting to a 5.5 FAR there is going to be what the  MR. BEHAR: So it may not apply in the (unintelligible). I mean, I don't really think have we done the analysis? I don't think that gets affected at the end of the day.  MR. WITHERS: But you guys do this every day of your life. If you have a 10,000 square foot parcel that you're going to think about dedicating it to a park, it's better for you to build on that 10,000 square feet than try to get additional FAR in the building next door to that?  MR. BEHAR: At the end of the day, you're not doing any more than you would be allowed to
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	incentive. Whether closer or not closer, that's not so much the problem. Like TDRs come from many different places.  MR. BEHAR: But not necessarily, because the TDRs, if you're going to transfer it, you have to have the receiving site and the sending site has to qualify. This is like, okay, we're going to take the FAR and the intensity and the density and we're going to transfer it over, and that becomes the park, without having to go through the other requirements, right?  MS. GARCIA: Right. And this one is transferring both, intensity, like the TDRs do, and density, which is the number of units per acre, which the TDR currently doesn't have right now. It's just square feet.  MR. TORRE: I'm thinking a little harder. So I think there's less issues coming at this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	you get to the North, there's some already big buildings that we already know are making lots of havoc in the North Ponce area. So I don't know if getting to a 5.5 FAR there is going to be what the  MR. BEHAR: So it may not apply in the (unintelligible). I mean, I don't really think have we done the analysis? I don't think that gets affected at the end of the day.  MR. WITHERS: But you guys do this every day of your life. If you have a 10,000 square foot parcel that you're going to think about dedicating it to a park, it's better for you to build on that 10,000 square feet than try to get additional FAR in the building next door to that?  MR. BEHAR: At the end of the day, you're not doing any more than you would be allowed to do on that 10,000 and the other parcel.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	incentive. Whether closer or not closer, that's not so much the problem. Like TDRs come from many different places.  MR. BEHAR: But not necessarily, because the TDRs, if you're going to transfer it, you have to have — the receiving site and the sending site has to qualify. This is like, okay, we're going to take the FAR and the intensity and the density and we're going to transfer it over, and that becomes the park, without having to go through the other requirements, right?  MS. GARCIA: Right. And this one is transferring both, intensity, like the TDRs do, and density, which is the number of units per acre, which the TDR currently doesn't have right now. It's just square feet.  MR. TORRE: I'm thinking a little harder. So I think there's less issues coming at this in the CBD level. If you go to North Ponce and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	you get to the North, there's some already big buildings that we already know are making lots of havoc in the North Ponce area. So I don't know if getting to a 5.5 FAR there is going to be what the  MR. BEHAR: So it may not apply in the (unintelligible). I mean, I don't really think have we done the analysis? I don't think that gets affected at the end of the day.  MR. WITHERS: But you guys do this every day of your life. If you have a 10,000 square foot parcel that you're going to think about dedicating it to a park, it's better for you to build on that 10,000 square feet than try to get additional FAR in the building next door to that?  MR. BEHAR: At the end of the day, you're not doing any more than you would be allowed to do on that 10,000 and the other parcel.  MR. WITHERS: I know, but cost-wise, is it
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	incentive. Whether closer or not closer, that's not so much the problem. Like TDRs come from many different places.  MR. BEHAR: But not necessarily, because the TDRs, if you're going to transfer it, you have to have the receiving site and the sending site has to qualify. This is like, okay, we're going to take the FAR and the intensity and the density and we're going to transfer it over, and that becomes the park, without having to go through the other requirements, right?  MS. GARCIA: Right. And this one is transferring both, intensity, like the TDRs do, and density, which is the number of units per acre, which the TDR currently doesn't have right now. It's just square feet.  MR. TORRE: I'm thinking a little harder. So I think there's less issues coming at this in the CBD level. If you go to North Ponce and you start getting really into big FARs, it does	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	you get to the North, there's some already big buildings that we already know are making lots of havoc in the North Ponce area. So I don't know if getting to a 5.5 FAR there is going to be what the  MR. BEHAR: So it may not apply in the (unintelligible). I mean, I don't really think have we done the analysis? I don't think that gets affected at the end of the day.  MR. WITHERS: But you guys do this every day of your life. If you have a 10,000 square foot parcel that you're going to think about dedicating it to a park, it's better for you to build on that 10,000 square feet than try to get additional FAR in the building next door to that?  MR. BEHAR: At the end of the day, you're not doing any more than you would be allowed to do on that 10,000 and the other parcel.  MR. WITHERS: I know, but cost-wise, is it better to put it in the main building or is it better  MR. BEHAR: Oh, cost-wise, it's better to
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	incentive. Whether closer or not closer, that's not so much the problem. Like TDRs come from many different places.  MR. BEHAR: But not necessarily, because the TDRs, if you're going to transfer it, you have to have the receiving site and the sending site has to qualify. This is like, okay, we're going to take the FAR and the intensity and the density and we're going to transfer it over, and that becomes the park, without having to go through the other requirements, right?  MS. GARCIA: Right. And this one is transferring both, intensity, like the TDRs do, and density, which is the number of units per acre, which the TDR currently doesn't have right now. It's just square feet.  MR. TORRE: I'm thinking a little harder. So I think there's less issues coming at this in the CBD level. If you go to North Ponce and you start getting really into big FARs, it does affect. The more density units, that starts to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	you get to the North, there's some already big buildings that we already know are making lots of havoc in the North Ponce area. So I don't know if getting to a 5.5 FAR there is going to be what the  MR. BEHAR: So it may not apply in the (unintelligible). I mean, I don't really think have we done the analysis? I don't think that gets affected at the end of the day.  MR. WITHERS: But you guys do this every day of your life. If you have a 10,000 square foot parcel that you're going to think about dedicating it to a park, it's better for you to build on that 10,000 square feet than try to get additional FAR in the building next door to that?  MR. BEHAR: At the end of the day, you're not doing any more than you would be allowed to do on that 10,000 and the other parcel.  MR. WITHERS: I know, but cost-wise, is it better to put it in the main building or is it

	Page 73		Page 74
1	MR. WITHERS: That's what I was saying, but	1	MR. WITHERS: There are no changes to the
2	where would you go, 5,000 feet, 10,000 feet,	2	motion, the way it's proposed? Any amendments
3	where is the cut-off for you?	3	to that, as far as restricting I mean,
4	MR. TORRE: Remember, you have the	4	adding additional FAR or allowing more than a
5	building, that you already paid for the	5	thousand feet or
6	footage, you paid for the elevator, you already	6	MR. BEHAR: I think that personally I'm
7	paid for the roof. All you're doing now is	7	good with it. You know, I don't want to go
8	adding another two or three floors, okay,	8	much, you know, further, because we don't know
9	that's very cheap.	9	the implications, but
10	MR. BEHAR: What I do like about this is	10	MR. TORRE: Let me be clear, this is not
11	that you're going to give an incentive to start	11	going to be the MF properties don't get
12	giving more park area.	12	this. So those Residential only on Zamora,
13	MR. WITHERS: No, I understand.	13	Mendoza
14	MR. BEHAR: And I think that that's	14	MS. GARCIA: Right. So, in North Ponce, it
15	ultimately what I think, you know, we're	15	would only apply to the segment along
16	looking for in the City.	16	MR. TORRE: On Ponce itself.
17	MR. TORRE: There's other pieces of this	17	MR. WITHERS: That corridor along Ponce.
18	that will come into play when the time comes,	18	MR. TORRE: I agree to that.
19	and that's again, back with the Commission	19	MR. WITHERS: All right.
20	will have to go back and forth to weed this out	20	MR. BEHAR: We have a motion. Do we get a
21	at some point, but I think overall, what you're	21	second?
22	saying, is that the ideology of this works,	22	MR. TORRE: I'll give it. I'll second.
23	because we're trying to promote parks. How it	23	MR. BEHAR: Jill, can you please call the
24	gets handled later may be a little bit	24	roll?
25	MR. BEHAR: Yeah.	25	THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?
23	MR. DEHAR. Teal.		THE SECRETARY. Veiling Toric:
	Page 75		Page 76
1	MR. TORRE: Yes.	1	necessary. This was I think the original
2	THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?	2	Ordinance was written back in, what did it say,
3	MR. WITHERS: Yes.	3	ten, fifteen years ago, and since then, it's
4	THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?	4	time to update that to allow more permanent
5	MR. REVUELTA: Yes.	5	generators to happen on single-family houses
6	THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?	6	and properties.
7	MR. BEHAR: Yes.	7	MR. BEHAR: And this has to do with,
8	Next item.	8	because of the carbon monoxide they would
9	MR. COLLER: Item E-4, an Ordinance of the	9	
		_	generate and we wanted it to be away from the
10	City Commission of Coral Gables, Florida	10	generate and we wanted it to be away from the opening, right?
10 11	City Commission of Coral Gables, Florida providing for text amendments to the City of		opening, right?
	providing for text amendments to the City of	10	opening, right? MS. GARCIA: Right.
11	providing for text amendments to the City of Coral Gables Official Zoning Code, Article 3,	10 11	opening, right?  MS. GARCIA: Right.  MR. BEHAR: And with the new generators
11 12	providing for text amendments to the City of Coral Gables Official Zoning Code, Article 3, "Uses", Section 3-317, "Permanently installed	10 11 12	opening, right?  MS. GARCIA: Right.  MR. BEHAR: And with the new generators MS. GARCIA: It's not necessary.
11 12 13 14	providing for text amendments to the City of Coral Gables Official Zoning Code, Article 3, "Uses", Section 3-317, "Permanently installed stand-by generators" removing the distance	10 11 12 13 14	opening, right?  MS. GARCIA: Right.  MR. BEHAR: And with the new generators  MS. GARCIA: It's not necessary.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. Is that it?
11 12 13	providing for text amendments to the City of Coral Gables Official Zoning Code, Article 3, "Uses", Section 3-317, "Permanently installed stand-by generators" removing the distance requirement of ten feet from any opening in a	10 11 12 13	opening, right?  MS. GARCIA: Right.  MR. BEHAR: And with the new generators  MS. GARCIA: It's not necessary.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. Is that it?  MS. GARCIA: Yeah.
11 12 13 14 15	providing for text amendments to the City of Coral Gables Official Zoning Code, Article 3, "Uses", Section 3-317, "Permanently installed stand-by generators" removing the distance requirement of ten feet from any opening in a building or structure; requiring that the	10 11 12 13 14 15	opening, right?  MS. GARCIA: Right.  MR. BEHAR: And with the new generators  MS. GARCIA: It's not necessary.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. Is that it?  MS. GARCIA: Yeah.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. Do we have any public
11 12 13 14 15	providing for text amendments to the City of Coral Gables Official Zoning Code, Article 3, "Uses", Section 3-317, "Permanently installed stand-by generators" removing the distance requirement of ten feet from any opening in a building or structure; requiring that the distance from any opening be determined by	10 11 12 13 14 15	opening, right?  MS. GARCIA: Right.  MR. BEHAR: And with the new generators  MS. GARCIA: It's not necessary.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. Is that it?  MS. GARCIA: Yeah.
11 12 13 14 15 16	providing for text amendments to the City of Coral Gables Official Zoning Code, Article 3, "Uses", Section 3-317, "Permanently installed stand-by generators" removing the distance requirement of ten feet from any opening in a building or structure; requiring that the distance from any opening be determined by manufacturer's specification; providing for	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	opening, right?  MS. GARCIA: Right.  MR. BEHAR: And with the new generators MS. GARCIA: It's not necessary.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. Is that it?  MS. GARCIA: Yeah.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. Do we have any public comments?  THE SECRETARY: No.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17	providing for text amendments to the City of Coral Gables Official Zoning Code, Article 3, "Uses", Section 3-317, "Permanently installed stand-by generators" removing the distance requirement of ten feet from any opening in a building or structure; requiring that the distance from any opening be determined by manufacturer's specification; providing for severability, repeater, codification, and for	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	opening, right?  MS. GARCIA: Right.  MR. BEHAR: And with the new generators MS. GARCIA: It's not necessary.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. Is that it?  MS. GARCIA: Yeah.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. Do we have any public comments?  THE SECRETARY: No.  MR. BEHAR: I'm going to close it to the
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	providing for text amendments to the City of Coral Gables Official Zoning Code, Article 3, "Uses", Section 3-317, "Permanently installed stand-by generators" removing the distance requirement of ten feet from any opening in a building or structure; requiring that the distance from any opening be determined by manufacturer's specification; providing for severability, repeater, codification, and for an effective date. Item E-4, public hearing.	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	opening, right?  MS. GARCIA: Right.  MR. BEHAR: And with the new generators MS. GARCIA: It's not necessary.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. Is that it?  MS. GARCIA: Yeah.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. Do we have any public comments?  THE SECRETARY: No.  MR. BEHAR: I'm going to close it to the public. Board discussion? Venny, do you want
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	providing for text amendments to the City of Coral Gables Official Zoning Code, Article 3, "Uses", Section 3-317, "Permanently installed stand-by generators" removing the distance requirement of ten feet from any opening in a building or structure; requiring that the distance from any opening be determined by manufacturer's specification; providing for severability, repeater, codification, and for an effective date. Item E-4, public hearing.  MS. GARCIA: So this is amending Article 3,	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	opening, right?  MS. GARCIA: Right.  MR. BEHAR: And with the new generators MS. GARCIA: It's not necessary.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. Is that it?  MS. GARCIA: Yeah.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. Do we have any public comments?  THE SECRETARY: No.  MR. BEHAR: I'm going to close it to the public. Board discussion? Venny, do you want to start?
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	providing for text amendments to the City of Coral Gables Official Zoning Code, Article 3, "Uses", Section 3-317, "Permanently installed stand-by generators" removing the distance requirement of ten feet from any opening in a building or structure; requiring that the distance from any opening be determined by manufacturer's specification; providing for severability, repeater, codification, and for an effective date. Item E-4, public hearing.  MS. GARCIA: So this is amending Article 3, Section 3-317, that basically striking	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	opening, right?  MS. GARCIA: Right.  MR. BEHAR: And with the new generators MS. GARCIA: It's not necessary.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. Is that it?  MS. GARCIA: Yeah.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. Do we have any public comments?  THE SECRETARY: No.  MR. BEHAR: I'm going to close it to the public. Board discussion? Venny, do you want to start?  MR. TORRE: No. I was just making sure, so
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	providing for text amendments to the City of Coral Gables Official Zoning Code, Article 3, "Uses", Section 3-317, "Permanently installed stand-by generators" removing the distance requirement of ten feet from any opening in a building or structure; requiring that the distance from any opening be determined by manufacturer's specification; providing for severability, repeater, codification, and for an effective date. Item E-4, public hearing.  MS. GARCIA: So this is amending Article 3, Section 3-317, that basically striking through the ten feet requirement. There have	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	opening, right?  MS. GARCIA: Right.  MR. BEHAR: And with the new generators MS. GARCIA: It's not necessary.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. Is that it?  MS. GARCIA: Yeah.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. Do we have any public comments?  THE SECRETARY: No.  MR. BEHAR: I'm going to close it to the public. Board discussion? Venny, do you want to start?  MR. TORRE: No. I was just making sure, so the ones that are going to say yea or nay will
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	providing for text amendments to the City of Coral Gables Official Zoning Code, Article 3, "Uses", Section 3-317, "Permanently installed stand-by generators" removing the distance requirement of ten feet from any opening in a building or structure; requiring that the distance from any opening be determined by manufacturer's specification; providing for severability, repeater, codification, and for an effective date. Item E-4, public hearing.  MS. GARCIA: So this is amending Article 3, Section 3-317, that basically striking through the ten feet requirement. There have been a lot of recent developments, as far as	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	opening, right?  MS. GARCIA: Right.  MR. BEHAR: And with the new generators MS. GARCIA: It's not necessary.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. Is that it?  MS. GARCIA: Yeah.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. Do we have any public comments?  THE SECRETARY: No.  MR. BEHAR: I'm going to close it to the public. Board discussion? Venny, do you want to start?  MR. TORRE: No. I was just making sure, so
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	providing for text amendments to the City of Coral Gables Official Zoning Code, Article 3, "Uses", Section 3-317, "Permanently installed stand-by generators" removing the distance requirement of ten feet from any opening in a building or structure; requiring that the distance from any opening be determined by manufacturer's specification; providing for severability, repeater, codification, and for an effective date. Item E-4, public hearing.  MS. GARCIA: So this is amending Article 3, Section 3-317, that basically striking through the ten feet requirement. There have	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	opening, right?  MS. GARCIA: Right.  MR. BEHAR: And with the new generators MS. GARCIA: It's not necessary.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. Is that it?  MS. GARCIA: Yeah.  MR. BEHAR: Okay. Do we have any public comments?  THE SECRETARY: No.  MR. BEHAR: I'm going to close it to the public. Board discussion? Venny, do you want to start?  MR. TORRE: No. I was just making sure, so the ones that are going to say yea or nay will be mechanical, electrical divisions, looking at

	Page 77		Page 78
1	MS. GARCIA: Yes.	1	five-foot setback for the generator, instead of
2	MR. TORRE: And you propose it. If it	2	the full ten feet.
3	meets it, they sign off on it.	3	MS. REDILA: Arceli Redila, again.
4	MR. BEHAR: My discussion that I want to	4	Actually, the interior side setback
5	bring up is that, there are cases, and I know	5	requirements for a generator is five feet
6	of houses, and I'm going to us mine, for	6	minimum from the side property line. So
7	example, that I renovated my house, so it was	7	generators are exempt from the twenty percent.
8	not like I built my house and I had the	8	MR. BEHAR: Thank you very much. I didn't
9	opportunity. I am ten feet away from I have	9	know that.
10	a 75-foot lot. So I'm ten feet away from one	10	MS. REDILA: It's an Ordinance, and it's in
11	side and five from the other. The twenty	11	Section 3
12		12	
	percent combined requirement of setback. I can	13	MR. BEHAR: No, I believe you. That's on the record.
13	never do a permanent, because the setback,	14	
14 15	you're not allowed to put a permanent generator in a setback, right?	15	Okay. Good. I like it. MR. WITHERS: Just now that Hurricane
16		16	season is almost over, you'll put it in, right?
	MS. GARCIA: Right.	17	MS. REDILA: Here it is.
17	MR. BEHAR: I mean, I think that something	18	
18	may need to be looked at, because, like me,	19	MR. BEHAR: Interior.
19	there's how many houses do we have in Coral	20	MR. REVUELTA: Is the regulation of putting
20	Gables, you know?	21	an emergency generator on a side street still in the Code?
21	MR. TORRE: You're saying, you want to		
22	maybe put it in the fifteen and maybe keep it	22	MS. GARCIA: Yeah, we're not touching that.
23	five feet or	23	MR. WITHERS: Okay. I'll move it.
24	MR. BEHAR: Well, no. I'm saying, in the	25	MR. BEHAR: So do we have a second?
25	ten feet that I have, maybe we maintain a	25	MR. TORRE: I will second it.
	Page 79		Page 80
1	MR. BEHAR: Call the roll, please.	1	CERTIFICATE
2	THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?	2	CERTIFICATE
3	MR. WITHERS: Yes.	3	STATE OF FLORIDA:
4	THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?	4	SS.
5	MR. TORRE: Yes.	5	COUNTY OF MIAMI-DADE:
6	THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?	6	
7	MR. REVUELTA: Yes.	7	
8	THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?	8	
9	MR. BEHAR: Yes.	9	I, NIEVES SANCHEZ, Court Reporter, and a Notary
10	Excellent. We don't have any discussion	10	Public for the State of Florida at Large, do hereby
11	•	11	certify that I was authorized to and did
12	item. Do we make a motion to adjourn?	12	stenographically report the foregoing proceedings and
13	MR. TORRE: I move. MR. REVUELTA: Second.	13	that the transcript is a true and complete record of my
14	MR. BEHAR: All in favor?	14	stenographic notes.
		15	
15 16	(All Board Members voted aye.)	16	DATED this 12th day of August, 2022.
16 17	MR. BEHAR: Thank you.	17	
18	(Thereupon, the meeting was concluded at	18	
	7:20 p.m.)	19	
19		20	
20			NIEVES SANCHEZ
21		21	
2.2		22	
22			
23		23	
23 24		24	
23			