

## 07.13.16 Excerpts of PZB Meeting Minutes

Page 129	Page 131
<p>1 Any further discussion?</p> <p>2 Seeing none, Jill, call the roll, please.</p> <p>3 THE SECRETARY: Frank Rodriguez?</p> <p>4 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.</p> <p>5 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?</p> <p>6 MR. BEHAR: Yes.</p> <p>7 THE SECRETARY: Marshall Bellin?</p> <p>8 MR. BELLIN: Yes.</p> <p>9 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell?</p> <p>10 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.</p> <p>11 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?</p> <p>12 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.</p> <p>13 THE SECRETARY: Alberto Perez?</p> <p>14 MR. PEREZ: Yes.</p> <p>15 THE SECRETARY: Jeff Flanagan?</p> <p>16 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes.</p> <p>17 All right. Item Number 11.</p> <p>18 MR. BELLIN: Jeff, I've got to recuse</p> <p>19 myself for 11 -- for both of those projects,</p> <p>20 so --</p> <p>21 MS. MENENDEZ: See you.</p> <p>22 MR. BELLIN: -- I'm out of here.</p> <p>23 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you, Marshall.</p> <p>24 MR. BELLIN: Have a good night.</p> <p>25 MR. BEHAR: Can we take, before we start --</p>	<p>1 Lot 6 and Lot 7 less east 15 feet, Block 25,</p> <p>2 Coral Gables Section "B" (734 Navarre Avenue);</p> <p>3 including required conditions; providing for a</p> <p>4 repealer provision, providing for a</p> <p>5 severability clause, and providing for an</p> <p>6 effective date.</p> <p>7 MR. TRIAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.</p> <p>8 Can I have the PowerPoint, please?</p> <p>9 We have a lot split here that is within a</p> <p>10 single-family neighborhood. You can see the</p> <p>11 aerial photograph. It's fully developed and</p> <p>12 the scale is very typical of the City of Coral</p> <p>13 Gables.</p> <p>14 The request is a little bit complicated,</p> <p>15 only because it has a 15-foot extra area there,</p> <p>16 but if you look at it in terms of the graphics,</p> <p>17 the yellow and the blue are the two proposed</p> <p>18 new lots, and the green is the additional</p> <p>19 fifteen feet that is going to the neighbor.</p> <p>20 If you look at the aerial, as you can see,</p> <p>21 it fits within the scale, the general scale of</p> <p>22 the immediate vicinity.</p> <p>23 The neighborhood is a Single-Family</p> <p>24 neighborhood, with one and two-story houses.</p> <p>25 It is zoned Residential. The Future Land Use</p>
Page 130	Page 132
<p>1 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: You want to take a</p> <p>2 five-minute --</p> <p>3 MS. MENENDEZ: Like a five-minute.</p> <p>4 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes. We'll recess for</p> <p>5 five minutes.</p> <p>6 (Short recess taken.)</p> <p>7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Ladies and gentlemen,</p> <p>8 we're going to re-convene please.</p> <p>9 Item Number 11 is an Ordinance of the City</p> <p>10 Commission of Coral Gables, Florida requesting</p> <p>11 Conditional Use Review for a Building Site</p> <p>12 Determination pursuant to Zoning Code Article</p> <p>13 3, "Development Review", Section 3-206,</p> <p>14 "Building Site Determination" to separate into</p> <p>15 two single-family building sites the property</p> <p>16 zoned Single-Family Residential District and</p> <p>17 legally described as Lots 8-10 and the east 15</p> <p>18 Feet of Lot 7, Block 25, Coral Gables Section</p> <p>19 B, known as (728 Navarre Avenue), Coral Gables,</p> <p>20 Florida, one building site consisting of Lot 8</p> <p>21 and the west half of Lot 9 and one building</p> <p>22 site consisting of Lot 10 and the east half of</p> <p>23 Lot 9 with the remaining east 15 feet of Lot 7</p> <p>24 to be included as a part of the property to the</p> <p>25 west legally described as the east 25 feet of</p>	<p>1 is Residential.</p> <p>2 The proposed Site Plan that was submitted</p> <p>3 has two houses that meet the Code. They're not</p> <p>4 requesting anything unusual.</p> <p>5 In terms of design, they made an effort to</p> <p>6 minimize the parking garage and emphasis the</p> <p>7 entrance, which are two features that I think</p> <p>8 have been discussed recently as desirable, in</p> <p>9 terms of a single-family design.</p> <p>10 The review time line included Development</p> <p>11 Review Committee meetings in November of 2015,</p> <p>12 neighborhood meetings in May of 2016, and, of</p> <p>13 course, today's Planning and Zoning meeting,</p> <p>14 and then, if you approve it, it will go to the</p> <p>15 Commission.</p> <p>16 We had, as always, public notifications, as</p> <p>17 required by Code. The neighborhood meeting was</p> <p>18 notified. There was a mail out to the property</p> <p>19 owners within a thousand feet. There was a</p> <p>20 posting of the property. There was a legal</p> <p>21 advertisement. And this meeting was advertised</p> <p>22 in the web.</p> <p>23 The radius is a thousand feet, which, in</p> <p>24 this graphic, you can see pretty clearly what</p> <p>25 properties were notified.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 133</p> <p>1 The existing building site is 150 feet  2 wide, and the proposed building sites are 75.  3 The depth is 112, and the site area for the  4 proposed site is over 8,000 square feet, 8,400  5 square feet, and the building size, the house  6 size proposal will be 3,600 square feet, two  7 stories, 29 feet in height.  8 The review criteria, as you know, has  9 changed recently, so this was reviewed based on  10 the two, the old criteria, because it was  11 submitted at that time, but it was also  12 reviewed based on the new criteria, and it  13 complies with both.  14 The criteria is described in the Staff  15 review. In the interest of time, I'll just  16 flip through the slides.  17 Probably the most interesting or the one  18 that most people focus on is the comparison,  19 and as you can see, a majority of the parcels  20 within a close proximity will be smaller in  21 frontage than the proposed sites.  22 There's one criterion that is not  23 satisfied, which is that the owner purchased  24 the property in 2015. So it has not been owned  25 for the past ten years by the same owner.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 135</p> <p>1 Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board, Mario  2 Garcia-Serra, with offices at 600 Brickell  3 Avenue, representing the owner of the property  4 at 728 Navarre, 728 Navarre, LLC.  5 I'm joined here today by Alejandro Bolante  6 (phonetic), the principal of 728 Navarre, LCC,  7 as well as Glenn Pratt, our project architect.  8 This property is unique in more than one  9 way, but two unique characteristics are  10 especially relevant to how we comply with the  11 applicable Code criteria for a lot separation.  12 First of all, at nearly four-tenth of an  13 acre, this property is one of the largest  14 properties in the area. So much so, that even  15 after we split the lot into two separate 8,500  16 square foot lots, each of those little parcels  17 will be bigger than 65 percent of the other  18 building sites in the area, and have a greater  19 frontage than 75 percent of the building sites  20 in the area.  21 I have a graphic here to demonstrate that.  22 Our property here is in the middle of the  23 radius area, of course, and what's shown in  24 green are all of the properties that are still  25 going to be smaller than the two parcels that</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 134</p> <p>1 So Staff recommends approval with  2 conditions, and the conditions are that the new  3 single-family residences shall meet all of the  4 Zoning requirements, without any variances,  5 which the proposed Site Plan does, and then the  6 total square footage of the two residences  7 shall be equal or less than what's allowed now  8 in the big parcel, which it does, and that the  9 parking garages, carports, porte cochere and  10 other car oriented features of the house should  11 be five feet behind -- set back from the front  12 facade five feet, and the 15 feet of the Lot 7  13 shall be deeded to 734 Navarre Avenue, which is  14 what was illustrated in the diagram before, but  15 that the Site Plan and elevations of the  16 residences shall be made part of the approval.  17 As you know, that was one of the issues  18 that were discussed with the new regulation,  19 and, finally, that a bond shall be required to  20 ensure the timely removal of any  21 non-conformities as a result of the building  22 site separation approval.  23 Staff recommends approval, and I think the  24 Applicant has a presentation for you.  25 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Good evening,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 136</p> <p>1 will be created if this lot split is approved.  2 So, again, once the lot split is approved, it's  3 still going to -- each lot is still going to be  4 bigger than almost 75 percent of all of the  5 other lots in the area, based on frontage.  6 Based on total lot area, it is similar.  7 There, once the two lots are split into 8,500  8 square foot lots, they will still be bigger  9 than about 65 percent of all of the other lots  10 in the 1,000 foot radius area.  11 Secondly, 728 Navarre was historically  12 under the same ownership as the home to the  13 immediate west at 734 Navarre. There was  14 previously a conveyance of property between the  15 734 site and the 728 site, which actually  16 created a nonconformity that would be corrected  17 right now.  18 I have another graphic that will help you  19 better understand that point.  20 Okay. 728 Navarre is what's indicated in  21 blue and yellow. 734 Navarre would be to the  22 west. Historically, for about 50 years, under  23 the same ownership. In about 1989, they  24 entered into a conveyance, which essentially  25 deeded the 15 easterly feet of Lot 7 to 728</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 137</p> <p>1 Navarre, and then increased it by that amount  2 of size, that building site, but then left 734  3 Navarre without one fully platted lot.  4 734 Navarre today is only part of Lot 7 and  5 part of Lot 6, which is further to the west.  6 Part of what we're proposing, as part of  7 this project, will be to deed those 15 feet  8 back to 734 Navarre, so that 734 Navarre will  9 again have one full lot, Lot 7, and part of Lot  10 6. 728 Navarre will be left with Lots 8, 9 and  11 10, and we're proposing to split right down the  12 middle of 9, so you have two 75-foot wide lots  13 on that property.  14 The project has been well received by the  15 neighborhood. At our neighborhood meeting,  16 five neighboring property owners attended and  17 expressed a desire to see the site re-developed  18 and thought that the parcels to be created  19 would yield appropriately sized homes for the  20 neighborhood, and they were complimentary of  21 the plans presented to them.  22 We had a petition at that meeting, which  23 was signed by four of the five in attendance.  24 We met with another property owner separately,  25 who also signed the petition in support, and so</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 139</p> <p>1 garage?  2 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Yes. A permit was  3 issued for that garage.  4 MS. MENENDEZ: Why was it non-conforming?  5 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: It is non-conforming  6 today because that detached garage was in a  7 side yard area. Under today's Zoning Code, a  8 detached garage has to be in the rear yard  9 area.  10 MS. MENENDEZ: Yeah, but it was conforming  11 then, when they issued the permit.  12 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Presumably so, if they  13 issued the permit.  14 MS. MENENDEZ: Right. So how can we say  15 that it's non-conforming? Why does this become  16 an issue, I guess? I mean, it's saying here,  17 it satisfies the criteria that the building  18 site separated or established would not result  19 in any structures becoming non-conforming.  20 "The subject property had an existing structure  21 in the form of a garage that did not" -- I  22 mean, it is non-conforming now, but -- in other  23 words, it shouldn't satisfy it.  24 MR. COLLIER: I think that the lot split in  25 and of itself didn't make it non-conforming.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 138</p> <p>1 I'll distribute that to you now, so you have it  2 for the record.  3 Mr. Pratt is here and can do a presentation  4 of the architectural drawings, if you so  5 desire, but we would ask you to follow your  6 Staff recommendation and vote to recommend  7 approval of this application, and we are in  8 agreement with the conditions being proffered  9 by Staff for approval.  10 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.  11 Does anybody have any questions for the  12 Applicant at this time?  13 MS. MENENDEZ: I do. I have questions.  14 MR. PEREZ: Yeah, I have questions.  15 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Maria.  16 MS. MENENDEZ: Mario, can you leave up that  17 last board, please, the one that shows the two  18 lots? Because I'm looking at the criteria, and  19 where it says -- and this is off of the slides  20 that the Staff presented, "The subject property  21 had an existing structure in the form of a  22 garage that did not meet Zoning regulations and  23 was removed."  24 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Correct.  25 MS. MENENDEZ: Was a permit issued for that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 140</p> <p>1 It was non-conforming prior to this. There was  2 a -- non-conforming, by the way, simply means  3 that at one time it was legal. We changed the  4 Code and now it's non-conforming, but the lot  5 split itself didn't make it non-conforming.  6 MS. MENENDEZ: Right.  7 MR. TRIAS: That's a much better way to  8 phrase it. Phrase it like that, yes.  9 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. All right. I just  10 don't know how that met the criteria. Do you  11 want to explain that to me, how that met the  12 criteria?  13 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Unless I take a look at  14 what the criteria is -- the criteria is --  15 you're looking at Criteria B --  16 MS. MENENDEZ: It's part of the exceptional  17 or unusual circumstances --  18 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: 4-B?  19 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.  20 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: I think 4-B is what you  21 were looking at, right?  22 MS. MENENDEZ: I'm looking at 2-B? Is it?  23 Wait, no.  24 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It's 4.  25 MS. MENENDEZ: I'm sorry, 4-B.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 141</p> <p>1 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Okay. Yeah. So it  2 reads that, "The building sites separated or  3 established will not result in any existing  4 structure becoming non-conforming as it relates  5 to setbacks, lot area, lot width and depth,  6 ground coverage and other applicable provisions  7 of the Zoning Code, Comprehensive Plan and the  8 City Code. The voluntary demolition of a  9 building or structure within the last 10 years,  10 which eliminates any of the conditions  11 identified in this criteria, shall result in  12 non-compliance with this criteria."  13 What we're basically saying is that, the  14 way that condition reads is, if this lot split  15 creates a non-conformity, you don't comply with  16 this criteria. What we're saying here is that  17 by approving this lot split and demolishing  18 that existing parking garage or the previously  19 existing, because it's actually already been  20 demolished, that that took away that  21 non-conformity.  22 In other words, we're not creating a  23 non-conformity, we are correcting a  24 non-conformity.  25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: When did the garage get</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 143</p> <p>1 could you please identify yourself.  2 MR. PRATT: Glenn Pratt, Bellin and Pratt  3 Architects, 285 Sevilla Avenue.  4 MR. COLLIER: I assume you've been sworn in,  5 sir; is that correct?  6 MR. PRATT: Yes.  7 No, actually, both houses -- the two  8 houses, the intention is that the square  9 footage for the two new houses on the lot split  10 will be equal to what was --  11 MR. RODRIGUEZ: That's not what it says  12 now.  13 MR. BEHAR: Yeah.  14 MR. TRIAS: No, Mr. Behar is correct. Yes,  15 he's correct. The house, as proposed, the two  16 houses are too big. So the condition is that  17 they should be --  18 MS. MENENDEZ: Lower?  19 MR. TRIAS: Yes.  20 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: There's a Staff  21 condition in there for that.  22 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Do you accept that?  23 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Yes. That is acceptable  24 to us. We were proceeding along that  25 assumption all of this time.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 142</p> <p>1 demolished?  2 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Within the last six  3 months. I can't tell you exactly when.  4 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Less than 10 years?  5 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Yes, definitely.  6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Robert, you had a question?  7 MR. BEHAR: I want a clarification,  8 because, I mean, I'm in support of having two  9 single-family versus one large one, but one of  10 the conditions says that you should build no  11 more -- be equal or less than the 6,213 square  12 feet permitted as if it's one lot. But yet  13 you're proposing two houses of approximately  14 3,600 square feet each. So the sum of both  15 would be greater than the 6,200. That's one of  16 Staff's recommendations.  17 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: But it looks -- the  18 difference is relatively minimum, right?  19 MR. BEHAR: A thousand square feet.  20 MR. PEREZ: 500 per home.  21 MR. BEHAR: You know, 500 per home, but --  22 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Let me take a look.  23 Glenn, does that sound right to you, as far  24 the --  25 MR. COLLIER: Sir, since you're speaking,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 144</p> <p>1 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Albert.  2 MR. PEREZ: 738 Navarre, is that owned by  3 the same -- by the Applicant, as well?  4 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Now, when you say, 730 --  5 MR. PEREZ: The parcel to the east that  6 some of that land is being deeded to.  7 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: That's actually the  8 parcel to the west, and it's 734. It's owned  9 by a related party. You know, it's another  10 corporate entity, but they do share some  11 ultimate ownership.  12 MR. PEREZ: So how is that going to be deed  13 over? Is it a replat or --  14 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: It will be actually  15 conveyed by Deed. Those 15 feet are going to  16 be conveyed back to 734 Navarre.  17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I have a question of  18 Staff. How did that 15 feet get legally  19 conveyed in the first instance? Do we know  20 that? And why was it conveyed?  21 MR. TRIAS: No, I don't know the details of  22 that. Do you know?  23 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mario, do you have a  24 copy of the unity -- there we go.  25 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Yeah. It happened</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 145</p> <p>1 pursuant to this Declaration of Restrictive  2 Covenant that was entered into in 1987. And as  3 you can see there, 728 Navarre, at that point  4 in time, was described as 9, 8 -- Lots 9 and 8  5 and the east fifteen feet of Lot 7.  6 Interestingly, it did not include Lot 10, which  7 today could potentially be a building site on  8 its own, but sort of the consensus, from both,  9 my client and the neighborhood, is to see a  10 bigger building site than just that Lot 10,  11 but, indeed, this was the document that  12 conveyed over that 15 feet to 728 Navarre and  13 then left 734 Navarre, which was subject to  14 another covenant, with Lot 7, less the east 15  15 feet and the east 25 feet of Lot 6.  16 So, as you can see, that covenant, signed  17 off by the City at that time, permitted a  18 building site which did not have one fully  19 platted lot, when one fully platted lot needs  20 to be included in every building site.  21 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And what was the  22 rationale for those two restrictive covenants?  23 I can't read that.  24 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: It's a bit a mystery.  25 We haven't been able to figure it out. The</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 147</p> <p>1 one of the conditions ought to be that the  2 deeding back of the 15 feet -- I would imagine  3 the City would require unity of title for that  4 property, to reincorporate the 15 feet back.  5 MR. COLLIER: My recollection of the  6 proposal is that, indeed, as part of this  7 application or the approval, it's requiring  8 that that lot be described to include the 15  9 feet. So that would be part of it.  10 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Anybody have any  11 further comments at this time?  12 Anybody from the public? We'll open the  13 public hearing. Anybody here -- Jill, do we  14 have any cards on this item?  15 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: I'll reserve time for  16 rebuttal, if necessary.  17 THE SECRETARY: One speaker, Enrique  18 Garcia.  19 MR. GARCIA: Enrique Garcia, 741 Navarre.  20 I was present in the previous meeting, when  21 they presented it. I think the project is  22 appropriate. The scale is appropriate. The  23 only thing I'm scared of is an empty lot in  24 front of my house. So I really would like to  25 have -- see it built, and I think it goes quite</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 146</p> <p>1 best I can tell you, there was a fence at that  2 point covering those 15 feet and making them  3 part of 728 property. So, for some reason,  4 Mr. Bellaman (phonetic), who now is deceased,  5 owned both properties, and he wanted, for some  6 reason, to see 728 be bigger.  7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Because while I think  8 this might be the right application, I struggle  9 with some of the requirements. And one of  10 those is Number 2, that exceptional and unusual  11 circumstances exist that are Site Specific,  12 which to me that means to the subject site  13 that's trying to be split.  14 And as I understand the analysis, the  15 unusual circumstance is that it has the 15 feet  16 from the adjoining property, and that by giving  17 that 15 feet back, it makes the adjoining  18 property conform, but, in my mind, that has  19 nothing to do with the subject lot split,  20 because it could be given back right now, I  21 would imagine.  22 MR. BEHAR: Yes, without doing this.  23 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah. It could be  24 given back without doing the lot split. I  25 think, by giving it back, assuming this passes,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 148</p> <p>1 well with our neighborhood.  2 Thank you.  3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.  4 Anybody else?  5 THE SECRETARY: No, that's it.  6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Seeing  7 none, we'll close the public hearing. Anybody  8 have any additional comments?  9 MR. BEHAR: I'll make a motion for  10 approval, with Staff conditions.  11 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Second.  12 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We have a motion and a  13 second. Anybody have any -- sorry -- any  14 further comments?  15 Can I just ask, Ramon, the first three  16 criterion must all be met, correct?  17 MR. TRIAS: Yes.  18 MS. MENENDEZ: Must what?  19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Must all be met.  20 MR. TRIAS: Yes.  21 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And then it's three of  22 the four, out of Number 4?  23 MR. TRIAS: Yes. That's the new process  24 that we have.  25 MS. MENENDEZ: Three must be met.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 149</p> <p>1 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes.</p> <p>2 MS. MENENDEZ: I had the same issue with</p> <p>3 what you raised.</p> <p>4 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. We have a motion</p> <p>5 and a second. No further comments? Jill, if</p> <p>6 you would call the roll.</p> <p>7 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?</p> <p>8 MR. BEHAR: Yes.</p> <p>9 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabel?</p> <p>10 MR. GRABEL: Yes.</p> <p>11 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?</p> <p>12 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.</p> <p>13 THE SECRETARY: Alberto Perez?</p> <p>14 MR. PEREZ: Yes.</p> <p>15 THE SECRETARY: Frank Rodriguez?</p> <p>16 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.</p> <p>17 THE SECRETARY: Jeff Flanagan?</p> <p>18 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Just because I don't</p> <p>19 think it meets one of the required criterion,</p> <p>20 no.</p> <p>21 All right.</p> <p>22 MR GARCIA-SERRA: Thank you very much.</p> <p>23 Have a good night.</p> <p>24 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: You, too.</p> <p>25 Next the three items are related. We'll</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 151</p> <p>1 all of Block 15, Coral Gables Section "L,"</p> <p>2 known as 20 and 42 Navarre Avenue, 33, 43 and</p> <p>3 47 Alhambra Circle and 2001 Galiana Street,</p> <p>4 Coral Gables, Florida; providing for</p> <p>5 severability, repealer and an effective date.</p> <p>6 Number 14 is a Resolution of the City</p> <p>7 Commission of Coral Gables, Florida requesting</p> <p>8 mixed use site plan review pursuant to Zoning</p> <p>9 Code Article 4, "Zoning Districts", Division 2,</p> <p>10 "Overlay and Special Purpose Districts",</p> <p>11 Section 4-201, "Mixed Use District (MXD)", for</p> <p>12 the mixed use project referred to as "33</p> <p>13 Alhambra" on the property legally described as</p> <p>14 all of Block 15, Coral Gables Section "L",</p> <p>15 known as 20 and 42 Navarre Avenue, 33, 43 and</p> <p>16 47 Alhambra Circle and 2001 Galiano Street,</p> <p>17 Coral Gables, Florida; including required</p> <p>18 conditions; providing for an effective date.</p> <p>19 Okay. Ramon.</p> <p>20 MR. TRIAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.</p> <p>21 If I could have the PowerPoint. Thank you.</p> <p>22 The property is one block, Block 15, shown</p> <p>23 in yellow in this image, and that block is at</p> <p>24 the edge of the Central Business District, the</p> <p>25 northern boundary. Navarre is the northern</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 150</p> <p>1 read them all in, and vote on them separately.</p> <p>2 Item 12 is an Ordinance of the City</p> <p>3 Commission of Coral Gables, Florida requesting</p> <p>4 an amendment to the Future Land Use Map of the</p> <p>5 City of Coral Gables Comprehensive Plan</p> <p>6 pursuant to Zoning Code Article 3, "Development</p> <p>7 Review", Division 15, "Comprehensive Plan Text</p> <p>8 and Map Amendments", and Small Scale amendment</p> <p>9 procedures Section 163.3187, Florida Statutes,</p> <p>10 from "Residential Multi-Family Medium Density"</p> <p>11 to "Commercial Mid-Rise Intensity" for the</p> <p>12 property legally described as all of Block 15,</p> <p>13 Coral Gables Section "L", known as 20 and 42</p> <p>14 Navarre Avenue, 33, 43 and 47 Alhambra Circle</p> <p>15 and 2001 Galiano Street, Coral Gables, Florida;</p> <p>16 providing for severability, repealer and an</p> <p>17 effective date. That's under Local Planning</p> <p>18 Agency review.</p> <p>19 Item Number 13 is an Ordinance of the City</p> <p>20 Commission of Coral Gables, Florida requesting</p> <p>21 a change of zoning pursuant to Zoning Code</p> <p>22 Article 3, "Development Review", Division 14,</p> <p>23 "Zoning Code Text and Map Amendments", from</p> <p>24 Multi-Family 2 District (MF2) to Commercial</p> <p>25 District for the property legally described as</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 152</p> <p>1 edge of the Central Business District.</p> <p>2 As you can see, there are some larger</p> <p>3 buildings to the south. And towards the north,</p> <p>4 is the North Ponce area that we talked about</p> <p>5 earlier today.</p> <p>6 The current Land Use is Residential, and so</p> <p>7 is the zoning, MF2. It is within the GRID, and</p> <p>8 you can see it right there, in the context of</p> <p>9 the GRID, which deals with the traffic issues,</p> <p>10 and within the GRID traffic is not considered</p> <p>11 to be an issue.</p> <p>12 Now, the project, as proposed, sits right</p> <p>13 on Alhambra, and it has an arcade, a continuous</p> <p>14 arcade, at the ground level, all throughout the</p> <p>15 perimeter of the block.</p> <p>16 As you can see, as you turn the corner, you</p> <p>17 can see that the sidewalk and the arcade and</p> <p>18 the live work units, which are located at the</p> <p>19 ground level, are the component the create the</p> <p>20 Mixed-Use designation for the project.</p> <p>21 And, then, as you turn around, there's a</p> <p>22 historic building on the side there, on</p> <p>23 Navarre, that is preserved -- the historic</p> <p>24 building is preserved -- with a park next to</p> <p>25 it, and a paseo going through the building,</p>