

Page 9

1 THE SECRETARY: Frank Rodriguez?
 2 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.
 3 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?
 4 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.
 5 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell?
 6 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.
 7 THE SECRETARY: Marshall Bellin?
 8 MR. BELLIN: Yes.
 9 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So that's Items
 10 5, 6 and 7 in our Agenda for tonight.
 11 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Mr. Chairman --
 12 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes, sir.
 13 MR. RODRIGUEZ: -- before we move forward,
 14 just in an overabundance of caution, I'm not
 15 sure that this is required or not, because I
 16 was quickly reading what you were articulating
 17 regarding ex parte communications, but I had a
 18 meeting with Mr. Serra concerning the Sevilla
 19 -- is that what it is? The matter -- the
 20 Valencia Avenue property. And in an
 21 overabundance of caution, I wanted to disclose
 22 it.
 23 Mr. Serra offered. I had some questions.
 24 I thought that I might miss the meeting. So I
 25 was particularly interested in having certain

Page 10

1 questions answered, and he was kind enough to
 2 come over and answer the question, but I just
 3 thought I'd disclose it.
 4 MR. GARCIA SERRA: Important to note, also,
 5 that there are legislative items involved with
 6 this application, and those aren't subject to
 7 the Jennings prohibition and ex parte
 8 communications.
 9 MS. MENENDEZ: That's correct.
 10 MR. LIEN: And did you just discuss the
 11 legislative items or did you discuss the
 12 quasi-judicial?
 13 MR. GARCIA SERRA: Correct. Correct. We
 14 discussed the proposed Code Amendments and the
 15 Comprehensive Plan Amendment.
 16 MR. LIEN: Yes, you're allowed to discuss
 17 the legislative items with him, and that's not
 18 an ex parte communication.
 19 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Thank you.
 20 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Thank you.
 21 Item 8 on the Agenda, I'll read it in.
 22 It's an Ordinance of the City Commission of
 23 Coral Gables, Florida providing for text
 24 amendments to City of Coral Gables Official
 25 Zoning Code, Article 5, called Development

Page 11

1 Standards, Division 14, "Parking, Loading, and
 2 Driveway Requirements," Section 5-1410, "Shared
 3 Parking reduction standards" creating
 4 provisions for shared parking reductions as a
 5 part of a mixed use site plan or planned area
 6 development; providing for a repealer
 7 provision, severability clause, codification
 8 and providing for an effective date. This item
 9 was continued from the October 14, 2015
 10 Planning and Zoning Board meeting.
 11 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, during the
 12 discussion last time, you requested some
 13 changes, which related basically to the table,
 14 the second item that we have in the ordinance,
 15 in terms of the options that a developer amy
 16 have.
 17 So we have a brand new table. That table
 18 is based --
 19 MS. MENENDEZ: I don't think we talked
 20 about this item at the last meeting, did we?
 21 MR. TRIAS: It was some meetings ago. It
 22 was --
 23 MR. RODRIGUEZ: October.
 24 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.
 25 MS. MENENDEZ: Oh, October?

Page 12

1 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. Maybe I misspoke. The
 2 last time --
 3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's like a lifetime
 4 ago.
 5 MR. TRIAS: The last time we had a chance
 6 to chat about this item, which was in
 7 October --
 8 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. Sorry.
 9 MR. TRIAS: I apologize for not being
 10 clear.
 11 MS. MENENDEZ: No. No. No problem.
 12 MR. TRIAS: Just to summarize briefly, I
 13 don't want to make a long presentation, because
 14 I think it is fairly straight-forward, this is
 15 an idea that is based on the concept that when
 16 you have a Mixed-Use project or a PAD, a
 17 Planned Area Development, a special project
 18 that has some unique characteristics, parking
 19 could be used by multiple users at different
 20 times. That's a very well understood idea in
 21 planning.
 22 So we believe that it would be very
 23 beneficial to development to have that option
 24 in the Zoning Code, the option of using the
 25 shared parking for those types of projects,

1 with the additional condition that they're LEED
2 certified, or at least that they meet the
3 standards of LEED.

4 And the idea is that the shared parking
5 methodology will have three options. Three
6 Options. One would be to follow the ULI
7 standard methodology.

8 The second option would be to follow the
9 parking matrix that is attached here in the
10 ordinance.

11 And then the third option is to provide a
12 customized study that relates to additional
13 issues that may be related to parking and the
14 project development.

15 So Staff is here to answer questions. We
16 have Kevin Kinney, our Director of Parking, and
17 also we have Scot Bolyard, our Principal
18 Planner, who prepared the table for you, and
19 Staff recommends approval.

20 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Let me ask, is what's
21 proposed the table on Page 2?

22 MR. TRIAS: Yes. That is one of the items.
23 What's proposed is everything that is
24 underlined, and that includes the table.

25 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I understand.

1 extensive review process that we have. We have
2 the Board of Architects. We have, obviously,
3 your process, and so on.

4 The design of the project is not something
5 that happens only at the end of the discussion.
6 It's an ongoing process.

7 So what happens is that with less parking,
8 there are more options that deal with the
9 aesthetics, with being compatible with the
10 neighborhood, with enhancing the overall design
11 of a District.

12 MS. MENENDEZ: What do you do when a
13 developer comes in and wants a change in the
14 FAR, plus they want to take advantage of the
15 shared use parking?

16 MR. TRIAS: Well, it would have to be
17 reviewed very carefully, and it comes to you
18 for advice to the Commission, and eventually
19 the Commission would review it. So it's likely
20 that you could have that scenario, yes.

21 MS. MENENDEZ: Would you want to consider
22 something like that or would you want to
23 discourage it, if you're, in fact, trying to
24 get shared use parking credits?

25 MR. TRIAS: Well, in my view, anybody --

1 MR. BELLIN: Ramon, I have a question.
2 This reduction in parking is only available to
3 buildings that are certified LEED?

4 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

5 MR. BELLIN: Okay.

6 MR. TRIAS: The actual language is, that
7 meets the standards of LEED.

8 MS. MENENDEZ: What are you trying to
9 achieve by this shared use concept being
10 incorporated into our Zoning Code?

11 MR. TRIAS: Well, we have observed that
12 parking needs to be at the optimum size. If
13 you have more parking than a project will need,
14 that has a negative effect on the aesthetics of
15 a project or even in the traffic that takes
16 place around the project.

17 So we believe that what this does is, it
18 allows to optimize the number of parking
19 spaces, and that makes the building look
20 better, because there's less of a bulk, in
21 terms of the parking.

22 MS. MENENDEZ: And how do you make sure
23 that the massing gets reduced as a result of
24 reducing the parking?

25 MR. TRIAS: Well, through the very

1 any applicant can request many things. In
2 general, I think that the idea is to keep FAR
3 to what it is and simply allow less parking.

4 Now, keep in mind that parking is not
5 counted in our City's FAR calculations. So
6 when you say a building should have an FAR of
7 three, that's basically the net building. The
8 additional parking design or area is not
9 counted.

10 So what happens is that all of those issues
11 are certainly discussed, reviewed by Staff, by
12 Boards, by the Planning and Zoning Board, and
13 by the Commission, and if it is in the interest
14 of the City -- and, obviously, with public
15 input, through the public input process, and if
16 it is in the interest of the City, then the
17 Commission may decide to approve it, and if
18 it's not, they would certainly deny it.

19 MS. MENENDEZ: I'm just trying to figure
20 out what benefit the City gets from the shared
21 use parking concept.

22 MR. TRIAS: The benefit is aesthetics, on
23 the one hand, and most likely also a better fit
24 within the District. What has happened is that
25 some of the projects, for example, along the

1 Ponce corridor, appear to be out of scale.
 2 And part of the reason is the way the
 3 parking is designed, and that has to do with
 4 some design choices that are made, but it also
 5 has to do with the number of parking spaces
 6 that are available in the project.
 7 MR. LEEN: Can I add something? I
 8 obviously have no position on the merits of
 9 this, but I do remember in the Commission
 10 hearings on Paseo, one issue that came up, that
 11 was interesting to the Commission about shared
 12 parking, was its ability to --
 13 MS. MENENDEZ: Reduce the mass?
 14 MR. LEEN: -- decrease the overall bulk of
 15 the building.
 16 MS. MENENDEZ: Right. That's where I'm
 17 getting at, but when you read this, it really
 18 doesn't state that. You know, it just provides
 19 for the shared use parking concept, and, you
 20 know, providing methodology in order to do
 21 that, but it really does not provide what the
 22 overall possible advantages it is to the
 23 development itself.
 24 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I think the concern, if I
 25 can just interrupt a second, that Maria might

1 be expressing is that instead of the City
 2 getting the benefit of, you know, the
 3 aesthetics and a smaller, let's say, you know,
 4 less bulky building, that it will be, you know,
 5 less parking, and then they'll cram in more
 6 space, either office space or residential space
 7 or something else, and there really is no net
 8 benefit to anybody, other than, you know, a
 9 developer or somebody like that.
 10 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, and what I was trying to
 11 explain is that the development --
 12 MS. MENENDEZ: Thank you.
 13 MR. TRIAS: -- that is available doesn't
 14 change, because that's what the FAR allows. So
 15 the 3.0 FAR, or 3.5 with Med Bonus, that's net
 16 development. That doesn't including parking.
 17 So whatever you do with parking doesn't really
 18 affect the amount of office or retail or
 19 apartments that you could do.
 20 MR. GRABIEL: What you're doing is reducing
 21 the bulk created by the number of cars required
 22 with our existing Code.
 23 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. And that's one of the
 24 benefits.
 25 And, Ms. Menendez, I think that's a very

1 good point. We don't have a good description
 2 of the intent and maybe that would be a good
 3 thing to do. I think that's a great idea.
 4 MS. MENENDEZ: Correct. I think that helps
 5 describe why you would even consider it,
 6 because, in reality, the way it's written, it
 7 only benefits the developer.
 8 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 9 MS. MENENDEZ: I had a few questions, if I
 10 may, Mr. Chair.
 11 MR. LEEN: Can I add something?
 12 MR. TRIAS: If you -- yeah, go ahead.
 13 MR. LEEN: What we'll do is, we can work
 14 with you. We can put a purpose section. That
 15 could be one of the principal purposes.
 16 MS. MENENDEZ: That would be great.
 17 MR. TRIAS: And the public benefit, a
 18 description of the public benefit.
 19 MS. MENENDEZ: Right. That would be great.
 20 MR. TRIAS: Okay.
 21 MS. MENENDEZ: When do you decide which
 22 methodology you use?
 23 MR. TRIAS: The applicant has that choice.
 24 So the applicant will propose the methodology
 25 and then it will be reviewed by Staff. And if

1 it's acceptable, then it would continue through
 2 the process.
 3 MS. MENENDEZ: Have you tested these
 4 methodologies on, let's say, an existing
 5 project, to determine what each methodology
 6 result is?
 7 MR. TRIAS: Yes. Actually, Scot did some
 8 of that work and maybe he can explain it.
 9 MS. MENENDEZ: Does it have the same net
 10 effect or is one better than the other, for the
 11 developer?
 12 MR. TRIAS: In general, I would say that
 13 the table is better for the small projects.
 14 The study, Number 3, is better for the larger
 15 projects. And the Urban Land Institute is
 16 better for projects that have night uses and
 17 day uses in the same building. So it depends
 18 on the project.
 19 MS. MENENDEZ: Are these methodologies -- I
 20 think you had mentioned it maybe here. How did
 21 you come up with these? Are these standard use
 22 methodologies from other references?
 23 MR. TRIAS: ULI is standard. ULI is
 24 standard.
 25 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.

1 MR. TRIAS: Now, the shared parking matrix,
 2 Scot will explain how he developed it.
 3 MR. BOLYARD: We took a look at the City of
 4 Miami Beach and the City of North Miami shared
 5 parking provisions. We took their tables. I
 6 put them all side by side. And basically I
 7 took the most conservative number of all of
 8 them and applied them to our table. So we
 9 have, basically, a conservative table here.
 10 You know, we're not trying to reduce by too
 11 much.
 12 MS. MENENDEZ: Conservative table based on
 13 those two cities?
 14 MR. BOLYARD: Correct.
 15 MR. GRABIEL: And the reason you selected
 16 those two cities?
 17 MR. BOLYARD: They're the only cities in
 18 the area that have this type of shared parking.
 19 MR. GRABIEL: Okay.
 20 MR. TRIAS: And Miami had the other matrix,
 21 that was something that you liked, and,
 22 frankly, it wasn't as sophisticated as the ones
 23 that we have proposed.
 24 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I just want to make a
 25 comment on the table on Page 2, regarding, for

1 example, weekday evening, 5:00 p.m. to 12:00
 2 a.m., office, 10 percent -- you know -- I mean,
 3 I can only go by the buildings -- and I've
 4 never been in a mixed-use building, quite
 5 frankly. I mean, I've been always in an office
 6 building. But the office buildings that I'm
 7 in, the 10 percent -- if there was only 10
 8 percent of the available parking available
 9 after 5:00, that wouldn't be adequate.
 10 I mean, maybe after 7:00 or 8:00 or
 11 something, but not -- I'm just pointing that
 12 out.
 13 MR. BOLYARD: Yes. Like, for instance,
 14 when we looked at the City of Miami Beach,
 15 their chart goes from 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.,
 16 and then North Miami, theirs goes from 9:00
 17 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. So we were trying to balance
 18 those hours. Really, it's more just kind of
 19 for reference purposes, the hours, so we can
 20 kind of get an idea of the different parking
 21 during the different times of the day.
 22 So, really, you know, from 5:00 to 6:00
 23 p.m., you may have more than 10 percent, but
 24 from 6:00 p.m. to midnight, you're not going to
 25 have 10 percent of the parking there for an

1 office use. So that's kind of what we were
 2 trying to capture.
 3 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay.
 4 MR. BELLIN: Ramon, I have a general
 5 question.
 6 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 7 MR. BELLIN: I guess we can all agree that
 8 if we can bring the massing of the building
 9 down, especially at the parking level, where
 10 it's really needed -- usually the towers go up,
 11 and they have big step backs -- why restrict it
 12 only to LEED buildings? I mean, if it's a good
 13 thing, it should be a good thing for every
 14 building.
 15 MR. TRIAS: And that's a very valid point.
 16 I mean, that's a policy choice that could be
 17 one way or the other. And the Commission has
 18 expressed an interest on LEED buildings, and we
 19 believe that that was a good approach in this
 20 case.
 21 The real restriction is on mixed-use and
 22 Planned Area Development projects. That's the
 23 key information. The LEED is an additional
 24 qualification.
 25 MR. BELLIN: I thought we were going to

1 have a requirement that buildings over certain
 2 square footage required to be LEED. To me, it
 3 seems like if it's a good thing, we ought to
 4 apply it to every building, as opposed to just
 5 LEED buildings.
 6 MR. TRIAS: There is a LEED or Green
 7 Building Ordinance later on in the Agenda, that
 8 if passed, would have the effect that you're
 9 saying. So if all of those things were to
 10 pass, certainly this will be redundant, and it
 11 may not be needed.
 12 But what I'm saying is that it depends
 13 whether or not it's accepted and passed. So
 14 those are some of the issues that I think are
 15 moving.
 16 MR. BELLIN: When we get to that, if we
 17 pass it, then can we go back and revise this?
 18 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. Keep in mind, you're
 19 making a recommendation to the Commission. Your
 20 recommendation could be perfectly fine, and
 21 simply say that we believe that the Green
 22 Building, as passed, applies to all of these
 23 projects. So we could revise the ordinance
 24 accordingly.
 25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Let me follow-up on the

1 LEED issue, though, because one of my comments
2 was, while you can design for some sort of LEED
3 or similar rating, you don't end up getting it
4 until after the project is completed, correct?

5 MR. WU: Correct.

6 MR. BELLIN: But there are certain things
7 that go into getting a LEED certification, and
8 those things have to be spelled out before you
9 ever get a building permit. It's got to be
10 part of the package.

11 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: My thought was, it's
12 probably unlikely, but if you go with a -- if
13 this says it needs to be LEED or similar
14 certification, and you build towards that, with
15 reduced parking, and then you fail to ever get
16 your certification, what happens?

17 MR. BELLIN: Then you have a problem with
18 your CO.

19 MR. TRIAS: What I would recommend is,
20 let's read what it says, because what it says
21 is that -- a project that meets the standard of
22 Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design,
23 LEED criteria. Okay, that meets the standards.
24 It doesn't say, "Certified." And it is because
25 that same issue that you're describing.

1 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. All right.

2 MR. TRIAS: Certification comes afterwards.

3 MR. RODRIGUEZ: If they're making this sort
4 of an incentive -- am I understanding that
5 correctly, it's an incentive for developers to
6 go with a LEED building? And if they do, they
7 have this added benefit?

8 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

9 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay. So that goes back to
10 the point that Maria was making before, and I
11 interjected on. There is a benefit to the
12 developer then?

13 MR. TRIAS: There are multiple benefits to
14 the developer, and there are multiple public
15 benefits, and we have not explained that
16 clearly, and I think that's a very good point.
17 We should explain it better.

18 But, I mean, certainly the developer
19 benefits.

20 MS. MENENDEZ: I'm sorry, I know that I had
21 asked a question related to, if you all had
22 done a sample of these, and what were the
23 results of it.

24 MR. BOLYARD: We studied four projects that
25 have been previously approved, and the

1 reduction ranged from about six percent to
2 eleven percent, the prior parking reductions.

3 MS. MENENDEZ: Tell me in numbers.

4 MR. BOLYARD: Let me go through the
5 different projects we did.

6 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.

7 MR. BOLYARD: We did Gables Gateway, the
8 original Gables Gateway, down on the South
9 Industrial Mixed-Use area.

10 MS. MENENDEZ: It's there?

11 MR. BOLYARD: Yes, it's attachment C.

12 MS. MENENDEZ: Forgive me. You're ahead of
13 the game.

14 MR. BOLYARD: Our study resulted in a
15 reduction of -- 8.3 percent reduction in
16 required parking, which was 54 spaces.

17 For Gables Ponce II, the reduction was 11.1
18 percent, and it was 67 spaces.

19 Gables Ponce III would have received a 5.8
20 percent reduction in required parking or 24
21 spaces.

22 And Paseo de la Riviera would have received
23 a 5.8 percent reduction in required parking or
24 48 spaces.

25 MS. MENENDEZ: Nice job.

1 MR. BOLYARD: Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is there any concern
3 about the dedicated valet parking spaces being
4 part of the shared parking reduction? And I
5 question that, because even when valet is not
6 in operation, from any garage that I see, it's
7 valet only, valet only, it's blocked off, you
8 can't use it.

9 So I think that becomes a farce, that at
10 some point others would be able to use it. I
11 think we're relying too much on valet, but
12 that's a different story, for a different day,
13 and the valet guys continue to abuse it. They
14 park in the parking spaces they're not supposed
15 to be parking at.

16 I watch it happen several times a week, for
17 whatever that comment might be worth. Maybe we
18 can start to take a look at that a little
19 harder. But I'm not so sure that the dedicated
20 spaces should either be included or that they
21 can't be dedicated valet. But I'm not sure how
22 to kind of answer my own question.

23 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, I think what happens is
24 that that will be an issue if the developer
25 chooses Number 3, which allows you to make an

1 argument and include the Valet Plan in that
2 argument. Now, that's only one of the aspects
3 of the argument that is made.

4 And I have to say, we have the best Parking
5 Director I've ever had the opportunity to work
6 with, and he's sitting right here, and I mean
7 that very sincerely. He's actually the best
8 I've ever worked with, and I know that he
9 reviews the projects in great detail, and
10 certainly can answer more specific questions.

11 MR. KINNEY: I, actually, just want to
12 follow-up on what you mentioned about valet.
13 Under the ULI, dedicated spaces are not counted
14 in shared parking calculations. The only way
15 it would come into play is if they choose to do
16 a study and try and convince us that there were
17 a reason to count the dedicated spaces.

18 The recent big projects that we've
19 reviewed, if a space is dedicated, it can't be
20 in the calculation.

21 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.

22 MR. KINNEY: And just related to valet,
23 I'll just say, I actually have people on staff,
24 in the City, who will go to lunch, and if they
25 see the valet do that, they'll give me a call,

1 and the officer will be there within five
2 minutes writing a ticket.

3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'll keep that in mind.

4 MR. KINNEY: Yes, the abuse is known, but
5 centralized valet is a key part of trying to
6 make our system work well. We just need to get
7 the people, who provide the centralized valet,
8 to follow the rules.

9 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Sure. Thank you.

10 MR. BELLIN: Ramon, a question about the
11 developer doing their own study or having
12 somebody do a study for them. Who is really
13 looking out for what goes on with these
14 studies?

15 MR. TRIAS: Well, as you can see, we have a
16 very good Parking Director, who looks at the
17 parking. Public Works looks at many issues
18 related to traffic and circulation. They also
19 have consultants, that are experts on traffic
20 and parking, that will review it. The Planning
21 Staff will also review it. So there are some
22 multiple layers of Staff.

23 In addition, it goes to different Boards
24 and you get a chance to review it yourselves at
25 some point.

1 MR. BELLIN: Okay. The study that's done
2 by the developer is reviewed by a number of
3 people? It's not just said, "Fine, thank you,"
4 and --

5 MR. TRIAS: Every project is reviewed by
6 many people, and projects that are complex,
7 like Mixed-Use projects, are reviewed for
8 months by many Staff people and by many
9 volunteer Boards, who are professionals, who
10 provide outstanding advice.

11 So I want to make that clear, because
12 sometimes I don't explain it, because, for me,
13 it's like second nature, it's happens, but it's
14 absolutely true. We have multiple layers of
15 review, many steps, before it gets to any of
16 the Boards.

17 And, then, through the Boards, as you know,
18 sometimes you postpone, sometimes you continue,
19 because you want more information, like in this
20 case, and then we provide more information. So
21 that's what I anticipate.

22 MR. BELLIN: But the reason it would go to
23 the various Boards is, what? I mean, I don't
24 think any of -- I certainly don't have enough
25 knowledge to be able to say whether it's a

1 valid report or not.

2 MR. TRIAS: Well, but that's why you have a
3 Staff recommendation, you have a consultant
4 that is working for Staff, you have the
5 applicant's professionals, and it comes to you
6 as part of a Mixed-Use project. It's just one
7 of the aspects of the project.

8 Or a PAD, a Planned Area Development, which
9 you would have to review, and make a
10 recommendation to the Commission, and then
11 there are two hearings, in some cases, and so
12 on. So there's multiple opportunities for
13 review and input, and the kind of Staff that we
14 have is able to advice you, and certainly
15 sometimes a developer proposes things that
16 don't make any sense, and we tell them. And,
17 then, hopefully, they change, and the project
18 gets better.

19 MR. BELLIN: Okay.

20 MS. MENENDEZ: You know, something just
21 occurred to me. Have we ever gone out and
22 tested the properties that you -- kind of like
23 -- you know, in other words, go into the
24 garages and see if, in fact, given the uses
25 that they have, whether there is vacant spaces

1 there, that, you know, kind of like justifies
2 this consideration of this method or this whole
3 shared use parking?

4 MR. TRIAS: We have, but Kevin has more
5 time, so please.

6 MR. KINNEY: I have. I walk through
7 everybody's garage. I pretend like I should
8 belong there, and they just let me walk through
9 it.

10 I will tell you that one of the specific
11 projects they mentioned, the Gables Ponce
12 Residences, it's very similar to the big
13 garages along Alhambra. Even at the peak of
14 the day, if you go into the garage, and you go
15 up to the top floors, there are no cars.

16 MS. MENENDEZ: Really?

17 MR. KINNEY: Of course, my concern in this
18 whole process is, I don't want it to have too
19 big an impact on the public parking system, and
20 so I do think we're being fairly conservative
21 and careful to not get into a situation where
22 we are providing parking for a private
23 enterprise.

24 MS. MENENDEZ: Have you reviewed this?

25 MR. KINNEY: This document, yes. Of

1 course, my favorite methodology is the ULI,
2 because it's the most I'm more familiar with
3 and I've seen used for the longest period of
4 time, and I think it has proven to be very
5 reliable over the last 20 years.

6 But I'm also aware of the other
7 possibilities, and I'm also aware that a lot of
8 us review -- if it's a Parking and
9 Transportation Plan that the developer
10 presents, that's not an easy sell.

11 MS. MENENDEZ: And why are we presenting
12 more than one method?

13 MR. TRIAS: Like I said, for the very small
14 projects, the ULI methodology may not be the
15 best. The table may work. And I'm talking
16 about a one or two spaces difference. And
17 sometimes that matters in the various small
18 infill projects.

19 The very large projects, the ULI
20 methodology may not take into account the fact
21 that, for example, the project may be right
22 next to Metrorail or that the project may have
23 certain unique characteristics of the site. So
24 we wanted to have that opportunity, also.

25 But, at the end of the day, if Staff

1 believes that the methodology is wrong, we
2 simply won't accept it.

3 MS. MENENDEZ: So you leave the choice up
4 to them, the developer?

5 MR. TRIAS: They propose. We review. And
6 if we believe it's incorrect or unacceptable,
7 we simply reject it. I mean, in some cases, it
8 may not be appropriate to do a study, for
9 example.

10 MS. MENENDEZ: Why don't we tell them
11 before they engage in the study? I think that
12 would be a little bit friendlier.

13 MR. TRIAS: We do. We do.

14 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.

15 MR. TRIAS: This is a friendly discussion.
16 I don't mean it to sound like it's not. And
17 it's actually a very collaborative discussion,
18 99 percent of the time.

19 MS. MENENDEZ: Mr. Kinney, do you approve
20 this? I mean, have you recommended approval?
21 When we see that Staff has approved it, is that
22 also your blessing?

23 MR. KINNEY: Yes.

24 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.

25 MR. KINNEY: I mean, with the caveats that

1 I expect Parking will get to review a study, if
2 somebody proposes a study, because I am
3 concerned that we don't want to get into a
4 situation where we're taxing our public
5 parking.

6 MR. GRABIEL: Can you, either one or both
7 of you, give us an idea of how our Coral Gables
8 parking requirements compare to other cities of
9 this size and character? Are we very
10 conservative, to the point of almost
11 exaggeration, or are we in the middle?

12 Because I was expecting to see a higher
13 percentage of reduction than 11 percent. I
14 mean, this is not a big deal. One's 11, one's
15 five and the other one is, I think -- yeah.

16 MR. TRIAS: But that's the table. That's
17 the table. And the other methodologies may
18 give you better results.

19 MR. GRABIEL: A higher percentage.

20 MR. TRIAS: Maybe. So that is why we have
21 several options.

22 MR. GRABIEL: Well, that's why I'm asking a
23 question. If it's 10 percent, 15 percent,
24 where our requirements are so strict that it's
25 not going to cause an impact on the public

1 using the parking, I have no problem whatsoever
2 with it.

3 MR. KINNEY: I'm trying to think of the
4 best way to phrase it. Our parking
5 requirements are very conservative. We want
6 developers to service their demand. So I would
7 say, if we're on a scale, we're on the higher
8 end of parking requirements.

9 MR. GRABIEL: Okay.

10 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Ramon, can you articulate
11 with, you know, a little bit more detail, as to
12 how the City benefits from this? I think, you
13 know, we've talked about the fact that, you
14 know, developers may benefit, which is fine,
15 and I think we can all envision that from time
16 to time the public may be inconvenienced,
17 possibly. What is the corresponding benefit to
18 the City? I'm not a hundred percent clear on
19 that.

20 MR. TRIAS: I've explained the aesthetic
21 benefit, which I think is clear, it has to do
22 with the bulk and so on.

23 MR. RODRIGUEZ: But, again, I don't mean to
24 be difficult. See, if that argument -- I think
25 that we've already -- or at least, in my mind,

1 there's nothing that stops the developer from
2 adding more square footage, is there? If they
3 get the benefit of having to put less
4 parking --

5 MR. TRIAS: No, that stays the same. The
6 square footage is the same. It's just that
7 they get less parking. The development -- the
8 size of the development --

9 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I understand. Okay. I
10 understand.

11 MR. TRIAS: Now, the other benefit -- I'll
12 give a theoretical argument on the additional
13 benefit, which is that many people believe that
14 buildings generate traffic, and, you know, it's
15 a good intuitive conclusion, but the reality is
16 that what generates automobile traffic is the
17 parking that is attached to those buildings.

18 If you have a building with no parking, not
19 too many people are going to be driving there.

20 So what happens is that if you optimize
21 that relationship, meaning not too much
22 parking, but just the right amount, then you
23 have less traffic, which creates less impact on
24 neighborhoods and surrounding communities.
25 That's the traffic explanation of why some of

1 these issues are important.

2 And what has happened in the past is that
3 we've had very conservative numbers, which
4 means very high numbers of parking spaces,
5 which encourages additional automobile traffic.

6 Today, what we're trying to do is focus on
7 mobility, not necessarily automobile traffic
8 only, but mobility, in general, and that is why
9 we believe that these tools, particularly when
10 we link transportation and land use -- and by
11 that I mean, the mixed-use is linked to the
12 number of parking and traffic -- then that's an
13 additional benefit to the City.

14 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Any other questions?

15 MR. GRABIEL: No.

16 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Anybody want to make a
17 motion?

18 MR. WU: Mr. Chair, did you open the public
19 hearing?

20 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's a good point.

21 MS. MENENDEZ: He's out of practice.

22 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. You miss a
23 month, you're out of practice.

24 This is a public hearing. Anybody in the
25 audience wish to provide any comments?

1 Seeing none.

2 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. I move for
3 approval, as presented.

4 MR. BELLIN: I'll second it, with the --
5 I'd like to reserve the right to be able to
6 come back to this issue, if we go ahead and
7 pass the other requirements with respect to
8 LEED certification, because I really think they
9 should not be tied to LEED certification.

10 MS. MENENDEZ: But wait a minute. Are you
11 approving -- the way it's written now is with
12 the LEED certification.

13 MR. BELLIN: I am, but if we approve the
14 LEED -- what comes, I don't know, it's three or
15 four from now, which puts certain requirements
16 on buildings over 20,000 square feet, I'd like
17 to come back and say then, we don't need to be
18 tied to LEED certification, because if it
19 benefits the City to make the parking garages
20 smaller, it benefits them in every building,
21 not just ones that are LEED certified.

22 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So why don't I suggest
23 this? Rather than going through the whole
24 re-consideration process after this gets
25 passed, if we put this -- if we defer this to

1 the end of the Agenda? Can we do that?
 2 MR. LEEN: Just one thought. You know,
 3 it's possible the Commission may take different
 4 actions, though, on these. So I would
 5 recommend that you view each of them
 6 separately. And we'll reconcile them when they
 7 come before the Commission. You could note
 8 your concern, and that will be in the minutes.
 9 MR. BELLIN: Okay.
 10 MR. LEEN: And I've heard your concern, and
 11 I know Craig's heard your concern.
 12 MR. BELLIN: Okay.
 13 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: You're good with that,
 14 then, Marshall?
 15 MR. BELLIN: Yes. So I've stated my
 16 concern --
 17 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman --
 18 MS. MENENDEZ: So you second it still? You
 19 second it?
 20 MR. BELLIN: Yes, I second it.
 21 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, if you don't
 22 mind --
 23 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes, sir.
 24 MR. TRIAS: We could also add language on
 25 the intent and the public benefit, if that's

1 okay.
 2 MR. GRABIEL: Oh, yes.
 3 MS. MENENDEZ: No, and a lot more. I think
 4 Craig is going to work on that.
 5 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: On a purpose statement.
 6 MS. MENENDEZ: On a purpose statement.
 7 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, and let's make it part of
 8 the motion also.
 9 MR. GRABIEL: Adding the purpose and intent
 10 to the ordinance.
 11 MS. MENENDEZ: Thank you, sir.
 12 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Marshall, you're
 13 good with that, adding the purpose and the
 14 intent, as was discussed?
 15 MR. BELLIN: Yes.
 16 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. A motion
 17 and a second. Could we call the roll, please?
 18 THE SECRETARY: Marshall Bellin?
 19 MR. BELLIN: Yes.
 20 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell?
 21 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.
 22 THE SECRETARY: Frank Rodriguez?
 23 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.
 24 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?
 25 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.

1 THE SECRETARY: And Jeffrey Flanagan?
 2 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes.
 3 All right. Next item on the Agenda is
 4 Number 9. Reading it in, it's an Ordinance of
 5 the City Commission of Coral Gables, Florida
 6 providing for text amendments to the City of
 7 Coral Gables Official Zoning Code, by amending
 8 Article 4, "Zoning Districts," adding Section
 9 4-206, called Giralda Restaurant Row Overlay,
 10 to allow for modified requirements with
 11 development standards that modify and
 12 supplement the existing Commercial District
 13 standards and criteria for the 100 block of
 14 Giralda Avenue, legally described as Lots
 15 21-37, Block 29, and Lots 3-24, Block 33,
 16 Section L, to allow appropriate infill and
 17 redevelopment that enhances the character of
 18 Restaurant Row; providing for a repealer
 19 provision, providing for a severability clause,
 20 providing for codification, and providing for
 21 an effective date.
 22 MR. WU: Mr. Chair, to clarify -- Craig,
 23 can you clarify, this is a quasi-judicial item?
 24 I believe Craig Leen made an interpretation
 25 that this case is quasi-judicial.

1 MR. COLLER: Yes. This is for a specific
 2 parcel of property. This relates to a specific
 3 parcel of property, so that it would be a
 4 quasi-judicial hearing.
 5 Let me explain, this is the --
 6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It relates to an entire
 7 block in the City.
 8 MR. COLLER: This is with a specific block
 9 of -- well, maybe you disagree. This is a
 10 specific block of Giralda, where they're
 11 changing the Zoning requirements.
 12 MR. LEEN: This is for the overlay?
 13 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 14 MR. LEEN: This is for the overlay?
 15 MR. WU: Yes.
 16 MR. LEEN: Well, can I ask, is anyone here
 17 to comment on this?
 18 We do have one person?
 19 You know, we'll talk about -- this is
 20 actually an interesting issue, and we've
 21 discussed it before. Coral Gables has a lot of
 22 Site Specifics, and we do have these Overlays.
 23 We've treated them as legislative in the past.
 24 I've been discussing with Craig, you know,
 25 based on some case law, you know, maybe the