

CITY OF CORAL GABLES  
PLANNING & ZONING MEETING

January 9, 2019  
405 Biltmore Way  
Coral Gables, Florida 33134

Planning & Zoning Board  
Chairperson Eibi Aizenstat  
Board Member Rhonda A. Anderson  
Board Member Robert Behar  
Board Member Julio Grabiell  
Board Member Alex Mantecon  
Board Member Maria Velez

1 PARTICIPANTS:  
2 Chairperson Eibi Aizenstat  
3 Board Member Rhonda A. Anderson  
4 Board Member Robert Behar  
5 Board Member Julio Grabiell  
6 Board Member Alex Mantecon  
7 Board Member Maria Velez  
8 Craig Collier, Special Counsel  
9 Ramon Trias, Planning & Zoning Director  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 MR. AIZENSTAT: Okay. Let's get started. As  
2 I was reminded, it's 6:05.

3 Good evening. I'd like to call the meeting to  
4 order. At this time I'd like to ask everybody to  
5 please turn off their phones, put their phones on  
6 silent, and any other devices that make noise.

7 This board is comprised of seven members, four  
8 members of the board shall constitute a quorum and  
9 the affirmative vote of four members shall be  
10 necessary for the adoption of any motion.

11 If only four members of the board are present  
12 an applicant may request and be entitled to a  
13 continuance to the next regularly scheduled meeting  
14 of the board. If a matter is continued due to a  
15 lack of quorum the chairperson or secretary of the  
16 board may set a special meeting to consider such  
17 matter.

18 In the event that four votes are not obtained,  
19 an applicant may request a continuance or allow the  
20 application to proceed to the city admission  
21 without a recommendation.

22 Any person who acts as a lobbyist pursuant to  
23 City of Coral Gables Ordinance No. 2006-11 must  
24 register with the city clerk prior to engaging in  
25 lobbying activities or presentations before city

1 staff, boards, committees and/or city commission.

2 A copy of the ordinance is available in the  
3 office of the city clerk. Failure to register and  
4 provide proof of registration shall prohibit your  
5 ability to present to the board.

6 As chair, I now officially call the City of  
7 Coral Gables Planning & Zoning Board of January  
8 9th, 2019 to order. The time is 6:04.

9 Jill, will you call the role, please.

10 THE CLERK: Rhonda Anderson?

11 MS. ANDERSON: Here.

12 THE CLERK: Robert Behar?

13 MR. BEHAR: Here.

14 THE CLERK: Julio Grabiell?

15 MR. GRABIEL: Here.

16 THE CLERK: Alex Mantecon?

17 MR. MANTECON: Here.

18 THE CLERK: Maria Menendez?

19 Maria Velez?

20 MS. VELEZ: Here.

21 THE CLERK: Eibi Aizenstat?

22 MR. AIZENSTAT: Here.

23 Please be advised that this board is a  
24 quasi-judicial board, and the items on the agenda  
25 are quasi judicial in nature which requires board

1 members to disclose an -- all ex parte  
2 communications and site visits.

3 An ex parte communication is defined as any  
4 contract, communication, conversation,  
5 correspondence, memorandum or other written or  
6 verbal communication that takes place outside a  
7 public hearing between a member of the public and a  
8 member of the quasi-judicial board regarding  
9 matters to be heard by the board.

10 If anyone made any contact with a board member  
11 regarding an issue before the board, the board  
12 member must state on the record the existence of  
13 the ex parte communication and the party who  
14 originated the communication.

15 Also, if a board member conducted a site visit  
16 specifically related to the case before the board,  
17 the board member must also disclose such visit. In  
18 either case the board member must state on the  
19 record whether the ex parte communication and/or  
20 site visit will affect the board member's ability  
21 to impartially consider the evidence to be  
22 presented regarding this matter.

23 The board member should also state that his or  
24 her decision will be based on substantial,  
25 competent evidence and testimony presented on the

1 record today.

2 Does any board member have such communication  
3 or site visit to disclose?

4 (ALL): No.

5 MR. AIZENSTAT: Having none, if anybody that  
6 will be speaking tonight, if they could please  
7 stand up to be sworn in with the exception of  
8 attorneys. Thank you.

9 THE COURT REPORTER: Please raise your right  
10 hand.

11 Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole  
12 truth and nothing but the truth?

13 (ALL): Yes.

14 MR. AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

15 First I'd like to start with the approval of  
16 the minutes. Has everybody had a chance to look at  
17 the approval of the minutes, or look at the  
18 minutes?

19 MS. ANDERSON: I have, yes.

20 MR. AIZENSTAT: Anybody like to make a motion?

21 MR. GRABIEL: I would like to move, accept.

22 MS. ANDERSON: On page 58 I have a one word  
23 correction.

24 MR. AIZENSTAT: Page 58.

25 MS. ANDERSON: 58, line 4. The word "stuff"

1 should be "freebie."

2 MR. AIZENSTAT: Bear with me one second. Page  
3 58, line Item 4?

4 MS. ANDERSON: Line Item 4, the word "stuff"  
5 should have been "freebie."

6 MR. AIZENSTAT: Say that again. I can't hear.

7 MS. ANDERSON: Freebie, like the freebie  
8 service.

9 MR. AIZENSTAT: I think the microphone's off.  
10 Maybe on the back.

11 MR. COLLIER: Take this one.

12 MS. ANDERSON: I think its battery is dead.

13 MR. AIZENSTAT: Okay. Robert went ahead and  
14 gave you his.

15 MS. ANDERSON: The word "stuff" should be  
16 "freebie" on line 4, page 58.

17 MR. AIZENSTAT: Okay. Any other comments?

18 We have a motion. Is there a second with that  
19 correction?

20 MS. VELEZ: Second.

21 MR. AIZENSTAT: Maria, second. Any other  
22 discussion?

23 MS. ANDERSON: No.

24 MR. AIZENSTAT: No. Having heard that, call  
25 the role, please.

1 THE CLERK: Robert Behar?

2 MR. BEHAR: Yes.

3 THE CLERK: Julio Grabiell?

4 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.

5 THE CLERK: Alex Mantecon?

6 MR. MANTECON: Yes.

7 THE CLERK: Maria Velez?

8 MS. VELEZ: Yes.

9 THE CLERK: Rhonda Anderson?

10 MS. ANDERSON: Yes.

11 THE CLERK: Eibi Aizenstat?

12 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yes.

13 At this time what I'd like to do is I'd like  
14 to take the meeting out of order. I'd like to  
15 defer Item E-1 till the end, the reason being I was  
16 advised by the city attorney that I have a possible  
17 conflict with it due to the proximity of where I  
18 live, and as a result I will excuse myself because  
19 I will listen to the city attorney. So I'd like to  
20 move this to the last item on the agenda if the  
21 board is okay with that.

22 MS. VELEZ: Yes.

23 MR. AIZENSTAT: Everybody okay?

24 MS. ANDERSON: No problem.

25 MR. BEHAR: No problem.

1 MR. AIZENSTAT: Let's do that.

2 The first item that we're going to listen to  
3 is Item E-2.

4 Mr. City Attorney, if you would please read it  
5 into the record.

6 MR. COLLIER: Item E-2, an Ordinance of the  
7 City Commission of Coral Gables, Florida providing  
8 for text amendments to the City of Coral Gables  
9 Official Zoning Code amending Article 3,  
10 Development Review, Division 3, Uniform Notice and  
11 Procedures for Public Hearing, Section 3-302,  
12 Notice, Division 5, Planned Area Development,  
13 Section 3-506, Application and Review Procedures  
14 for approval of plans, Division 6, Appeals, Section  
15 3-606, Procedure for appeals, Division 7,  
16 Moratorium, Section 3-708, City Commission Review  
17 and Decisions, Division 10, Transfer Development  
18 Rights, Section 3-1006, Review and approval of use  
19 of TDRs on Receiver Sites, Division 12, Abandonment  
20 and Vacations, Section 3-1205, City Commission  
21 Review and Decision, Division 15, Comprehensive  
22 Plan Text and Map Amendments, Section 3-1059,  
23 Transmittal Hearing, and Article 5, Development  
24 Standards, Division 6, Design Review Standards,  
25 Section 5-604, Coral Gables Mediterranean Style

1 Design Standards providing for required mailed  
2 notice for certain actions pursuant to the Zoning  
3 Code providing for repealer provision, severability  
4 clause, codification and providing for an effective  
5 date. Item E-2, public hearing.

6 MR. AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

7 Mr. Trias?

8 MR. TRIAS: I'm going to defer to Craig  
9 because this is his work and he can give you a very  
10 good explanation of the intent.

11 MR. AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

12 MR. COLLIER: Mr. Chairman, members of the  
13 board, the city commission had requested that there  
14 be required mail notice for certain actions of the  
15 planning and zoning board and the city commission.  
16 It was -- the city attorney directed me to prepare  
17 a draft, which is what's here before you tonight.

18 In summary it provides for mailed notice for  
19 generally the zoning actions that you take before  
20 the planning and zoning board and provides mailed  
21 notice to the -- at a city commission meeting. If  
22 it's an action taken by RESO it will take place at  
23 the hearing of -- the single hearing of the city  
24 commission. If it's an action taken by ordinance,  
25 for example, a zone change it would -- the mailed

1 notice would take place at the second public  
2 hearing that's required because ordinances require  
3 two public hearings.

4 And there is also that notice is within a  
5 thousand feet with the exception of comp plan  
6 amendments, which have previously for this board  
7 has been 1500 feet. So the radius is generally a  
8 thousand feet for most zoning items except for comp  
9 plan items.

10 The other thing that's a little bit different  
11 about this is that the burden is actually placed on  
12 the applicant to do the physical mailing rather  
13 than having the department be involved in the  
14 mailing. The department obviously is going to have  
15 to approve the form of the notice, but the -- and  
16 that has actually been the -- that was a provision  
17 that was put in for the planning and zoning board.

18 But I put in for both to sort of get the  
19 people that are actually reviewing your  
20 applications get out of the mail business and be  
21 able to reserve their time for reviewing  
22 applications.

23 Again, ultimately it's going to be a policy  
24 decision and the board may have their own feelings  
25 about how it should be done, but that's -- we've

1 extended this process to the city commission  
2 process.

3 So I think that pretty much covers it.

4 Ramon, is there something that I may have left  
5 out that you want to mention?

6 MR. TRIAS: No. I think from my point of view  
7 it's just clean up and improving a little bit some  
8 of the technical requirements of notice, so it's  
9 something that certainly we would recommend  
10 approval.

11 MR. BEHAR: Can I -- can we ask questions at  
12 this point, at this time or are you still -- let me  
13 ask you, I see some of it that makes sense, but I  
14 see that you have the Section 3-1006, which is  
15 review and approval of the use of the TDRs on  
16 receiver sites, and the Section 5-604, the Coral  
17 Gables Mediterranean Style Design Standards. I  
18 don't see why those two needs to be notified to,  
19 you know, be amended, particularly, the  
20 Mediterranean Style unless I'm understanding this  
21 incorrectly.

22 Maybe, Ramon, you can clarify that.

23 MR. TRIAS: Are you speaking of page 3 at the  
24 bottom where it says Corals Gables --

25 MR. BEHAR: It's page actually -- page 11,

1 which is section at the bottom where I think you're  
2 trying to -- if this is -- you're going to notify  
3 when it comes to Mediterranean style --

4 MR. TRIAS: That is a very, very specific,  
5 very rarely used provision of the Mediterranean  
6 style. It's not the typical Mediterranean Bonus.  
7 It has to do with adjacencies next to single  
8 family. It was used with the Bacardi building, I  
9 think, the last time. It's a very -- it's a very  
10 unusual provision, and that's the reason why it has  
11 notice requirements because it deals with noticing  
12 of the neighbors and so on.

13 But that is not the 99 percent of the time of  
14 the use of the Mediterranean.

15 MR. BEHAR: I'm just concerned for that 1  
16 percent.

17 MR. TRIAS: No, I understand, but the way that  
18 I understand that provision, and I did not draft  
19 it, it predates my work, is that it applies to  
20 projects that would be otherwise by right, for  
21 example, if you were to do an office building, like  
22 the Bacardi building, for example, and it happens  
23 to be next to single family, in order to get  
24 Mediterranean Bonus, there's this very specific  
25 process. When you do mixed use, that's not the

1 case. When you do typical projects that are not  
2 next to single family, that's not the case. It  
3 doesn't apply to any of that.

4 It's a provision that we I -- I think we  
5 should probably review in the context of the work  
6 that we're doing as --

7 MR. BEHAR: I think so. I think we should  
8 take that section out and review it further before  
9 I feel comfortable.

10 MR. COLLIER: Can I just, on the issue what we  
11 were requested by the city commission is on  
12 quasi-judicial hearings that there be a required  
13 notice. This is in that grouping.

14 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.

15 MR. COLLIER: And it may be that this shouldn't  
16 be in the code at all. That's --

17 MR. TRIAS: That is --

18 MR. COLLIER: That's a substantive issue --

19 MR. TRIAS: -- that's what Mr. Behar is  
20 saying.

21 MR. BEHAR: That's a substantive issue.

22 MR. COLLIER: So what -- I think that's  
23 something that can be looked at. This is just kind  
24 of, well, we're doing this blanket thing, but we  
25 may need to look at certain provisions and say, why

1 are we having these hearings in the first place.

2 MR. BEHAR: But if that's the case, and we got  
3 to look at it in the code, perhaps that should not  
4 be here now.

5 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. No. I think that's a very  
6 valid observation, and I -- yes. The only issue is  
7 that I don't believe that Craig has made any  
8 changes in the content. He's kept everything  
9 there. He's only made changes on the dates and the  
10 notice requirements.

11 MR. COLLIER: There were no substantive changes  
12 to the code made in this item. This is separate  
13 and apart from the code revision that the --

14 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.

15 MR. COLLIER: -- consultant was hired for, and  
16 I think that we can certainly put this on the  
17 agenda, the things that she needs to look at.

18 MS. ANDERSON: I had a few questions.

19 MR. AIZENSTAT: Please.

20 MS. ANDERSON: The first one is directed to  
21 the chart, it's Page No. 3 of the chart, Type of  
22 Application, and with regard to mailing, I notice  
23 that it doesn't have a provision for what I  
24 typically see in civil rules of procedure and any  
25 rules of procedure, three days allowed for mailing

1 so that the party that is being notified at least  
2 has that ten-day notice period. Is there -- are  
3 people open to allowing, you know, three days for  
4 mailing so it has to be mailed 13 days in advance  
5 so the residents have at least ten days notice to  
6 fit things into their calendars to be present at  
7 these hearings?

8 MR. AIZENSTAT: Ramon?

9 MR. TRIAS: I don't have a preference. I  
10 think that ten days is what we have currently right  
11 in the code, and if that is not sufficient you can  
12 recommend something different to the commission,  
13 right, Craig? Is there any --

14 MR. COLLIER: No. I think the ten days was  
15 taken from other provisions in this code that were  
16 actually sort of courtesy notice, ten days, and you  
17 could add three additional days and change  
18 everything to 13 days.

19 The only issue when you do have that is if  
20 you're having a hearing here and then you want to  
21 have a hearing at the city commission, it may mean  
22 that the city commission hearing, it might not make  
23 that hearing so it will be pushed off another  
24 month. So that could be a practical issue, but  
25 that's really a policy issue. From a legal issue,

1 there's -- we can make it whatever --  
 2 MR. TRIAS: From my point of view ten days is  
 3 sufficient and certainly we never had any issues  
 4 before as far as the number of days. Now, some  
 5 people may claim they never got the letter, but  
 6 that usually had to do with the area, the  
 7 1,000 feet versus 1500 feet.

8 MS. ANDERSON: Well, I'm really relying upon  
 9 what is accepted norms in the legal community for  
 10 notice, ten days notice is the minimum and notice  
 11 is actually governed by when it's received.

12 That three-day provision has been removed from  
 13 some of the rules of court where you have  
 14 electronic notification to attorneys that they have  
 15 the ten-day notice provision before they have to go  
 16 to a hearing, and that's pretty consistent  
 17 throughout the civil and criminal rules of  
 18 procedure, both in the federal and state courts  
 19 except where you have electronic notification or  
 20 hand delivery of notices.

21 So I would think it would be prudent to make  
 22 sure that people have notice in hand ten days in  
 23 advance, and allowing three days for mailing should  
 24 suffice to cover that.

25 MR. AIZENSTAT: I'd like to ask Julio, another

1 architect on the board, how do you feel about the  
 2 comments?

3 MR. GRABIEL: All my experience over the  
 4 years, never had a problem with ten days. And I  
 5 fear what our attorney said that it creates for a  
 6 project going through another month of extension  
 7 because we didn't make it to the commission, and  
 8 that could be a serious problem.

9 MR. BEHAR: To that point, in all the  
 10 municipalities that I -- we do work, ten days is  
 11 the norm. Perhaps when it comes to some criminal  
 12 matter, something differently, but it when it comes  
 13 to zoning matters, I've seen ten days as the norm.

14 MS. ANDERSON: Well, even for zoning hearings  
 15 in circuit court and State of Florida notice is  
 16 counted upon the date received and if you're  
 17 mailing it three days is added.

18 I feel very strongly about this position  
 19 because people are receiving notices in the mail  
 20 seven days in advance. You can't alter your  
 21 schedule on such short notice, meetings and doctors  
 22 appointments and everything else if we really want  
 23 to have public participation, and if three days  
 24 makes or breaks whether it makes a commission  
 25 meeting, I'm having difficulty understanding why

1 three days is such a big deal. Just get those  
 2 notices out three days earlier so people have them  
 3 in hand and they can make their plans for the week.

4 MR. AIZENSTAT: Maria?

5 MS. VELEZ: I think ten days is sufficient. I  
 6 have received notices as a property owner and  
 7 sometimes I'm not able to attend, but other people  
 8 might be able to attend on my behalf. I think that  
 9 ten days is sufficient to get the notice out.  
 10 Because, in addition, most of these things are  
 11 posted or appear on our website.

12 MS. ANDERSON: That's another issue I want to  
 13 discuss about the website posting, you know, the --  
 14 I don't know how many people actually look at the  
 15 website for the posting of these things, but by the  
 16 time the agenda is published we're less than ten  
 17 days out. Most people are looking for the agenda  
 18 to determine what's going to be happening for the  
 19 next planning and zoning meeting or the commission  
 20 meetings. And if they're not getting -- if it's  
 21 not posted until the Friday before the commission  
 22 meeting or the Friday before the planning and  
 23 zoning meeting, it's less than ten days notice.

24 MR. AIZENSTAT: Alex?

25 MR. MANTECON: Does the posting refer to the

1 website or does that refer to being posted on the  
 2 physical property, one says on the chart?

3 MR. AIZENSTAT: The posting is based upon the  
 4 notice given, correct?

5 MR. TRIAS: The posting is the posting of the  
 6 site.

7 MR. AIZENSTAT: On the site itself?

8 MR. MANTECON: On the property.

9 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.

10 MR. MANTECON: So that's not the posting on  
 11 the websites?

12 MR. TRIAS: Right.

13 MR. MANTECON: When does it get posted on the  
 14 website? Is that addressed anywhere?

15 MR. TRIAS: I don't believe that's addressed  
 16 in the notice.

17 MR. COLLIER: It's not addressed in the code as  
 18 far as what gets placed on the website. The  
 19 notice, it does get -- there is a published  
 20 requirement.

21 Ramon, you --

22 MR. TRIAS: There's some legal requirements  
 23 and those are the newspaper advertisements. The  
 24 other postings we do are additional and we try to  
 25 do them as earlier as we can and for the very good

1 reasons that Ms. Anderson is speaking now.

2 The downside of extending the dates to longer  
3 periods is that things just get delayed longer.

4 MS. ANDERSON: Well, I'm trying to enhance  
5 notice to the public. Not many people receive the  
6 Miami Review, but if the City's website has that  
7 link with a layman's term topic of what it is,  
8 whether it's the address and a link to the Miami  
9 Review ad itself, whether it be scanned in or a  
10 link to it for the Miami Review that people can  
11 actually read without subscribing to the Miami  
12 Review, then that would be helpful.

13 MR. TRIAS: Okay. Now, what I would say as an  
14 observation is that lately I've actually seen  
15 people for the first time in my life come and said  
16 we got notice, we actually got notice. So clearly  
17 we're doing something right. Most of the time you  
18 hear, oh, I never got any notice. And that usually  
19 doesn't have to do with the dates or whatever, it  
20 has to do with the geographic distribution of the  
21 mail notice.

22 So I think that Craig has done a very good job  
23 cleaning things up. I think that we had to do it  
24 because there were many meetings that we were  
25 sending letters but it was not a requirement. We

1 were just doing it because we wanted to enhance the  
2 process, but now it's going to be in the code, so  
3 that is the purpose of this amendment.

4 MR. MANTECON: I think it's calendar days, is  
5 it ten days calendar or business days?

6 MR. TRIAS: It's calendar days.

7 MR. COLLIER: Ten days are calendar days.

8 MR. AIZENSTAT: Anybody like to -- Craig, did  
9 you have something to say?

10 MR. COLLIER: Well, I respect the view of the  
11 board member as far as the five days. It went I  
12 think up to five days mailing, and then it was  
13 three days, and now with the electronic service, I  
14 will say that at least my experience with the  
15 county code there isn't a provision for the, you  
16 know, three additional days for mailed notice.

17 One difference maybe here is that since most  
18 of the notices are going locally, it's many times  
19 people get their mail sometimes the next day. So  
20 there is -- and, obviously, the more notice the  
21 better, but I think ten days certainly meets the  
22 legal requirement, but I think it's a policy issue  
23 for this board and for the city commission, you  
24 know, what you feel is appropriate that's not  
25 become overly burdensome to the City as well.

1 MS. ANDERSON: I've received notice with less  
2 than five days, five days, because you have the  
3 intervening holidays, you have the Saturdays and  
4 Sundays, so if we're going to be talking about  
5 calendar days as opposed to business days, it's  
6 going to affect people's ability to timely be able  
7 to schedule in participation in the process. And  
8 if what we're trying to really achieve is  
9 participation in the process we need to enhance it.

10 Going back to the proposed web link for the  
11 Miami Review, you know, by a topical index of the  
12 items that are going to be heard by the planning  
13 and zoning board, that notice could easily be put  
14 on the website with a link to it so people would be  
15 aware of what's happening at the property.

16 And as far as posting on the properties  
17 itself, I did have a question. Is that requiring a  
18 posting on each facing street side? So like if you  
19 have three street sides like we have on one of the  
20 items coming up later on on each side of the lot,  
21 there's some kind of posting on the corners where  
22 people can see it?

23 MR. TRIAS: That's typically done like that,  
24 and they get a map with a location, and it's based  
25 on the specifics of the site. It's hard to

1 describe that with words in the code, but that is  
2 the way it's done.

3 MS. ANDERSON: Okay. Because, you know, if  
4 you only post it on one street, it's not  
5 necessarily going to be seen by the adjacent  
6 property.

7 MR. TRIAS: Exactly. Exactly. And some  
8 properties are a whole block and they may require  
9 multiple locations so, yeah.

10 MS. ANDERSON: Okay.

11 MS. VELEZ: I have a question.

12 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yes, go ahead, please.

13 MS. VELEZ: I'm all in favor of requiring  
14 notice as opposed to courtesy notice. I think  
15 that's a great step.

16 I have on page 7, on No. 2, this is the one  
17 for city commission. It only requires mailed  
18 notice for the second public hearing or the second  
19 reading of an ordinance. Why can we not make it  
20 for both?

21 MR. COLLIER: Well, I believe -- well, this is  
22 a policy issue. Legally the feeling was that this  
23 is the final passage so this would be the  
24 appropriate time to have the mailed notice.

25 The concern I think was for both notices is

1 that it could very well delay the second hearing  
2 and then it would be pushed off to another month.  
3 So from a legal perspective, as long as we're  
4 giving notice and if since the final adoption is  
5 when substantive changes are typically made, it was  
6 made -- it was a policy decision in discussion with  
7 the city attorney and with staff that if we're  
8 going to -- we want to give notice that we should  
9 give it at the most important hearing which is the  
10 final passage hearing. So that's why the notice  
11 was given for that period of time.

12 MS. VELEZ: I can see the reasoning, you know,  
13 behind the delaying because it could kick it off to  
14 the second -- to another month if the two weeks go  
15 by and the commission meets and then you don't get  
16 the notice out. But I don't know, as a citizen I  
17 find that if you have notice of the first hearing I  
18 think a lot more people might be involved and a lot  
19 more discussion can then happen, and then the city  
20 commissioners would be able to hear the  
21 perspectives of the residents at that point.

22 MS. ANDERSON: I would agree with you.

23 MR. COLLIER: Again, that's a policy  
24 choice that the board --

25 MS. VELEZ: So that's -- my recommendation

1 would be that notice would be given on first and  
2 second on that.

3 Then I have on page 8, there are two items  
4 seven and eight where notice is given only at the  
5 discretion, the sole discretion of the  
6 developmental review official. I think notice  
7 should be given regardless of the discretion of the  
8 zoning review.

9 MR. COLLIER: Let me explain what that was. So  
10 there's certain text amendments of a comprehensive  
11 plan that generally apply to all properties in the  
12 city, and you ordinarily wouldn't give notice  
13 because it's, first of all, comprehensive plan is  
14 legislative so really a notice is not even  
15 required, and, in fact, Dade County sends just a  
16 courtesy notice.

17 And I think with regard to eight was if  
18 there's a specific set of properties that's going  
19 to be determined by the review official, somebody  
20 has to make that decision, is this amendment  
21 dealing with specific properties or is it affecting  
22 an entire city. So somebody has to make that  
23 decision. So that's why it was written that way.

24 MR. TRIAS: For example, and seven is zoning  
25 and eight is the code. For example --

1 MR. COLLIER: Right.

2 MR. TRIAS: -- the artificial grass amendment,  
3 if we were to send a letter to every resident in  
4 the city that may not be the most effective way to  
5 notice people. So the issue is that certainly  
6 should be left to some discretion because  
7 otherwise, I mean, we've been sending thousands of  
8 letters already because we've been implementing  
9 this informally without changing the code, and it  
10 gets to a point where that it's just not practical  
11 so that's why it was written like this.

12 MS. VELEZ: That makes sense.

13 MR. COLLIER: And I stand corrected, we did do  
14 it with zoning too because, again, a zoning text  
15 amendment may have to do with all properties as an  
16 example.

17 MS. VELEZ: Okay. That makes sense. Thank  
18 you.

19 MR. AIZENSTAT: Craig, what are you looking  
20 for a motion?

21 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

22 MR. COLLIER: Ramon is looking for a motion.  
23 I'm advising you legally.

24 MR. AIZENSTAT: Well, you brought this up.

25 MS. ANDERSON: I still have another question.

1 MR. AIZENSTAT: Okay.

2 MS. ANDERSON: On the chart on page 5,  
3 transfer of development rights, it states that  
4 notice is required for the receiving site plan  
5 application. Is there a reason why there was not  
6 included expansion of the TDR areas as requiring  
7 notice to the nearby residents?

8 MR. TRIAS: That would be an amendment to the  
9 zoning code if the rules were to be changed. It  
10 wouldn't be under this provision. It would be  
11 under the other provision that we talked about.

12 MS. ANDERSON: The discretionary provision?

13 MR. TRIAS: I think so. What do you think,  
14 Craig? Is there any other provision that would  
15 apply to that?

16 MR. COLLIER: I'm not 100 percent clear. We  
17 have the --

18 MR. TRIAS: The way I understand the question  
19 is if there's a proposal to change the zoning code  
20 provisions for the area, meaning expanding the area  
21 in the map, is that --

22 MR. COLLIER: So is it a zoning code text  
23 amendment to --

24 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.

25 MR. COLLIER: -- expand the area, then you

1 would make the determination if that affects  
2 specific properties and they would get mailed  
3 notice under this provision as a text amendment  
4 relating to specific properties. And that's  
5 provided for in Subsection 7.

6 MR. TRIAS: The issue is that if it was an  
7 expansion to some area that is very specific, the  
8 judgment of any professional would be, yes, send  
9 notice.

10 Now, if you want to make it mandatory to send  
11 notice for every change, every amendment of the  
12 zoning code, then basically we're going to have a  
13 mail operation instead of a zoning department.

14 MR. BEHAR: That's --

15 MS. ANDERSON: That's not my suggestion.  
16 That's not the suggestion.

17 MR. COLLIER: But I think your issue is  
18 regarding a text amendment that might impact  
19 specific properties.

20 MR. TRIAS: Right, because --

21 MR. COLLIER: Because you -- the receiving zone  
22 got expanded, right?

23 MR. TRIAS: That's what I said. That's  
24 exactly --

25 MR. COLLIER: So that gets covered.

1 MR. TRIAS: That is exactly what I said. The  
2 way I understand your question is if we expand the  
3 area to a specific area that's larger, yes, they  
4 should get notice. That would be the judgment of  
5 any staff person doing the review.

6 If the change is, as I said before, for  
7 example, the requirements for the artificial grass,  
8 for example, a minor change that applies throughout  
9 the city, then mail notice really doesn't make  
10 sense.

11 MS. ANDERSON: Right. Now, historically I  
12 know we didn't have mail notice to the adjacent  
13 property owners for expansion of the TDR receiving  
14 area. Based upon the way this is written here, are  
15 we going to be notifying the homeowners and owners  
16 of the business?

17 MR. TRIAS: Are you speaking of -- because the  
18 expansion has nothing to do with this provision.  
19 The provision here is for a project that is  
20 requesting sending and receiving.

21 MS. ANDERSON: Then my suggestion is is that  
22 we include it also for expansion of TDR receiving  
23 areas, because the adjacent property owners would  
24 be affected by any potential impact there, and  
25 providing them notice they have an opportunity to

1 participant and we don't have issues in the future  
2 with saying I had no idea this was going on.

3 MR. TRIAS: I understand what you're saying,  
4 and what I'm saying is that that is an amendment to  
5 the zoning text. Okay? If we want to have some  
6 specific zoning text amendments beyond just a  
7 general term --

8 MS. ANDERSON: Right.

9 MR. TRIAS: -- that is one certainly, but it  
10 complicates, it complicates the amendment.

11 MR. COLLIER: Well, can I -- I think it's  
12 addressed actually.

13 MS. ANDERSON: Where?

14 MR. COLLIER: If you look at Item 1 on where  
15 mailed notices are it talks about the mailed  
16 notices subject property and the property owner's  
17 address are known by reference and the latest ad  
18 valorem tax record within 1,000-foot radius. So if  
19 you were to amend the zoning code text, and I may  
20 want Ramon to respond to this, you change the area  
21 so now you have these subject properties that are  
22 now going to be subject to receiving these TDRs,  
23 then they are part of the subject property and also  
24 within a thousand feet of the surrounding property.

25 So I think it would be covered. This is --

1 we're trying to respond to questions as they come,  
2 but I believe it would be viewed as a subject  
3 property, and it provides in the code that it's  
4 within a thousand feet, so I think it would be  
5 covered.

6 MR. TRIAS: I think it is covered. I think  
7 it's very clearly covered.

8 MR. COLLIER: Right.

9 MS. ANDERSON: I just noted that in the past  
10 the notice hadn't been sent to the adjacent  
11 property owner so therefore I'm concerned.

12 MR. TRIAS: In the past, I mean, let's say  
13 several years ago, certainly you were right.

14 MS. ANDERSON: No, within the past few months.

15 MR. TRIAS: But in the -- which project are  
16 you thinking?

17 MS. ANDERSON: It wasn't a particular project.  
18 It was an expansion of the TDR area on Biltmore  
19 Way.

20 MR. TRIAS: There was a neighborhood meeting  
21 and that was --

22 MS. ANDERSON: There was workshop after the  
23 fact.

24 MR. TRIAS: There was the workshop -- there  
25 were multiple opportunities for public input.



1 Now --

2 MS. ANDERSON: I'm just saying going forward,

3 can we have --

4 MR. TRIAS: Going forward it is covered in the

5 text right here clearly. I think that Craig and I

6 have explained that. I don't think there's any

7 need to add any language, but if you believe that

8 there is, you're free to make that recommendation.

9 MS. VELEZ: And this does say required as

10 opposed to courtesy, so I think going forward it's

11 very clear.

12 MS. ANDERSON: All right.

13 MR. BEHAR: And before, just to make sure,

14 Ramon, the language of going back to Section 5-604,

15 that's the same language that exists today?

16 MR. AIZENSTAT: Page 11.

17 MR. BEHAR: Page 11.

18 MR. TRIAS: Page 11.

19 MR. BEHAR: Except for that one line that says

20 after notice in accordance with provision of

21 Article 3, Division 3.

22 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, and as you can see there

23 it's about properties in the MF 2C. It's a very

24 specific type of request. It's not the

25 Mediterranean Bonus as we know it.

1 MR. COLLIER: Yeah, only the underlying

2 language is new language. Everything that's there

3 is existing language. Only that which is

4 underlined.

5 MR. TRIAS: It's a provision that's called

6 special location site plan review for Mediterranean

7 Bonus. It is not the Mediterranean Bonus.

8 MR. BEHAR: You say that the Bacardi building

9 had to go through this process.

10 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

11 MR. BEHAR: For example, the Collection

12 Building on Bird Road.

13 MR. TRIAS: Maybe. I don't know that one

14 specifically.

15 MR. BEHAR: And neither of the projects are

16 this here.

17 MR. TRIAS: What happens is that the other

18 projects close by were mixed use projects so they

19 went through a different process.

20 MR. BEHAR: So the mixed use project are now

21 required to --

22 MR. TRIAS: Right. They go through the mixed

23 use process.

24 MR. BEHAR: Okay. All right.

25 MR. MANTECON: I have a question. So if --

1 and I understand Maria's concern with having to

2 give two notices, you know, to be able to give two

3 notices to people in order to be able to come to

4 different meetings, I think that would -- but I

5 mean, I don't think I've seen that --

6 MR. TRIAS: For the commission, you mean the

7 first and --

8 MR. MANTECON: For commission. The first and

9 second reading, I think that's a little bit of a

10 big burden for any project or anything like that.

11 Would it maybe make sense to give maybe 13 days

12 notice, as she had mentioned before, but doing it

13 on first reading where then it wouldn't put any

14 impact on potentially going into second reading

15 between the attorneys, you know, between going from

16 first reading to second reading it wouldn't delay

17 or cause any potential delays on hearings.

18 Is that maybe something to explore?

19 MR. TRIAS: It certainly we could explore all

20 that, but I think at some point we need to try to

21 understand what kind of problem are we trying to

22 fix, and we haven't had any problem in terms of

23 notice any time recently because we've basically

24 have been following what has been proposed.

25 Now, more notice is better, perhaps, I don't

1 know. I mean, it's one of those things that I

2 don't hear except the issues that you're bringing

3 up with the Biltmore Way expansion. I haven't

4 really heard anybody express any frustration with a

5 notice recently.

6 MR. COLLIER: I don't have -- can I -- we're

7 talking about a very small set here, first of all.

8 Many of the actions that are taken by the city

9 commission, or I should say some of them, there's a

10 subset that are done by resolution. There's only

11 one hearing and there's only one notice.

12 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

13 MR. COLLIER: The legislative items, or I

14 shouldn't say ordinances, but items that have to be

15 passed by ordinance, they're the ones that have the

16 two readings, so those are the ones where we

17 provided the notice for the second reading.

18 Obviously the board is in the position if you

19 wish to recommend two notices on first reading and

20 second reading or you'd rather have the notice

21 meaning on first reading or you want to have the

22 notice be 13 days for the first reading, these are

23 all appropriate recommendations --

24 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

25 MR. COLLIER: -- that the board, you know, may

1 want to consider making to the city commission on  
2 this item.

3 MS. ANDERSON: I would recommend that because  
4 if you send it on first -- if you at least send it  
5 out on the first commission hearing people are  
6 aware the issue exists. They can follow up on it,  
7 figure out when the second hearing is by looking,  
8 you know, alerting them to look at the city's  
9 website, to look at the agenda, see when an item's  
10 going to be heard again.

11 I think it's more important to get it at that  
12 first commission hearing for that reason and give  
13 them adequate notice and an opportunity to  
14 participate in the process.

15 MR. BEHAR: I don't have a problem with that  
16 because the fact of the matter is you always have  
17 more time between planning and zoning and for  
18 commission versus, you know, the first and second  
19 reading of commission. So I don't think if you  
20 want to give them additional time, the three extra  
21 days between, you know, before the first hearing, I  
22 don't think that's going to affect any --

23 MR. MANTECON: And if you put it at ten days  
24 and, you know, if you keep it at ten days, do it at  
25 first reading maybe, then at that point if they

1 can't make the first, it's on their radar and they  
2 can make the second.

3 MR. BEHAR: Yeah, you know what, that should  
4 work.

5 MR. AIZENSTAT: Would anybody like to make a  
6 motion? Maria?

7 MS. ANDERSON: Rhonda. Rhonda. Maria's not  
8 here.

9 MR. AIZENSTAT: Sorry about that.

10 MS. ANDERSON: It's one of those nights.

11 I would make a motion for this to be passed  
12 with the notice being provided at the first  
13 commission hearing with ten days notice and three  
14 days required for mailing.

15 MR. AIZENSTAT: Is there a second or --

16 MS. ANDERSON: Yeah, just one other thing is  
17 the recommendation that I had for posting on the  
18 city's website with a link to the Miami Review  
19 postings so that people can review that as well.

20 MR. AIZENSTAT: Is there a second?

21 MS. VELEZ: I'll second.

22 MR. AIZENSTAT: That's Maria's second. Any  
23 comments? No?

24 Call the role, please.

25 THE CLERK: Julio Grabiell

1 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.

2 THE CLERK: Alex Mantecon?

3 MR. MANTECON: Yes.

4 THE CLERK: Maria Velez?

5 MS. VELEZ: Yes.

6 THE CLERK: Rhonda Anderson?

7 MS. ANDERSON: Yes.

8 THE CLERK: Robert Behar?

9 MR. BEHAR: Yes.

10 THE CLERK: Eibi Aizenstat?

11 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yes.

12 Craig, if you would, please, read Item E-3.

13 MR. COLLIER: Item E-3, an Ordinance of the  
14 City Commission of Coral Gables, Florida providing  
15 text amendments to city of Coral Gables Official  
16 Zoning Code amending Article 2, decision making and  
17 administrative bodies, Division 2, Planning and  
18 Zoning Board, Section 2-203, meetings, quorum,  
19 required vote, providing for clarifying planning  
20 and zoning board voting procedures providing for  
21 repealer provision, severability clause,  
22 codification, and providing for an effective date.

23 Item E-3, public hearing.

24 I don't know, before we -- did we ask for  
25 comments from the audience on the last one?

1 MR. AIZENSTAT: No, we did not.

2 MR. COLLIER: So maybe before we -- I may have  
3 to read this again. We need to see if we had any  
4 comments.

5 MR. AIZENSTAT: Is there anybody here for Item  
6 E-2 that would like to make any comments?

7 MR. COLLIER: Let the record reflect nobody  
8 stepped forward.

9 MR. AIZENSTAT: All right.

10 MR. COLLIER: All right. I don't think I need  
11 to read E-3 since I read it. It's again my  
12 ordinance so I guess I need to explain it.

13 I'm hoping this will be viewed as a  
14 housekeeping measure. There's a provision in your  
15 code that says on a tie vote or where you have less  
16 than four affirmative votes it goes to the city  
17 commission without a recommendation. We had a  
18 situation that occurred, I think it was a couple  
19 meetings ago, where it was a 3-3 tie vote so there  
20 was no motion passed, but the board fashioned a new  
21 motion, I think it was kind of a compromise between  
22 the groups about how the motion should be and it  
23 did go to the city commission with your  
24 recommendation.

25 All this does is just reconfirm in an

1 abundance of caution, as a lawyer might say, just  
2 clarifying that indeed if you do have a tie vote  
3 and you wish to, because that vote doesn't pass or  
4 you have less than four votes, which means the item  
5 goes without a recommendation, if you want to give  
6 the board the benefit of a recommendation you have  
7 the opportunity to fashion a new motion that may  
8 get more support of the entire board.

9 So all this does is just clarify that you have  
10 that authority, so basically gives you more  
11 authority so you can recommendations to be heard  
12 by -- to be seen by the city commission.

13 MR. AIZENSTAT: So it's basically cleaning up.

14 MR. COLLIER: It's a housekeeping measure is  
15 what I would call it.

16 MS. VELEZ: I'll move it.

17 MS. ANDERSON: Second.

18 MR. BEHAR: Second.

19 MR. AIZENSTAT: We have a motion.

20 MR. BEHAR: Rhonda second it.

21 MS. ANDERSON: No problem.

22 MR. AIZENSTAT: Who second it?

23 MR. BEHAR: Rhonda did.

24 MR. AIZENSTAT: Rhonda second it.

25 Is there anybody here that would like to talk

1 about this item? No? Having none, any discussion?

2 No?

3 Call the role, please.

4 THE CLERK: Alex Mantecon?

5 MR. MANTECON: Yes.

6 THE CLERK: Maria Velez?

7 MS. VELEZ: Yes.

8 THE CLERK: Rhonda Anderson?

9 MS. ANDERSON: Yes.

10 THE CLERK: Robert Behar?

11 MR. BEHAR: Yes.

12 THE CLERK: Julio Grabiell?

13 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.

14 THE CLERK: Eibi Aizenstat?

15 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yes.

16 The next item is E-4.

17 Craig, if you would, please.

18 MR. COLLIER: Sure.

19 Item E-4, an Ordinance of the City Commission  
20 of Coral Gables, Florida providing for a text  
21 amendment to the City of Coral Gables Official  
22 Zoning Code by amending Article 5, Development  
23 Standards, Division 11, Landscaping, Section  
24 5-1104, general requirements, limiting locations  
25 for artificial turf, providing severability,

1 repealer, codification, and an effective date.

2 Item E-4, public hearing, I'm pleased to say  
3 that I did not do this one, and that Ramon, I  
4 believe, is going to handle the explanation.

5 MR. TRIAS: Chairman, I had the pleasure of  
6 drafting this ordinance personally. So here we  
7 have my understanding of what the latest commission  
8 discussion has been on the topic of artificial  
9 turf.

10 Number one, that a permit should be required  
11 so to clarify that issue and, number two, was to  
12 separate single family and duplex requirements from  
13 other, for example, commercial properties in  
14 general. And the idea was that in the single  
15 family or duplex it would be allowed in the rear  
16 yard with a buffer, some kind of acceptable buffer  
17 like a fence or a wall to the neighbors, and that  
18 any other location that is not the rear yard would  
19 be reviewed by the landscape services staff and  
20 determined on a case-by-case basis. And that in  
21 the other zoning districts, meaning the commercial  
22 buildings, for example, or mixed-use buildings,  
23 that it would not be allowed at the ground level.  
24 In other words, ground level should be grass. If  
25 somebody has a pool on the fifth floor and they

1 have a pool deck, for example, in a mixed-use  
2 building, there it would be okay. But not on the  
3 ground level.

4 That's the concept, that's the way that I  
5 understand the commission was leaning towards, and  
6 they were looking for your opinion and  
7 recommendations.

8 MS. ANDERSON: Well, I do have some questions  
9 for you.

10 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

11 MS. ANDERSON: The draft that, you know, I've  
12 read doesn't address retroactivity for existing  
13 installations and residential properties as to FAR  
14 MF-1 zoning districts, so I presume that permit had  
15 been pulled for those. But from what I'm hearing  
16 it doesn't sound like permit was pulled for those.

17 MR. TRIAS: Well, if there is no permit, then  
18 that would be an issue of code enforcement, and we  
19 just wanted to clarify that, that a permit is  
20 required.

21 MS. ANDERSON: Okay. How are we going to deal  
22 with existing installations that did pull a permit?  
23 Is there going to be a retroactive provision so  
24 that if it needs to be reinstalled, they can't do  
25 it again, or is it going to be grandfathered in, or

1 is it going to be just outright prohibited?

2 MR. TRIAS: Well, if one has a valid permit

3 it's grandfathered in generally, so it's not like

4 this retroactive enforcement.

5 I don't know if there are any specific issues

6 that you're thinking or specific instances of

7 application of this artificial turf.

8 MS. ANDERSON: There is a specific instance in

9 which I'm thinking because I've seen it in the

10 front of a particular property. But historically

11 I've also seen where there's been a change in a

12 zoning code from many years ago, for instance, a

13 swing set in the front yard was permitted at one

14 point. Once the swing set rusted out and was

15 removed, you couldn't put it back again even though

16 you had a permit for it in the first instance.

17 MR. TRIAS: Well, I'm glad you mentioned that

18 because I'm working on those issues, and that's

19 coming next, swing sets and play houses and so on.

20 MS. ANDERSON: Right. So is it going to be

21 that type of instance where they have to when they

22 go to replace the turf they're not allowed to

23 replace the turf because now it's not allowed? Do

24 they have to re-pull a permit?

25 MR. TRIAS: Possibly, yeah. Clearly one

1 cannot speculate on the details without a specific

2 case. I mean, I think that the idea is to try to

3 not make it visible.

4 MS. ANDERSON: Right.

5 MR. TRIAS: However, we do have an option

6 that, you know, if there are no other -- if the

7 site conditions make it very difficult in other

8 locations to have grass, it can be approved by the

9 landscape department staff.

10 MS. ANDERSON: So if a permit wasn't pulled,

11 they now have to pull a permit?

12 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

13 MS. ANDERSON: Okay.

14 MR. BEHAR: And that's a code violation issue

15 and, yes, they would have to pull a permit?

16 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

17 MS. ANDERSON: Okay. Even though it's already

18 installed?

19 MR. TRIAS: Clearly we would have to look at

20 it on a case-by-case basis.

21 MS. ANDERSON: So --

22 MR. TRIAS: And in some cases the permit could

23 be given retroactively --

24 MS. ANDERSON: Right.

25 MR. TRIAS: -- if it's a reasonable

1 application, which I think most of the time the

2 ones that I've seen that I've been made aware of

3 they tend to be very reasonable, it was just that

4 they were done without permits.

5 MS. ANDERSON: Right. So I would suggest that

6 the courtesy notice then be given to those property

7 owners now that we have a clear provision and

8 they're going to have to pull a permit in order to

9 have that allowed.

10 MR. TRIAS: I think that the courtesy notice

11 is the code enforcement -

12 MS. ANDERSON: Norm.

13 MR. TRIAS: -- action. And I mean that

14 seriously, the first action is just to inform

15 there's a violation and that they can go ahead and

16 fix it.

17 MR. AIZENSTAT: So this will count towards the

18 green space that's required during the construction

19 of a home?

20 MR. TRIAS: Yes. And I think that it's

21 probably more relevant in the construction --

22 MR. AIZENSTAT: You were a little hesitant, it

23 took a little time, so I want to be clear on that.

24 MR. TRIAS: Well, let me be clear on that. It

25 won't be up to me. It will be up to the landscape

1 professionals to determine that it does comply with

2 the, let's say, previous requirements, if that is

3 one of the cases -- if that's the case.

4 MR. AIZENSTAT: It shouldn't be in the code

5 that dictates a percentage of the property or how

6 much you can?

7 The reason I ask is because of lot of the

8 properties in certain areas of the Coral Gables

9 work on septic tanks.

10 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

11 MR. AIZENSTAT: So when you start dealing with

12 septic tanks in areas, how are you going to -- how

13 are you also going to deal with the artificial

14 turf?

15 MR. BEHAR: Well, keep in mind that I would

16 say 99 percent of the septic tanks has to be the

17 front of the property, and this artificial turf is

18 not -- would not be allowed to be in the front

19 yard.

20 MR. AIZENSTAT: Go ahead.

21 MR. MANTECON: Artificial turf companies with

22 their septic tanks they also have a -- there's a

23 register that -- there's actually a mechanism to be

24 able to access septic tanks underneath artificial

25 turf.

1 MR. AIZENSTAT: Right. You're required to  
 2 have the lid or whatever it is either way, but --  
 3 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Behar is correct. I mean, 99  
 4 percent of the time that's not going to be an issue  
 5 based on the text.  
 6 MR. BEHAR: This is more for the rear yard,  
 7 you know, where it would be acceptable or not.  
 8 MR. TRIAS: Yes.  
 9 MR. BEHAR: I got one concern. I'm okay in  
 10 single family in the rear of the properties, you  
 11 know, with above, et cetera, et cetera. My concern  
 12 is all other zoning districts not allowed at the  
 13 ground level. I'm okay with that.  
 14 What I'm not okay is that in other locations,  
 15 for example, if you do -- and let's look at a mixed  
 16 use project that you got on the fifth level, on the  
 17 tenth level, whatever, you do have some amenities  
 18 area and you want to incorporate it, to be approved  
 19 by the public work landscape services division, I  
 20 don't think that at those location needs to be  
 21 approved by them. At the ground level I'm  
 22 100 percent okay with it.  
 23 MR. TRIAS: But, Mr. Behar, they do review the  
 24 landscape plans already. I mean, that's what that  
 25 really means, it's part of the normal review.

1 MR. BEHAR: They review landscape for plant  
 2 material, but I think -- and we've seen this, the  
 3 use of the artificial turf in those locations more  
 4 and more because, you know, as a maintenance,  
 5 especially when you're around a pool area.  
 6 MR. TRIAS: And it's approved, I think, all  
 7 the time.  
 8 MR. BEHAR: But I am subject to, you know,  
 9 their liking if they want to approve it or not.  
 10 MR. MANTECON: I agree. I think it should be  
 11 just approved at a level that's not at the ground  
 12 level on a mixed use project, on a commercial  
 13 project, et cetera.  
 14 MR. TRIAS: Maybe the phrasing is not clear  
 15 enough, but that was the intent in the sense that  
 16 it says, "in accordance with the open space  
 17 requirement," you know, whatever's in the code  
 18 already, and the review and approval --  
 19 MR. BEHAR: Upon review and approval.  
 20 MR. TRIAS: Which is what the code requires.  
 21 MR. BEHAR: But if they -- but when it comes  
 22 to landscape area, plant material, which I'm okay  
 23 with that, and you know, that in some cases the  
 24 input from the public service division, it's good.  
 25 I just don't think that the artificial turf at

1 those locations needs to be part of this process.  
 2 MR. MANTECON: Yeah, I think it should just  
 3 read more the way it says for the single family  
 4 residential where it says "allowed" as opposed to  
 5 "upon review and approval." I mean, maybe that  
 6 would clarify it.  
 7 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, we can -- I don't think it  
 8 was meant to be an extra step. I mean, I think  
 9 it's just the normal review step that takes place.  
 10 Maybe we need to make it more clear that that's  
 11 what it's meant to be.  
 12 MR. BEHAR: Because at the end of the day,  
 13 look, what's important to us I think it's the  
 14 ground level.  
 15 MR. TRIAS: Yes.  
 16 MR. BEHAR: To me that's what's important.  
 17 The upper level, which the public would not see, to  
 18 me is not important.  
 19 MR. TRIAS: We could stop after the zoning  
 20 code period and just say in "accordance with the  
 21 open space requirements of the zoning code,"  
 22 period.  
 23 MR. BEHAR: I'm okay with that. That would  
 24 be good. That's acceptable.  
 25 MR. TRIAS: That may be better.

1 MS. ANDERSON: I would agree with that.  
 2 MR. GRABIEL: I have one.  
 3 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yes, please.  
 4 MR. GRABIEL: The only -- I agree with this  
 5 whole thing and the changes. The only time that I  
 6 have used artificial grass on the ground floor is  
 7 when a client wants a driveway that is made of  
 8 stone or pavements separated by green. I've tried  
 9 for years to maintain the grass doing everything  
 10 possible, it never grows. It ends up being just  
 11 sand.  
 12 And I think we've discussed this before and we  
 13 said that maybe the option of allowing them, you  
 14 know, with a dimension of four, six inches,  
 15 whatever it is, using pavements would be allowed on  
 16 the ground floor.  
 17 I don't know how the rest of the board feels,  
 18 but I'd hate to see large driveways paved with  
 19 grass that is always gray and --  
 20 MR. AIZENSTAT: Sand.  
 21 MR. GRABIEL: -- sand.  
 22 MS. ANDERSON: It's a good point, very good  
 23 point.  
 24 MR. GRABIEL: Ramon?  
 25 MR. TRIAS: I think in that case I would tend

1 to interpret that as a pavement material more than  
2 a landscape material, and I think it probably can  
3 be approved as part of a driveway design.

4 MR. GRABIEL: Assuming, you know, the  
5 residents that want that look.

6 MR. TRIAS: Let me think about how to  
7 interpret that into the code. I mean, as you know  
8 the zoning code if you put too much information in  
9 it, it's not necessarily better. We're going to  
10 be --

11 MR. BEHAR: Really?

12 MR. TRIAS: I mean, we do have very tough  
13 professionals, some of them serve here on this  
14 board that design projects and they need to have  
15 flexibility, and then there's professional staff  
16 also. So it's not just the language of the code.  
17 But I think that in that case particularly I'm  
18 inclined to think that's really not landscaping.

19 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yeah, that's a very good point  
20 because, you know, what are the options if you're  
21 doing concrete in between? It's either sand, rock  
22 or artificial because grass won't grow in there.

23 MR. TRIAS: Or you may want to design, let's  
24 say, a granite band. I mean, that would be part of  
25 the pavement, not necessarily part of the

1 landscape, right? So let me work on -- yeah, let  
2 me take a look at it.

3 MR. GRABIEL: It gives residents an  
4 opportunity to do that.

5 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.

6 MR. BEHAR: Good point.

7 MR. MANTECON: I have two questions.

8 So what is the definition of rear yard? What  
9 defines rear yard versus side yard? Because it's  
10 kind of -- it's a little weird to have a -- you  
11 know, if you have a house --

12 MR. BEHAR: On a corner lot.

13 MR. MANTECON: -- on a corner lot or where  
14 the -- you know, where does it define -- I mean, in  
15 the rear yards typically are the ones where your  
16 grass doesn't grow because you've got, you know,  
17 smaller setbacks and you've got trees and stuff, et  
18 cetera.

19 MR. TRIAS: The short answer to that question  
20 is defined by the discussion that takes place  
21 between the applicant and the review person or the  
22 architect and the review person.

23 What happens is that there's no way to codify  
24 a rear yard definition that's going to work for  
25 every possible site. And all I'm saying is keep in

1 mind that all of this is implemented by highly  
2 trained professionals, both on the applicant side  
3 and the review side, and they deal with this issue  
4 all the time.

5 Now, my preference is to think of the rear  
6 yard of anything that is behind the building,  
7 actually behind the building. Some people may say,  
8 well, you know, that should be a little bit forward  
9 all the way to the front of the building, and  
10 that's where the gave and take takes places in the  
11 review process. That's normal, it happens most of  
12 the time. Yeah. And what happens is that if you  
13 read the definitions, basically that's what I'm  
14 describing to you.

15 Now, clearly we can have more text and be more  
16 precise and so on, but that is not going to make  
17 the code better, and I'm telling you that from a  
18 professional point of view. It's not a better code  
19 if you make it more specific because you can never  
20 put the code all the --

21 MR. MANTECON: That's why I'm asking because  
22 rear yard is defined as from the rear from the  
23 furthest point of the house to the rear fence or  
24 whatever, then I think you have a problem because  
25 then that's black and white and, you know, then

1 you're just going to have this weird --

2 MR. BEHAR: Demarcation line.

3 MR. MANTECON: -- demarcation in the backyard  
4 which --

5 MR. TRIAS: A recent example was that the side  
6 yard makes sense as artificial turf also in a  
7 recent example that I looked at, and that was  
8 approved. And in that case, for example, the rear  
9 in a general sense could be interpreted to include  
10 that side yard, for example.

11 MR. BEHAR: You're right, because you could  
12 have in the front of a house, you know, the  
13 setback, whatever, you could have a wall that you  
14 don't see, a screen that you don't see behind.

15 MR. TRIAS: Right.

16 MR. BEHAR: And the side yard could be part of  
17 it, you know.

18 MR. MANTECON: I just want to make sure that  
19 the, because I haven't read the definition of rear  
20 yard, that the rear yard isn't specific to the rear  
21 of the house and back.

22 MR. TRIAS: It says "an occupied area  
23 extending across the full width of the lot between  
24 the main building and the rear line of the lot."

25 Well, that as you can see is as close as we

1 get to a definition. So what I'm saying is please  
2 keep in mind the zoning code is just one of the  
3 information that is used, that you also have the  
4 professionals designing the building and the  
5 professionals reviewing it. There's always room  
6 for interpretation and to make a decision, yeah,  
7 that is part of the area that should or should not  
8 be used for artificial turf.

9 And if there's a disagreement there's an  
10 appeals process. You could appeal if you don't  
11 like it.

12 MR. BEHAR: Alex, in a single family instance  
13 I'm okay with the landscape, you know, review  
14 committee, whatever, you know, making those  
15 determinations because every case may be different.

16 You know, I think it would be very practical,  
17 you know, if it was a little more clear where it  
18 says even side yards or something could be included  
19 but, you know -- Ramon, do you feel comfortable  
20 that, you know, this should stay like this or  
21 should we maybe modify the language maybe slightly?

22 MR. TRIAS: I mean, the way I read this is  
23 that allow it in the rear yard, that's pretty clear  
24 it should be, and then all other locations are  
25 reviewed, and that's really the best way that I can

1 think of that allows for enough flexibility.

2 MR. BEHAR: And I've see instances where in a  
3 single family -- what I would not like to see is in  
4 a single family in the front yard, which you see as  
5 you drive, and I see it every day when I drive,  
6 okay, and it's the whole yard, it looks great  
7 because it looks manicured perfectly. But, you  
8 know, I don't want to see that throughout the city.

9 MR. TRIAS: It doesn't look great in the  
10 context of Coral Gables which is about  
11 authenticity, it's about landscape, it's about --  
12 let's keep that in mind also in the sense that if  
13 all of a sudden everything is artificial turf, then  
14 pretty soon we lose some of the most important  
15 qualities of the city.

16 MR. BEHAR: I agree.

17 MR. MANTECON: Then my last question is, is  
18 there already -- when you pull permits, I mean, one  
19 of our biggest things is percolation.

20 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

21 MR. MANTECON: There's different ways of  
22 installing this. I mean, is there a building code  
23 for installation of artificial turf that requires  
24 more rock versus sand. If you just go with  
25 compressed sand you have zero percolation versus,

1 you know, different types of materials.

2 MR. TRIAS: That is why we have the  
3 professional review by the landscape professionals  
4 because there's different types of grass, there's  
5 different qualities of grass, there's different  
6 percolation. I mean, it has to be reviewed.

7 MR. MANTECON: Okay.

8 MR. BEHAR: I'll make a motion to approve with  
9 the condition that we strike out the last sentence  
10 of No. 2, where it says "upon review and approval  
11 by the public work landscape service division," and  
12 I welcome whatever other comment from board members  
13 to the motion.

14 MR. AIZENSTAT: Before we do that, is there  
15 anybody here that would like to speak on this  
16 subject matter? No?

17 Is there a second to Robert?

18 MR. MANTECON: I'll second it.

19 MR. BEHAR: Any friendly amendment to the  
20 motion?

21 MS. ANDERSON: Just clarifying for the record  
22 that you meant after the comma in that second  
23 sentence --

24 MR. BEHAR: Yes.

25 MS. ANDERSON: -- not the entire second

1 sentence?

2 MR. BEHAR: Correct. Correct. You're  
3 correct. That's why we have attorneys here on the  
4 board.

5 MS. ANDERSON: Hey.

6 MR. AIZENSTAT: So we have --

7 MR. BEHAR: A motion.

8 MR. AIZENSTAT: -- a motion, a second. Any  
9 discussion?

10 MS. ANDERSON: No.

11 MR. AIZENSTAT: Having heard none, call the  
12 role please.

13 THE CLERK: Maria Velez?

14 MS. VELEZ: Yes.

15 THE CLERK: Rhonda Anderson?

16 MS. ANDERSON: Yes.

17 THE CLERK: Robert Behar?

18 MR. BEHAR: Yes.

19 THE CLERK: Julio Grabiell?

20 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.

21 THE CLERK: Alex Mantecon?

22 MR. MANTECON: Yes.

23 THE CLERK: Eibi Aizenstat?

24 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yes.

25 At this time -- actually, before I'd like -- I

1 want to thank first the applicant for E-1 for  
2 standing by. I do appreciate it.

3 At this time I'm going to recuse myself, not  
4 that I agree that I should recuse myself, but the  
5 city attorney has advised that it's probably  
6 prudent that I do because the proximity of my home.

7 Seeing that the vice chair is not here, which  
8 would be Maria Menendez, I would like to ask Robert  
9 if he would continue the meeting?

10 MR. BEHAR: Sure.

11 MR. AIZENSTAT: For Item E-1 given his  
12 experience and tenure on the board. And thank you  
13 very much.

14 MR. BEHAR: Thank you.

15 MR. AIZENSTAT: Please note for the timestamp  
16 that I left at 7:10.

17 MR. BEHAR: Thank you. I guess this is a  
18 first but we'll do it.

19 Mr. Attorney, can you read that item on the  
20 record for the record, please.

21 MR. COLLIER: Yes. Item E-1, an Ordinance of  
22 the City Commission of Coral Gables, Florida  
23 requesting conditional use review for a building  
24 site determination pursuant to zoning code, Article  
25 3, development reviews, Section 3-206, building

1 site determination to separate into two single  
2 family building sites on the property zoned single  
3 family residential district, legally described as  
4 Lots 10 through 18, Block 236, Coral Gables  
5 Riviera, Section Part II, 601 Sunset Drive, one  
6 building site consisting of Lots 13, 14, and 15,  
7 east parcel, and the other building site consisting  
8 of Lot 16, 17 and 18, west parcel including  
9 required conditions, providing for a repealer  
10 provision, providing for a severability clause, and  
11 providing for an effective date. Item E-1, public  
12 hearing.

13 MR. BEHAR: Thank you.

14 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, the request is to do  
15 a building site separation at the end of a block  
16 that is facing Sunset and it's bound by Tordera and  
17 Almansa Street. As you can see in the existing  
18 plat there are six platted lots and the applicant  
19 is proposing to make two parcels with three lots  
20 each.

21 There's a house, there's an existing house  
22 over the whole property right now and that is the  
23 way the house looks. The request as the  
24 chairman -- as the attorney explained, is the  
25 create two parcels, and you can see how that looks

1 in the site.

2 The parcels would front Sunset and the access  
3 for automobile would be on the side street, so from  
4 many points of view it implements some of the ideas  
5 that you have worked on so hard for the past year  
6 or so as you worked on the improvement of the  
7 single family regulations. This is I think a very  
8 good examples of that.

9 The existing land use and the zoning is single  
10 family, and there's no change, there's no proposed  
11 changed for any of that. And as the applicant will  
12 explain later on, they have prepared two very  
13 different custom designs for each parcel, and they  
14 have preserved the trees, the existing trees. It's  
15 a very sensitive design as you can see with a full  
16 landscape plan.

17 There are very different houses. They're  
18 compatible with the scale of the neighborhood, and  
19 they do preserve the existing open space.

20 The applicant will go into more detail as far  
21 as the architecture, but this is to give you a  
22 sense of the design. As you know, one of the  
23 conditions is to have two houses fully designed and  
24 that is part of the review and approval process.

25 Now, the timeline that the DRC, the

1 Development Review Committee, took place in  
2 September of 2018, and then there was a  
3 neighborhood meeting in December, and today we are  
4 dealing with the planning and zoning meeting.

5 Public notice, the neighborhood meeting, it  
6 was noticed. Also there was a courtesy  
7 notification mailed to property owners within a  
8 thousand feet. The property was posted. There was  
9 a legal ad and there was also the posting of the  
10 agenda on the city web page and also here at city  
11 hall, and the staff report was also posted on the  
12 web page.

13 And that's what we had talked about before,  
14 there's additional ways to get the word out and  
15 posting and so on than what's required by the code.

16 This gives you a sense of the 1,000 radius,  
17 the 1,000-foot radius that received the mailed  
18 notice. And here we have the site information.  
19 The current frontage is 200 feet so therefore there  
20 will be two 100-foot parcels. The depth is 154,  
21 and the site area would be 15,500 for each, and the  
22 building floor area would be no more than what's  
23 the maximum allowed now. So that's another one of  
24 the conditions which is very typical condition.

25 The reviewed criteria as you know if very



1 difficult to meet, but in this case the applicant  
2 satisfies the size, the area of the lot  
3 requirement. It also explains the exceptional  
4 circumstances and that's also satisfied.

5 As I mentioned before they preserve open space  
6 and promotes a compatible design with the  
7 neighborhood. And then they need to satisfy three  
8 of the other four criteria, and three of them are  
9 satisfied; the building site created would have a  
10 frontage equal or larger than the existing building  
11 sites within the 1,000-foot radius, that the  
12 building site would not result in any  
13 nonconforming -- any structure becoming  
14 nonconforming, and that no restrictive covenants or  
15 encroachments or easements exist. Those are  
16 satisfied.

17 The fourth condition is that the site is owned  
18 for longer than ten years by the property owner.  
19 That is not satisfied, but you only have to satisfy  
20 three of the four, so the criteria is met.  
21 Therefore staff recommends approval with  
22 conditions, and the conditions are the typical  
23 conditions. See here that we have that the square  
24 footage of the residence allowed by the separated  
25 building sites will not be more than the one

1 allowed in one site. As you know, when you divide  
2 it sometimes you're able to do more, and that they  
3 should follow the zoning requirements, that the  
4 plans attached will be part of the application, the  
5 plans that the applicant will present, and that a  
6 bond shall be required to ensure a timely removal  
7 of any nonconforming as a result of the building  
8 site separation approvals.

9 That is the end of my presentation. I believe  
10 the applicant has a power point.

11 MR. BEHAR: Before we open to the applicant,  
12 can you go back to the timeline that you presented  
13 to us, the city review timeline?

14 MR. TRIAS: This one or that one? This one.

15 MR. BEHAR: This one. In this staff report  
16 you showed the Board of Architects, that they went  
17 to the Board of Architects.

18 MR. TRIAS: They did. That is missing in  
19 this. It's a typo.

20 MR. BEHAR: But they did comply.

21 MR. TRIAS: They did go to the board, yes.

22 MR. BEHAR: Okay. Thank you.

23 Let me go ahead then open it to the applicant.

24 MR. NAVARRO: Good evening, Mr. Chair,  
25 congratulations. Board members, happy new year.

1 For the record, my name is Jorge Navarro with  
2 offices at 333 Southeast Second Avenue. With me  
3 this evening is my colleague, Ms. Devon Vickers,  
4 and our project architect, Reinaldo Borges from  
5 Borges & Associates.

6 It's my pleasure to be here before you this  
7 evening to present this project. It is an  
8 application that not only revitalizes a piece of  
9 property that's been neglected and abandoned for  
10 some time, but also furthers the city's initiative  
11 which was recently done to improve abandoned and  
12 foreclosed properties.

13 Many of you may be familiar with this property  
14 at 601 Sunset Drive. It's a property that has made  
15 the headlines for all the wrong reasons. It's been  
16 in the news stories and articles and the topic of  
17 various city's meetings due to the poor condition  
18 of the home, several issues with squatters and  
19 recent foreclosure proceedings. And I'd like to  
20 just say for the record, that all of this happened  
21 before my client purchased the property. We're  
22 here before you this evening with clean hands.

23 But as a result of this and with the help of  
24 your city attorney's office who did a fantastic job  
25 throughout that process, the city commission and

1 the city attorney's office created a process where  
2 they would go and make sure that these properties  
3 that were going through the foreclosure process and  
4 were being neglected by owners, that the bank had  
5 some skin in the game, and they went after them and  
6 made sure that they put liens, and they initiated  
7 their own enforcement proceedings to make sure that  
8 people would take care of these properties.

9 And as a result of this ordinance that was  
10 passed, my client had the opportunity to purchase  
11 this property, and since then he has cleaned it,  
12 he's maintained it, he's brought it up to code, and  
13 unfortunately due to all the issues that have  
14 happened, the property's in very poor condition.  
15 This is a property that was originally constructed  
16 in the 1960s and it has structural issues and, you  
17 know, due to the squatters the interior of the  
18 property is no longer salvageable.

19 In lieu of this we have proposed to take this  
20 very large site, it's currently 31,000 square feet,  
21 so about seven-tenths of an acre, and we are  
22 proposing to subdivide this lot into two  
23 15,000-square foot lots with 100 feet of frontage.  
24 And this condition, as you'll see, is the same  
25 condition that exists all along the north side of

1 Sunset. This is only one of two properties that  
2 have more than 20,000 square feet. The other one's  
3 an institutional use. So it's the only single  
4 family lot that has more than 20,000 square feet on  
5 Sunset Drive that's comprised of six platted lots.  
6 So this property actually has six underlying lots.

7 Our program, as you'll see here, is to combine  
8 three of the lots, and three of the lots to create  
9 two independent building sites, which is very  
10 similar in size as to what you see in this  
11 neighborhood.

12 The 15,000-square foot lots are larger than 85  
13 percent of the lots within this neighborhood and  
14 within this plat. So this is very compatible with  
15 what's there. And in lieu of building one very  
16 large home, a McMansion, we're proposing to build  
17 two more modest homes which we believe are going to  
18 be very consistent with the existing development  
19 trend and also create that pattern of development  
20 that you see along Sunset Drive.

21 With that I'd like to present Reinaldo so that  
22 he can walk you through the plan. It's important  
23 to highlight that these homes are being built fully  
24 in compliant with your zoning code. We're not  
25 asking for any rezoning, any variances. In fact,

1 we have less lot coverage and less building height  
2 than would normally be allowed. And as Reinaldo  
3 will discuss, we've gone through great efforts with  
4 your planning and zoning director to make sure that  
5 we're preserving onsite resources and maintaining  
6 open space.

7 So with that I'll turn over the microphone to  
8 Reinaldo and I'm here to answer any questions that  
9 you may have.

10 MR. BORGES: Thank you, Jorge.

11 Reinaldo Borges, for the record, Borges &  
12 Associates. I'm here with my partner, Alice  
13 Dahbura, and the project architect, Luis Gabriel.

14 So I'll walk you briefly through the project  
15 since it's a bit late in the day and then open it  
16 for questions. I think both Ramon and Jorge gave  
17 you already good insight into the project.

18 You know, we have by the nature of the  
19 clarification here to design two very unique  
20 residences that cannot be mirror images of each  
21 other, same prototypes. So you can see that the  
22 characteristic of the homes are quite different,  
23 the spacing, the distancing, the conformity with  
24 the setbacks.

25 We've also taken a very careful look at the

1 existing tree canopy scenario in the site. We  
2 started with our arborist doing a very careful  
3 report on the existing trees that we were to really  
4 protect and preserve. The trees that you notice  
5 with a dot where the trunk would be are the ones  
6 that are really specimen trees that we're keeping,  
7 and we basically have designed around these trees  
8 to make sure that we are maintaining the distancing  
9 from the root structure and make sure that those  
10 trees remain very healthy. We also have a tree  
11 protection plan that's been submitted already to  
12 the city.

13 You will see that, you know, if you look at  
14 the tree mitigation plan and preservation strategy  
15 we're keeping everything that is really significant  
16 from oak trees to gumbo limbos and such. There are  
17 lot of palm trees that are really not worth  
18 preserving and we're replanting a lot of new very  
19 rich material. So the landscaping will really be  
20 fantastic, you know, to really dress up these  
21 homes.

22 You can see the massing here, the two houses  
23 fronting Sunset. Wanted to make sure that both  
24 houses would have their distinguished main  
25 entrance, you know, fronting Sunset. There's a

1 very low wall really to provide a protective  
2 barrier anticipating that these would be homes with  
3 children and families and such. But as you know,  
4 there's really no allowance for any significant  
5 permanent wall around these homes.

6 There's a pool barrier issue related to code  
7 and things like that that are also resolved.

8 And the two entrances to the garages are on  
9 the side streets. You see the massing from the  
10 opposite corner. And then, you know, they're four  
11 bedroom homes, very flexible open spaces in the  
12 ground floor, you know, service facilities for the  
13 maids and, you know, home office that could be also  
14 convertible to a guest room, bedrooms upstairs  
15 primarily with a grand master bedroom suite.

16 We're also conforming to all the heights  
17 associated with your codes, and we did receive our  
18 preliminary approval from the Board of Architects,  
19 and we'll come back for a final approval once these  
20 plans get more detailed.

21 As you can see the extensive process to get to  
22 this point to get this lot split is pretty  
23 significant. The city is very careful to make sure  
24 that this is done properly. These are the side  
25 facades here, and the facades towards the rear.

1 Again, the houses are compatible in terms of  
2 their language. They do have some stone applied to  
3 them, nothing artificial, everything is going to be  
4 natural materials. And we're still in that process  
5 of process selecting all the final materials with  
6 our client.

7 You saw the aerials and the parcel split.  
8 Existing home, you've seen that already, and our  
9 strategy for splitting the house.

10 So the sequential nature of this PDF that I'm  
11 showing you now basically is repetitive because I'm  
12 showing you two different homes, and in both cases  
13 I wanted to show you the context of the two houses  
14 together.

15 This is the plan of the second home that you  
16 can see really is more of a courtyard house in a  
17 way that really forms itself around the pool, and  
18 the nature of the site kind of allowed for that  
19 based on the placement of trees and so on.

20 And so you've got the four bedroom upstairs  
21 with wonderful outdoor terraces and, you know, just  
22 a lot of opportunities to enjoy this beautiful  
23 neighborhood.

24 So, you know, with that -- and these are more  
25 technical facade drawings.

1 I will probably leave it then open for  
2 questions, if any. So that's the conclusion of my  
3 presentation. Thank you.

4 MR. BEHAR: And that concludes your  
5 presentation at this point?

6 MR. NAVARRO: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
7 That concludes our presentation. We're here to  
8 answer any questions, and if possible, I'd like to  
9 save a few minutes for rebuttal if needed.

10 Thank you very much.

11 MR. BEHAR: I'm going to go ahead at this  
12 point open it up to the board. Julio, do you want  
13 to start?

14 MR. COLLIER: Do we have anybody in the  
15 audience?

16 MR. BEHAR: Sorry. Have you signed in?  
17 Jill, can we call them up, please.

18 THE CLERK: Diane Landsberg.

19 MR. BEHAR: I think both work.

20 MS. LANDSBERG: Thank you. Hi. Good evening.  
21 I've been a resident, I've lived in my home  
22 for almost 50 years in the same house that's kind  
23 of caddy-corner across from this place, and I'm  
24 just here interested to know what's going up.

25 I did go to the neighborhood meeting. They

1 arrived late and I couldn't stay very long, so I  
2 didn't hear everything that was going on with this  
3 property and what they were planning to do, so  
4 that's why when I did get the notice like ten days  
5 ago, which from this -- for this meeting, I think,  
6 so I'm just really here just to find out what's  
7 really going on.

8 I personally don't like design because I don't  
9 think it fits with the Old Gables, but that's just  
10 me personally. It's irrelevant. That's just my  
11 taste. But I'm really here just to find out what  
12 is going on.

13 I understand as far as the design, I think  
14 it's kind of strange that the front door is on  
15 Sunset, but you don't -- I don't know how you get  
16 into that front door, you know, because it's not  
17 the front of the house really, it's designed like  
18 that but it seems kind of strange to me. But,  
19 again, that's a design thing.

20 So I'm just really here to see what's going on  
21 in my neighborhood.

22 MR. BEHAR: And you feel comfortable that what  
23 you heard today about what's going in your  
24 neighborhood?

25 MS. LANDSBERG: I think that the houses are

1 too close together. I mean, I wouldn't want to  
2 look out of my second story bedroom and see  
3 something that's about where that TV is, you know I  
4 wouldn't, you know, personally. You know, and  
5 again that doesn't make sense to me.

6 But, you know, and most of the houses on that  
7 side of the street are smaller than on the side  
8 that I live on. But, you know, I'm just curious  
9 where's the trash pit going to go? Because my, you  
10 know, it's on Sunset, you know, is it going to be  
11 on the side streets or something? Because you got  
12 to consider that.

13 But, you know, just -- I really just want to  
14 see what's going on. So I appreciate the  
15 opportunity.

16 MS. ANDERSON: They may choose not to have a  
17 trash pit too.

18 MS. LANDSBERG: Pardon?

19 MS. ANDERSON: They may choose to have their  
20 landscaper taking it off and not have a trash pit.

21 MS. LANDSBERG: Yeah, I mean, they've talked  
22 about the trees, and I'm all for saving all the  
23 trees, you know, in that sense, so that's  
24 important.

25 You know, but again, I built onto my house, I

1 built a pool and I know how important zoning is and  
2 all of the steps, and I've been through this  
3 process. So I know that it's quite lengthy with  
4 everything, and we appreciate the idea.

5 I mean, I love living in the Gables because of  
6 this management and ensuring that quality is built,  
7 and consistency, and you know, safety in mind also  
8 because of the hurricanes and the zoning and code  
9 enforcement where it's gone. So I appreciate  
10 everything that you do to really continue to keep  
11 the value of our homes.

12 And I pay a lot of taxes, but not as much as  
13 everyone else because I've lived there so long.

14 Thank you.

15 MR. BEHAR: Thank you. You're lucky.

16 Next speaker, please.

17 THE CLERK: Mark Leban.

18 I don't think he was sworn in.

19 MR. BEHAR: Could you swear him in.

20 THE COURT REPORTER: Yes, sir.

21 Please raise your right hand.

22 Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole  
23 truth and nothing but the truth?

24 MR. LEBAN: Before I begin --

25 MR. BEHAR: Speak to the microphone, please.

1 MR. LEBAN: Could you show up there compatible  
2 homes that you had up for a second or two?

3 MR. BORGES: The existing homes?

4 MR. LEBAN: The existing homes just to the  
5 north. I think you had one.

6 MR. BEHAR: Speak to the microphone, if you  
7 don't mind.

8 MR. LEBAN: I will.

9 I thought I saw one. You mentioned something  
10 about the compatibility with the neighboring homes.

11 My name is Mark King Leban, I'm a retired  
12 circuit judge. I've lived in 6916 Almansa Street,  
13 three houses behind the east parcel for 35 years  
14 this April.

15 I don't have a strong objection, I'll tell you  
16 that. What's certainly an eyesore is what's there  
17 now, and I commend any landowner who proposes to  
18 enhance the neighborhood.

19 My comments though deal with a couple of  
20 things that I heard here, and I just want to voice  
21 my concern. This is a McMansion, two McMansions,  
22 in my opinion, and it is not compatible, the design  
23 itself, with the surrounding neighborhood with my  
24 humble home at 6916. It reminds of a home that's  
25 across the street on Sunset that I like to call the

1 public library. It actually looks like a, you  
2 know, public facility which obviously passed muster  
3 here. So I'm not saying we shouldn't have similar  
4 homes, but it is not at all compatible with the  
5 design that I saw with the homes that I've lived --  
6 the home that I live in in my surrounding  
7 neighborhood.

8 The mention was made of the foliage and the  
9 existing trees. I would wonder what the people  
10 immediately -- they're not here, I can't speak for  
11 them, would say who live right behind each of those  
12 parcels. Certainly the neighbor who lives directly  
13 behind on the east side, two houses away from me  
14 would be horrified to see this McMansion literally  
15 ten feet in his backyard, but he's not here.

16 There was some denigration, if you will, of  
17 palm trees. Palm trees are our life blood  
18 everywhere in South Florida, including Coral  
19 Gables. I have approximately 50 palms and other  
20 varieties of palms in my home. But that's neither  
21 here nor there because we don't have to have palms  
22 to make a house beautiful.

23 My only objection is to the scale of it, and I  
24 don't think that it's compatible with my  
25 neighborhood, and I'm hoping something could be

1 done. I'm not saying to change it completely, but  
2 to me it looks like it certainly isn't what George  
3 Merrick had in mind.

4 Any questions?

5 MR. BEHAR: Okay. Thank you very much.

6 Any other speaker?

7 Okay. Then we're going to close the public  
8 hearing. Let's get it to open up to the board.

9 Julio?

10 MR. GRABIEL: Mr. Borges, just a minor point,  
11 you did not give your address when you addressed  
12 the board.

13 MR. BORGES: Okay. So our offices are at 999  
14 Brickell, Suite 700.

15 MR. GRABIEL: We don't miss anything.

16 MR. BORGES: City of Miami, 33131.

17 MR. GRABIEL: The trees, could you go through  
18 the landscaping plan again. I wasn't sure if I  
19 understood how much of the trees are staying.

20 MR. BORGES: So in your packages you have more  
21 information on the landscaping, you actually even  
22 have a planting list with all our trees being  
23 planted, and there's a lot of specificity there.

24 The nature of this slide doesn't have a lot of  
25 the high resolution to really identify all the

1 trees for you. But most of the ones with the red  
2 dots are live oaks, and there's a also pretty  
3 significant --

4 MS. ANDERSON: Which tab are you referring to  
5 for the foliage and the tree list?

6 MR. BORGES: Well, we submitted the project by  
7 sheets, not tabs.

8 MS. VELEZ: Tab 3.

9 MR. BEHAR: We're looking for the landscape  
10 plan that you're referring to, right?

11 MR. GRABIEL: Yeah.

12 MS. VELEZ: I see under Tab 3 the existing --

13 MR. TRIAS: The survey, the survey is on  
14 Tab 3, at the first page, and that survey has a  
15 description of the existing trees.

16 MR. BORGES: Yeah, so the survey does describe  
17 the existing trees, and then if you look at all the  
18 L sheets, L-100, this starts -- this is our  
19 disposition plan and that shows you the list of  
20 trees, what is being removed, and what is being  
21 kept.

22 MR. BEHAR: I don't see an L sheet on mine.

23 MR. TRIAS: If you keep going, the whole  
24 package, the 11 by 17 that is folded --

25 MR. BORGES: Do you not have the L sheets?

1 MR. TRIAS: Some site plans that are --

2 MS. ANDERSON: L what?

3 MR. BORGES: It's L-100, L-200 and L-300.

4 MS. ANDERSON: I have some A dash numbers.

5 MR. BEHAR: I don't believe I have any L

6 drawings, landscape drawings in my package.

7 MS. ANDERSON: No. There's no large folded  
8 sheets in mine with a prefix of L.

9 MR. TRIAS: I think you're correct, I think  
10 that the landscape sheets were not included in the  
11 submittal, however, the site plan does show some of  
12 the trees.

13 MR. BORGES: I have them here, I could share  
14 if you want to glance at them. Yes?

15 MR. BEHAR: Sure.

16 MS. ANDERSON: Yes.

17 MS. VELEZ: I'm looking at the survey under  
18 Tab 3, and it does -- there are some very mature  
19 trees on there, there's some oak trees with a  
20 40-foot canopy and 25-foot height, 30-foot height.

21 Are those being maintained?

22 MR. BORGES: Yes.

23 MS. VELEZ: And there's a banyan, there's also  
24 a large banyan with a 50-foot height.

25 MR. BORGES: Yes.

1 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, I think the  
2 applicant forgot to include the L sheets on the  
3 package you got. We do have it on file, and I  
4 think they have it also for the presentation.

5 MR. BORGES: So, you know, it says normal now.  
6 In most municipalities we start with a very careful  
7 tree report with a certified arborist, and then we  
8 work closely with a landscape architect to make  
9 sure that we're keeping everything that's  
10 significant.

11 And then we're planting. There are many, many  
12 palm trees and other species that are being  
13 planted. I mean, the whole landscape scheme is  
14 going to be quite rich for this project. And in  
15 these renderings that you see that we've shown the  
16 two homes, they don't have all the trees in the  
17 foreground because you wouldn't really see the  
18 houses if we were to place those trees. You can  
19 see those better in the plan that's on the screen  
20 right now.

21 MR. GRABIEL: I like the project. I think  
22 it's preferred to have two homes than allow one  
23 extremely large home that would be allowed on that  
24 site. And if it has followed every zoning  
25 requirement and has been approved by the Board of

1 Architects I don't see any problem with this  
2 project at all. I think it's actually an  
3 improvement eliminating the driveway coming out on  
4 Sunset, which you have right now, and can be a  
5 problem with that street.

6 MR. BEHAR: Okay how about Alex?

7 MR. MANTECON: I mean, I think the project is  
8 great. I think it's -- you know, I think with  
9 relation to the neighborhood I think by right they  
10 can build over 10,000 square feet, and instead --  
11 which would be massive and really different from  
12 the rest of the neighborhood to his concern.

13 I think, you know, the two smaller homes would  
14 definitely be more compatible with the existing  
15 neighborhood. And also, you know, I think the  
16 traffic is an issue on Sunset and getting those  
17 driveways off of Sunset I think is an important  
18 factor as well, you know, backing people up as, you  
19 know, people are coming in or out of the house, et  
20 cetera.

21 You know, I think they've done a great job,  
22 you know, with the amount of tree canopy,  
23 maintaining everything that's going to be in there,  
24 and, actually, it's refreshing to see how the  
25 architecture actually goes around the existing tree

1 canopy as opposed to relocating or moving so many  
2 trees. They're actually cognizant of it and  
3 actually building the houses around what the tree  
4 canopy permits.

5 MR. GRABIEL: I do have another question, if I  
6 may?

7 MR. BEHAR: Go ahead.

8 MR. GRABIEL: I think one of the requirements  
9 from staff is that you do not build more in the two  
10 homes than it's allowed in a single home, and  
11 that's -- if I read it right, maximum allowable in  
12 the single lot would be 10,450, yet you're  
13 proposing two houses of 5800 square feet which  
14 would be more.

15 MR. BORGES: We're going to need to implement  
16 a dietary plan as we move forward to final to the  
17 Board of Architects.

18 MR. GRABIEL: So you are agreeing --

19 MR. BORGES: Yes, of course.

20 MR. GRABIEL: -- and conforming to homes of  
21 5,225 --

22 MR. BORGES: Yeah.

23 MR. BEHAR: That is a staff condition.

24 MS. VELEZ: Yes.

25 MR. BORGES: Yes. And I think it's actually

1 in the code --

2 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, the conditional use process  
3 is used for this request, and that is a typical  
4 condition that is applied every time.

5 MR. BEHAR: Okay. Maria?

6 MS. VELEZ: I am usually opposed to lot  
7 splits. I'm happy to see that this is a very large  
8 lot and that the frontage is 100. I think it's  
9 fine. So I have no objection on that end.

10 I do have a question. This house sits on  
11 several of the lots, the existing house. Most  
12 times when we have a house like this in the Gables  
13 we have a decoration of restrictive covenant that  
14 has been filed by the owner. Is that the situation  
15 here? Do we have one here? And if so, how do we  
16 get around that?

17 MR. NAVARRO: That's a very good question and  
18 we've been working with staff on that. There's  
19 actually two items. So normally when you create a  
20 building site -- this house was built in the '60s,  
21 this single family home was built in the '60s,  
22 that's when building site is created and the unity  
23 of title is done. In this particular case it's  
24 very interesting. The unity of title was not until  
25 almost 30-plus years later when they went to go do

1 a small patio addition.

2 MS. VELEZ: That's typical in these homes that  
3 they're not there at the beginning, but when you do  
4 make an addition, you are required to sign a unity  
5 of title.

6 MR. NAVARRO: Correct. So the unity of title  
7 was done at the time they did a small patio  
8 addition, so it does not apply necessarily to the  
9 principal structure.

10 MR. TRIAS: The question was, what is the  
11 process to change it, and this is the process.

12 MS. VELEZ: What happened --

13 MR. TRIAS: This is the process. The process,  
14 plan, zoning and commission approval of the  
15 conditional use process for the building site  
16 separation.

17 MS. VELEZ: So if we are to approve the lot  
18 split we are in essence deleting and making nothing  
19 of an existing covenant.

20 MR. TRIAS: Well, it has to be eliminated or  
21 modified in a legal way, but the process to do it  
22 is the process we're going through right now.

23 MS. VELEZ: But we would be deleting an  
24 existing covenant?

25 MR. NAVARRO: Yeah, and at the point we will

1 come in and do two new unities unifying the three  
2 lots that are going comprise the two new building  
3 sites, and at that point we'll have two fresh  
4 unities of title which are more in line with the  
5 city's current language of the unities of title  
6 which are much more restrictive than the one that  
7 we have from the '80s.

8 MS. VELEZ: I think I would like to have had  
9 that information in my packet. That's just my  
10 comment on that.

11 Thank you.

12 MR. NAVARRO: We had a very long letter of  
13 intent, that it was buried in there but...

14 MS. VELEZ: I think it's important that we're  
15 aware that we're made aware of any restrictive  
16 covenants that apply to any parcels that we are  
17 dealing with, especially on a situation like this.

18 MS. ANDERSON: I was looking for it as well.  
19 This mentions it, but we don't the language, we  
20 don't a copy of it.

21 MS. VELEZ: Yeah. Many times we do get a copy  
22 not only of the deed or the certificate of title,  
23 like in this instance, but we have been supplied in  
24 other situations with copies of covenants that  
25 affect the property. I think that's vital to our

1 deliberations.

2 MR. NAVARRO: Yeah, it took us some time to

3 dust off that copy because of the distressed nature

4 of this property. It's gone through several

5 different many court proceedings so the title was

6 not as clean when we got it. But we were able to

7 finally dust it off and find it.

8 And the way it reads is it was from the '80s.

9 MR. TRIAS: So it should be included when it

10 goes to the commission as the background material.

11 MR. COLLIER: Excuse me. I'm sorry. I didn't

12 mean to interrupt you. Isn't it included in this

13 notebook.

14 MR. NAVARRO: I think it's reference with

15 recording book and page. It may not be attached,

16 but it's part of the public record.

17 MR. BEHAR: Rhonda?

18 MS. ANDERSON: Yeah, I'll continue. I was

19 just waiting for the copy of the tree plan to

20 arrive.

21 MR. NAVARRO: I'm being told it's Tab 2 under

22 statement of use so --

23 MS. ANDERSON: The covenant or the trees?

24 MR. NAVARRO: No, it's just the recording

25 information for the covenant. But in the letter of

1 intent, Tab 2, you have the letter of intent we

2 discussed, the compliance of the criteria, it's

3 referenced in there.

4 MR. TRIAS: So if you could add the actual

5 document --

6 MR. NAVARRO: Yeah.

7 MR. TRIAS: -- that would be very helpful.

8 MS. VELEZ: Thank you.

9 MS. ANDERSON: So for future submissions can

10 we please have this included at the time so we can

11 actually have an opportunity to study it.

12 MR. BORGES: Well, we submitted that as part

13 of our submittal, right?

14 MR. TRIAS: Right. And I think that the

15 applicant just forgot to include it --

16 MS. ANDERSON: Yeah, with the binders.

17 MR. TRIAS: -- and it's just not here.

18 MR. NAVARRO: The landscape drawings may have

19 come separately.

20 MR. TRIAS: It's not here, Reinaldo, I'm sure

21 you intended to include it, but it's just not here.

22 MR. BORGES: And also this is the one for

23 house two.

24 MR. COLLIER: What page is the reference to on

25 that?

1 MS. VELEZ: Page 5.

2 MR. COLLIER: Page 5.

3 MS. VELEZ: Uh-huh. I had actually marked it.

4 MS. ANDERSON: Although I said that I'd like

5 to have this ahead of time, I do applaud the

6 efforts have been made to preserve the specimen

7 trees on the lot, and although palm trees I know

8 are an important part of our canopy, when they need

9 to be moved, I mean, you can donate them to folks

10 that can use them if it's feasible to do so. It's

11 not always feasible to do so. So I applaud your

12 efforts in preserving this tree canopy as much as

13 possible. I just ask that you take special note to

14 the root systems as well on some of these trees.

15 There are specific ordinances now dealing with

16 roots two inches of diameter and more that would

17 have to be addressed with the city.

18 MR. BORGES: Yes, and we've been working with

19 the city architect and that came up also during the

20 Board of Architects process, and we're working

21 carefully to make sure we conform to that.

22 MS. ANDERSON: And as far as the members of

23 the audience that are talking about the building

24 design and the architect itself, the Board of

25 Architects would be the more appropriate venue to

1 express your concerns with the compatibility with

2 the neighborhood as far as the architecture itself.

3 As far as the diet plan for the square footage

4 on this, is it the intent to give more of a setback

5 in the rear on the adjacent properties or the side

6 properties depending on which way you look at this

7 lot?

8 MR. BORGES: So, look, in both houses we had

9 designed them to be below the allowable FAR, so

10 once we learned about this condition we really

11 haven't had a chance to sit with our client and

12 kind of work through that. But we would really

13 reduce the house in a way that it doesn't lose any

14 of its, you know, features and its qualities. In

15 some cases it could add to the front, the front has

16 some.

17 Like the pool, the one that has the courtyard

18 and the pool in the courtyard format, we may add

19 space to that. I mean, we really haven't studied

20 that, so I don't have any clear idea of how we're

21 going to reduce the square footage at the moment.

22 MS. ANDERSON: Right. I'm just responding to

23 the resident's comment about the closeness to the

24 adjacent home, and as homes get closer and closer

25 together it does affect the quality of a

1 neighborhood.

2 MR. BORGES: Right. Yeah. I think she was  
3 referring to the two houses side by side and the  
4 distance between them, and what we had done already  
5 as part of our process was that we increased that  
6 setback. If you look at our site plan we have  
7 actually increased the setback of one of the houses  
8 to increase that space in between.

9 And if you look at the landscape plan, there's  
10 a lot of landscape density in between the two  
11 houses that are going to really create a sense of  
12 privacy and lush tropical landscape in between the  
13 two houses. So you really in most cases are not  
14 going to see your neighbor. You're going to see a  
15 lot of beautiful green outside your window.

16 MR. BEHAR: Is that also -- let me -- because  
17 you're showing a couple of the oak trees, existing  
18 oak trees that you're preserving, you had to move  
19 the houses closer together, is that the reason you  
20 did that?

21 MR. BORGES: Well, so in terms of the site --

22 MR. BEHAR: Because you see right now you see  
23 the red dots that you have on both lots --

24 MR. BORGES: Yes.

25 MR. BEHAR: -- I guess that's -- I mean, I

1 would look at it one of the reasons they had to  
2 come closer in the center.

3 MR. BORGES: Well, in a way not really because  
4 that really created a challenge for the way we laid  
5 out the pool and make sure we don't put a pool  
6 right under a tree and things like that. So it  
7 kind of affected the way we did the backyard design  
8 on the house that we call House 2.

9 And then, you know, the other house, the trees  
10 really affected the way we were working the schemes  
11 out, you know, but I don't know that they really  
12 compress, this is between the two houses, and we  
13 actually exceeded that setback by about five feet  
14 from what's required.

15 MR. NAVARRO: Yeah, normally you would require  
16 a ten-foot interior side setback between the homes,  
17 and we're almost I think at 30, right?

18 MR. BORGES: We have about 25 feet between the  
19 houses on that side yard.

20 MS. ANDERSON: All right. I'm satisfied with  
21 the project.

22 MR. BEHAR: I'm typically not in favor of lot  
23 split, but I think this is a very compatible and a  
24 very good, you know, request because I rather have  
25 two houses that are going to be about 5200 square

1 feet than one house that's going to be 10,000  
2 square feet. I think this is more in keep, and  
3 more in character with the neighborhood.

4 The architecture, like Rhonda says,  
5 unfortunately we don't have any restrictions on the  
6 architecture, that's the Board of Architects, and  
7 you've gone through the process, and they're the  
8 one that are going to set forth, you know,  
9 whatever.

10 I think you've done a great job trying to keep  
11 the trees, which is important. I think those  
12 canopy trees are going to be beautiful and, you  
13 know, you're right, like you mentioned you're not  
14 showing all the trees on the renderings because  
15 otherwise it would take away. But I think that  
16 once these houses are completed, however they look,  
17 they're going to be great because you have  
18 beautiful mature canopy trees on top of it.

19 So that's my...

20 With that I'll close it to the board. Do  
21 we --

22 MR. GRABIEL: I'd like to make a motion?

23 MR. BEHAR: Okay. We have a motion.

24 MR. GRABIEL: A motion for approval. Somebody  
25 mentioned that we want covenants to go to the

1 commission.

2 MS. VELEZ: Yes, the amendment on that when  
3 you get to the second.

4 MR. GRABIEL: Okay. So with that pending  
5 amendment I'll move for approval.

6 MR. MANTECON: I'll second the motion.

7 MR. BEHAR: And that's going to be based on  
8 staff recommendation with the conditions that they  
9 have?

10 MR. GRABIEL: Oh, yes, absolutely.

11 MS. VELEZ: Yes, and to make sure that we do  
12 know that there is a restrictive covenant, although  
13 it appears on the findings of fact that we  
14 received, that that was satisfied, that there was  
15 no restrictive covenant, there is in fact a  
16 restrictive covenant, a unity of title on all six  
17 parcels which would be eliminated by this house  
18 split.

19 MR. TRIAS: The findings of fact don't says  
20 exactly that. What they say is that a restrictive  
21 covenant that would prevent a split. So I think  
22 that's an important interpretation that needs to be  
23 made by staff and also by you. However, the  
24 information I agree should be provided.

25 MR. BEHAR: Okay. We have a motion, a second.



1 Can we please call the role?

2 THE CLERK: Rhonda Anderson?

3 MS. ANDERSON: Yes.

4 THE CLERK: Julio Grabiell?

5 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.

6 THE CLERK: Alex Mantecon?

7 MR. MANTECON: Yes.

8 THE CLERK: Maria Velez?

9 MS. VELEZ: Yes.

10 THE CLERK: Robert Behar?

11 MR. BEHAR: Yes.

12 MR. BORGES: Thank you so much.

13 MR. BEHAR: You're very welcome.

14 MR. NAVARRO: Thank you very much, everyone.

15 MR. BEHAR: All right. Do we have anything  
16 else on the agenda? Then we're going to make a  
17 motion to adjourn.

18 MS. VELEZ: So moved.

19 MR. GRABIEL: Second.

20 MR. BEHAR: Thank you, everybody.

21 MS. ANDERSON: Thank you.

22 (The proceedings concluded at 7:49 p.m.)  
23  
24  
25

1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

2  
3 STATE OF FLORIDA  
4 COUNTY OF PALM BEACH

5 I, Jessica A. Donnelly, Florida Professional Reporter  
6 and Notary Public in and for the State of Florida at  
7 large, do hereby certify that I was authorized to and  
8 did report said meeting in stenotype; and that the  
9 foregoing pages, numbered from 1 to 97, inclusive, are a  
10 true and correct transcription of my shorthand notes of  
11 said meeting.

12 I further certify that said meeting was taken at the  
13 time and place hereinabove set forth and that the taking  
14 of said meeting was commenced and completed as  
15 hereinabove set out.

16 I further certify that I am not an attorney or  
17 counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or  
18 employee of any attorney or counsel of party connected  
19 with the action, nor am I financially interested in the  
20 action.

21 The foregoing certification of this transcript does  
22 not apply to any reproduction of the same by any means  
23 unless under the direct control and/or direction of the  
24 certifying reporter.

25 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and  
26 24th day of January, 2019.

27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

