

OF CORAL GABLES
LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY (LPA)/
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING
VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT
VIA ZOOM TELECONFERENCE
THURSDAY, AUGUST 20, 2020, COMMENCING AT 4:03 P.M.

Board Members Present:
Eibi Aizenstat, Chairman
Robert Behar
Rhonda A. Anderson
Venny Torre
Wayne "Chip" Withers
Rene Murai
Maria Velez

City Staff and Consultants:
Ramon Trias, Planning Director
Craig Coller, Special Counsel
Jill Menendez, Administrative Assistant, Board Secretary
Jennifer Garcia, City Planner
Ana Restrepo, Principal Planner
Arceli Redila, Principal Planner
Miriam Soler Ramos, City Attorney
Kevin Kinney, Parking Director
Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk, Consultant
ALSO PARTICIPATING:
Mario Garcia-Serra, Esq.
Jorge Navarro, Esq.
Barbara Tria
Jill Travieso-Silva

1 THEREUPON:

2 (The following proceedings were held.)

3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I'd like to call the
4 meeting to order.

5 Good afternoon. This Board is comprised of
6 seven members. Four Members of the Board shall
7 constitute a quorum and the affirmative vote of
8 four Members of the Board present shall be
9 necessary for the adoption of any motion. If
10 only four Members of the Board are present, an
11 applicant may request and be entitled to a
12 continuance to the next regularly scheduled
13 meeting of the Board.

14 If a matter is continued due to the lack of
15 a quorum, the Chairperson or Secretary of the
16 Board may set a special meeting to consider
17 such matter. In the event that four votes are
18 not obtained, an applicant may request a
19 continuance or allow the application to proceed
20 to the City without a recommendation.

21 Today's agenda items are legislative, and
22 not quasi-judicial, and, as such, there will be
23 no swearing in of speakers. Also, what has
24 been referred to as applicant is the City of
25 Coral Gables.

1 As Chair, I now officially call the meeting
2 of the City of Coral Gables Planning and Zoning
3 Board Virtual Meeting of August 20th, 2020 to
4 order. This meeting is a continuance of
5 discussion held at the Planning & Zoning Board
6 meeting held on July 29th, 2020. Due to
7 COVID-19, Zoom platform is being used, along
8 with a dedicated phone line. The time is 4:03
9 p.m.

10 Now, I'd ask all of the Board Members to
11 please unmute themselves. Jill will call the
12 roll and please acknowledge your presence.

13 Jill, go ahead, please.

14 THE SECRETARY: Rhonda Anderson?

15 MS. ANDERSON: Present.

16 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?

17 MR. BEHAR: Present.

18 THE SECRETARY: Rene Murai?

19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We'll acknowledge him
20 when he comes back.

21 There he is.

22 THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?

23 MR. TORRE: I'm here.

24 THE SECRETARY: Rene Murai?

25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Rene, you've got to

1 turn up maybe your volume, because you are
2 unmuted.

3 Let's acknowledge that he is present. Go
4 ahead, please.

5 THE SECRETARY: Maria Velez?

6 MS. VELEZ: I'm here.

7 THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?

8 MR. WITHERS: Here.

9 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat?

10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Here.

11 Zoom platform participants, I will ask any
12 person wishing to speak or testify on a
13 specific agenda item to please open your chat
14 and send a direct message to Jill Menendez,
15 stating the agenda item you would like to speak
16 about and include your full name. Jill will
17 call you when it's time for your turn.
18 Depending on the number of speakers, I'd ask
19 you to please limit your remarks to three
20 minutes.

21 We also have phone platform participants.
22 After the Zoom platform participants are done,
23 I will ask phone participants to comment on the
24 agenda items. I will also ask you to limit
25 your remarks to three minutes. If you would

Page 5

1 like to speak, please dial *9 and Jill will
 2 know that.
 3 I will also ask the City Clerk if there are
 4 any comments or e-mails received. Jill, have
 5 you received any at all for E-1 or E-2?
 6 THE SECRETARY: No comments.
 7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: There's no comments at
 8 this time.
 9 MR. BEHAR: Excuse me, Eibi. Rene is
 10 putting up a sign. He needs to be unmuted.
 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: He is. He is not
 12 muted.
 13 THE SECRETARY: He is unmuted.
 14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: He is unmuted. So he
 15 is unmuted.
 16 Jill, can you confirm that, that he's unmuted?
 17 THE SECRETARY: That is correct. He is
 18 unmuted.
 19 MR. COLLER: Does he have a Millennial in
 20 his home to help him?
 21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Rene, maybe you can
 22 login through your iPad. That may be better.
 23 I'm not sure if there's an issue with your
 24 speaker.
 25 Let's continue. For this meeting --

Page 7

1 the minutes from the last meeting, so we will
 2 not have that at this time.
 3 I'd like to talk a little bit about the
 4 procedure we will use tonight. First we'll
 5 have the identification of the item by
 6 Mr. Coller. Second will be a presentation by
 7 Staff. Afterwards, I'll go ahead and open it
 8 to public comment, first to Zoom platform and
 9 then to the phone line platform. Please
 10 remember that the phone line platform is *9.
 11 If any e-comments do arrive or e-mails, we'll
 12 read those into the record. Afterwards, we'll
 13 close the public comment for Board discussion,
 14 and if there's a motion, further discussion, a
 15 second and a vote, if any.
 16 Any questions?
 17 MS. ANDERSON: No.
 18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: No? Okay.
 19 Mr. Coller.
 20 MR. COLLER: Okay. Mr. Chairman, Item E-1
 21 is really on the agenda only for informational
 22 purposes. That item, E-1, was already passed.
 23 If you'll recall, Item E-1 was just a
 24 re-organization of the Zoning Code, without
 25 substantive changes.

Page 6

1 MR. COLLER: May I make a suggestion?
 2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.
 3 MR. COLLER: He could actually call in and
 4 be on the video at the same time, could he not?
 5 Could we do that? Is he able to call in, Jill?
 6 THE SECRETARY: Yes. He's able to call in
 7 the number that's on the invite.
 8 MR. COLLER: I don't know if he can hear
 9 us.
 10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: He said, "I did."
 11 MR. COLLER: He did call in?
 12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Maybe that is the
 13 problem, that he's on both under his name or
 14 something.
 15 MR. COLLER: Maybe that's why he can't be
 16 heard, because he's got both things going at
 17 the same time.
 18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. That I don't
 19 know.
 20 MR. COLLER: Yeah, I don't know.
 21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Well, tech -- looks
 22 like they're resolving it. Let's continue,
 23 please.
 24 In the agenda, there's approval of the
 25 minutes, but we actually have not gotten back

Page 8

1 So the only item that actually is a
 2 continuation from our previous item, is E-2,
 3 and I'm going to read the title in, although I
 4 believe having read the title in before, it may
 5 not be necessary, but in an abundance of
 6 caution, I'll read it anyway.
 7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.
 8 MR. COLLER: Item E-2, an Ordinance of the
 9 City Commission of Coral Gables, Florida
 10 providing for text and map amendments to the
 11 City of Coral Gables Official Zoning Code
 12 pursuant to Zoning Code Article 14, "Process,"
 13 Section 14-212, "Zoning Code Text and Map
 14 Amendments," by amending the following
 15 provisions; (1) Article 1, "General
 16 Provisions," creating new zoning districts;
 17 Multi-Family 3 (MF3), Multi-Family 4 (MF4),
 18 Mixed-Use 1 (MX1), Mixed-Use 2 (MX2), Mixed-Use
 19 3 (MX3), and Design/Industrial District
 20 Overlay; and deleting: Multi-Family Special
 21 Area (MFSA), Commercial Limited (CL),
 22 Commercial (C), Industrial (I), and the north
 23 and south Industrial Mixed-Use Overlay
 24 Districts, and making the appropriate zoning
 25 map amendments to effectuate these changes; (2)

Page 9

1 Article 2 "Zoning Districts", creating new
 2 zoning districts and associated provisions, and
 3 deleting floor area ratio requirements in
 4 certain districts; (3) Article 3 "Uses",
 5 allowing certain uses in new zoning districts,
 6 and updating Telecommunication provisions; (4)
 7 Article 4 "Urban Design and Public Improvement
 8 Standards", refining public realm requirements;
 9 (5) Article 5 "Architecture", updating zoning
 10 districts to be consistent with Article 2; (6)
 11 Article 6 "Landscape" updating and increasing
 12 certain open space requirements; (7) Article 10
 13 "Parking" updating certain parking
 14 requirements; (8) Article 14 "Process";
 15 revising and clarifying processes for zoning
 16 applications; and (9) Article 16,
 17 "Definitions"; updating certain definitions;
 18 providing for repealer provision, severability
 19 clause, codification, and providing for an
 20 effective date.
 21 Item E-2, continuation of public hearing.
 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, Mr. Coller.
 23 Ramon, would you like to make your
 24 presentation?
 25 MR. TRIAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Page 11

1 drawings in comp planning. And right next to
 2 it, I wanted to show an area of the City of
 3 Coral Gables with the same technique, the same
 4 technique, that today we call it figure-ground,
 5 which shows buildings in black and what we like
 6 to call public space in white.
 7 And there are very few places in America
 8 that I can do that type of exercise and it
 9 would recognize the place, and Coral Gables is
 10 one of those places, and it is because of the
 11 legacy of George Merrick's great plan, and,
 12 also, because of the fact that, for a very long
 13 time, Zoning has been addressed very
 14 deliberately by the community, and I'm going to
 15 explain a little bit of that in a few minutes.
 16 But, also, I want to say that Zoning can
 17 only do so much. Just like here, you don't see
 18 the whole building, you don't see the whole
 19 public space either. You see some aspects of
 20 the building; the shape, the size, the
 21 location. Zoning needs to be seen as that, as
 22 just one of many, many things that we use to
 23 develop the City.
 24 And I want to give you a little bit of
 25 context, just to make sure you are more

Page 10

1 If I could have the PowerPoint, please.
 2 So, first of all, I want to thank all of
 3 you for coming again to talk about something
 4 that is very important, which is the rules for
 5 development of the City. And I also want to
 6 thank Member Robert Behar, and the architects
 7 and attorneys that have worked with me in the
 8 last couple of weeks, after all of you had some
 9 very good suggestions, in terms of improving
 10 the Code, Willy Bermello, Mario, of course,
 11 Jorge Navarro. They provided some very, very
 12 helpful ideas, and I think we have a very
 13 interesting strategy for discussion in the memo
 14 that I forwarded yesterday, and I'm going to
 15 explain that today in the presentation, also.
 16 MR. COLLER: What happened?
 17 MS. ANDERSON: We cannot hear you.
 18 MR. TRIAS: Sorry. I pressed the wrong
 19 thing. Can you hear me now? Yes, I think.
 20 Next, please.
 21 First, I want to talk about the big
 22 picture, to give you some context of what we're
 23 doing. The Nolli Map of Rome that you see
 24 there from 1746 is a classic depiction of the
 25 city. This is one of the most important

Page 12

1 comfortable with the exercise that we're doing,
 2 and to explain that even though it looks like
 3 an overwhelming big project, it actually is a
 4 very reasonable request being made of you and
 5 of the Commission, just to update some of the
 6 rules that we have.
 7 Next.
 8 And Zoning, like I said, is not the only
 9 thing. Platting, for example, George Merrick
 10 platted that area very nicely, with the public
 11 space, the blocks, the lots, et cetera, and a
 12 few years ago, I found a map from 1914 that had
 13 all of the natural systems prior to Coral
 14 Gables being platted, which is the map on the
 15 left, and then I superimposed the grid of Coral
 16 Gables, and if you look at it closely, the
 17 environmental systems were also integrated into
 18 Merrick's design. So there are many layers of
 19 design, regulation, planning, et cetera, beyond
 20 Zoning, that are the ones that have been able
 21 to give us the City that we love and respect.
 22 Next.
 23 And one of the most important ones, I
 24 think, is the artistic depiction of
 25 architecture and the connection that the

Page 13

1 buildings have to the Site Plan and the overall
 2 design of the City, and here you have the
 3 Biltmore right in the center, and you can see
 4 all of those vistas that are terminated on the
 5 building, that were planned very deliberately
 6 and very carefully by George Merrick's team,
 7 and, today, that legacy continues to be
 8 implemented with the Board of Architects,
 9 again, an additional level of review beyond
 10 pure Zoning.
 11 Next.
 12 And what's interesting about Zoning is that
 13 we know when it began. It begins in 1926,
 14 where the Supreme Court has a case called
 15 Euclid versus Ambler Realty, and there's a
 16 document prepared by the Federal Government,
 17 Zoning primer, that is used by many cities,
 18 1926. In 1926, when Zoning begins, Coral
 19 Gables already existed. As you can see, 1926,
 20 in the map that I'm showing right next to it,
 21 Coral Gables was laid out, the public spaces,
 22 the golf courses are there, and in black you
 23 can see all of the buildings that were already
 24 built in 1926.
 25 So what does that mean? That means that

Page 15

1 copies of many of the Codes, and here you have
 2 some of them, and what's interesting is that
 3 most of the content from all of those Codes
 4 actually remains in the Zoning Code today.
 5 Most of the good ideas that the City had
 6 through time are there, and we're not touching
 7 any of that, just like they were not touched in
 8 the '60s or the '70s or the '80s, either.
 9 We've built on the great ideas that -- the
 10 very, very high aspirations that the City have
 11 in the very beginning, and we continue to build
 12 on that, and that's what we're doing today.
 13 Next.
 14 If you look at the history of the Code, you
 15 can see that maybe every ten years or so,
 16 there's a major effort to do an update, 1930s,
 17 the first one, in 1937. If you read what it
 18 says, "Regulate building and open spaces," same
 19 things we're talking about. In 1937, they were
 20 already talking about it. Then, if we go to,
 21 let's say, 1957, that's when we get the Zoning
 22 Board and the Board of Architects, and then,
 23 in '65 is when we get the Planning & Zoning
 24 Board, as we know it today, and we continue.
 25 Then '86 is when we had the Med Bonus

Page 14

1 Coral Gables actually predated Zoning in
 2 America.
 3 Next.
 4 So one of the interesting things is that,
 5 in 1930 is when we have the first Zoning Code
 6 in Coral Gables. It's a very early example --
 7 next -- and it has a few things that are really
 8 interesting. It talks about architectural
 9 beauty and harmony. I mean, when was the last
 10 time that a Zoning attorney, Mr. Coller, talked
 11 about these things, right, in the context of a
 12 Zoning Code?
 13 And then -- next -- it also created the
 14 Office of the Supervising Architect. Now, that
 15 office was transformed through time into the
 16 Board of Architects. So you can see, from the
 17 very beginning, the very high aspirations of
 18 the Code. It's a very high standard. And it's
 19 one of the earliest Codes in America. And that
 20 the City -- that the great things that we like
 21 about the City were actually in place prior to
 22 that. So that gives you an idea of how the
 23 City began.
 24 Next.
 25 And, then, I was lucky enough to find

Page 16

1 regulations at the beginning, and there are
 2 many, many revisions later on. And in 2007 is
 3 the last major re-write in which many of you
 4 participated, because it was a really big
 5 project.
 6 Now, the question is, what has happened? I
 7 mean, is what we're doing today the first time
 8 that we're looking at the Code?
 9 Well -- next -- not really, because from
 10 2007 to 2019, there are 123 Ordinances, 123
 11 changes, as significant as, let's say, Art in
 12 Public Places, shared parking, electric
 13 vehicles. Some of them, you've worked on, with
 14 our assistance, such as shared parking,
 15 electric vehicles, but you can see that it's an
 16 ongoing effort, and what we're doing today is
 17 one of many, many updates that have led to this
 18 point, and I expect that there will be many
 19 more in the next few decades, as that is the
 20 nature of Zoning and the way that regulation
 21 takes place.
 22 Next.
 23 Now, what have we done in this effort?
 24 Well, we've done three things. We had an
 25 assessment analysis effort, which is in green.

Page 17

1 Then we had a chance to draft the Code that you
 2 have before you today. And now we are engaged
 3 in the adoption effort.
 4 Now, as you can see, many, many, many
 5 groups have participated, the City Commission,
 6 the Staff, obviously the Planning & Zoning
 7 Board, multiple times, we had a working group
 8 of interested professionals. Some of them
 9 helped this last week, and I want to emphasize
 10 that, and all of them have been able to lead to
 11 the point that we're at, which is the very,
 12 very last space.
 13 Next.
 14 Very briefly, the first phase, about a year
 15 or so, dealt with looking at the Code and
 16 deciding which issues were important and should
 17 be addressed, and I think many people had a
 18 chance to participate, and we came up with a
 19 very comprehensive list of names, and that is
 20 the content of the new ideas in the Code.
 21 Keep in mind, most of the Code remains the
 22 same. It's just a few new ideas that are very
 23 significant, that I'll summarize later on.
 24 Next.
 25 The re-organizing and drafting, the two

Page 19

1 within the history and the tradition of the
 2 City.
 3 Next.
 4 Now, we went through some of those ideas
 5 last time, and today I'm going to go very
 6 briefly, and I'm going to try to summarize some
 7 changes, and then get to some very specific
 8 recommendations that have been worked out in
 9 the last couple of weeks, that I think address
 10 most of the concerns that you expressed last
 11 meeting.
 12 Next.
 13 For example, in the current Code, in 2007,
 14 we have multiple designations that in the
 15 current revision in 2020 have changed.
 16 Next.
 17 Okay. So we go from several Commercial
 18 designations that become Mixed-Use, three
 19 Mixed-Use designations, and then Multi-Family
 20 becomes MF3 and MF4. I don't think there were
 21 too many questions on this issue. I think it
 22 was clear that the different designations
 23 follow the Comp Plan and that's why they were
 24 different and that's why they were in the place
 25 that they were in the map, but basically that's

Page 18

1 Ordinances that you're dealing with, to get
 2 that to point, to get to the point of the
 3 Ordinance, as you will remember, we had
 4 multiple meetings of the Planning & Zoning
 5 Board, plus we had three Workshops of the
 6 Commission, plus we had multiple meetings with
 7 the working group, et cetera. That was another
 8 year worth of work.
 9 Next.
 10 And now we're hopefully at the end. We're
 11 looking at the Code in a very detailed and
 12 thorough way at Planning & Zoning. Once you're
 13 comfortable with the ideas, with maybe some
 14 revisions, that's forwarded to the City
 15 Commission, and they look at it twice, or at
 16 least twice, and currently they have a first
 17 meeting scheduled for September 15th. So
 18 that's where we are at today.
 19 We're at the end of the process, a very
 20 lengthy process, about two years' worth of
 21 work, from many of you, and many others. In
 22 addition, we had a world class consultant,
 23 Duane Plater-Zyberk and Company, so we've had
 24 wonderful input and I think we have a product
 25 that could be very, very much something that is

Page 20

1 one of the before and after images that I
 2 wanted to show in this presentation.
 3 Next.
 4 2007, if you look at the Zoning Map, in the
 5 Central Business District, it's just one Zoning
 6 designation, Commercial. 2020, there's three,
 7 MX1, MX2 and MX3. Now, the question is, is it
 8 different? Does it change any of the
 9 development rights? And the answer is, no.
 10 The development rights are the same.
 11 What has happened is that the new Zoning
 12 designations are more descriptive of what you
 13 can actually do, because they follow the Comp
 14 Plan, and do create some additional
 15 opportunities for development, by encouraging
 16 Mixed-Use.
 17 Right now, as you know, Mixed-Use only
 18 happens in very big projects, 20,000 or more.
 19 So having these new designations allows a
 20 smaller increment of development, and hopefully
 21 a City that is more beautiful and follows some
 22 of the aesthetic goals that shape the first
 23 century of development.
 24 Next.
 25 In the Multi-Family, same thing. A few

Page 21

1 things, clarifications, very much targeted to
 2 very, very key areas. As you can see, none of
 3 the Single-Family neighborhoods change. Most
 4 of the City is still the same, in terms of
 5 designations and so on. It's only very, very
 6 targeted areas, with the goal of making it more
 7 clear and simpler to use.

8 Next.

9 We did include the consultant's
 10 recommendations, some charts, that have allowed
 11 us to understand the Code better, I think, and
 12 at the same time, I have identified a few
 13 issues that we have discussed with this group
 14 in the last couple of weeks, that I think we
 15 can resolve, and they have to do with the way
 16 that, for examples, stories are depicted, et
 17 cetera. I think we're making some good
 18 progress on that.

19 Next.

20 The important thing is that, in the larger
 21 projects, we have created this new category for
 22 projects that have 10,000 square feet. No
 23 longer 20,000 only, now there's a smaller
 24 increment that I think will encourage very
 25 reasonable development.

Page 23

1 little more open space in MF4, for example, to
 2 30 percent, and more direction of where to
 3 place that open space, in terms of design and
 4 so on. So I think that's very helpful.

5 Next.

6 In 2007, we allowed open in the upper areas
 7 of buildings, which doesn't really add to the
 8 public spaces of the City that much.

9 Next.

10 Now we're trying to do it at the ground
 11 level, clarify those issues, for example. I
 12 think that's a significant change that is very
 13 helpful. We can do better. Ms. Anderson
 14 suggested having some language that deals with
 15 existing trees and trying to find public space,
 16 and I think that's very good, and I think we
 17 probably could work on that.

18 Next.

19 Open space, for example, 25 percent in
 20 2007, same issue with the upper stories for the
 21 Commercial buildings.

22 Next.

23 Now, we are making sure that the required
 24 landscape is at the ground level and open to
 25 the sky, in the way that we calculate the open

Page 22

1 Next.

2 If you look at the Mixed-Use chart, which
 3 previously, in the 2007 Code, it was
 4 Commercial, just one Commercial, I mean,
 5 basically that was it. There was Commercial
 6 Limited, also, in some key areas, but if you
 7 were to look at the Downtown, you would see
 8 only one. Now you have three.

9 And, again -- next -- the new idea that I
 10 think is very powerful is that the 10,000
 11 increment projects, 10,000 square feet of site,
 12 allow for significant development that was not
 13 allowed before.

14 So that's the only thing. Nothing is taken
 15 away. Some things are given, that are, I
 16 think, better, in terms of development, but
 17 it's all consistent with the existing Zoning
 18 Code and the existing Land Use Map and
 19 Comprehensive Plan.

20 Next.

21 A few changes. In 2007, for example, there
 22 was 25 percent landscape open space, and
 23 required ground coverage maximum for small lots
 24 only.

25 Now, for example -- next -- we have a

Page 24

1 space for the Commercial buildings. Those are
 2 some changes that are subtle. They're not
 3 major, from my perspective, but truly, truly
 4 enhance the quality of projects.

5 Next.

6 Some of the changes also deal with location
 7 and shape and size and so on, and our
 8 consultant can go into detail, if you'd like,
 9 but I don't think you had too many questions
 10 about this, either.

11 Next.

12 There were some issues about having some
 13 test examples and so on, and I just want to
 14 point out that our consultant had prepared
 15 those analyses and they have looked at things
 16 very closely, and I think that we've had a
 17 chance to talk to some of the architects that
 18 do Mixed-Use buildings, Mr. Behar and
 19 Mr. Bermello, for example, and Hamed Rodriguez,
 20 also, and I didn't see any major concerns,
 21 except some very specific dimensional issues,
 22 that I think are fine and we can incorporate
 23 into the re-write, that deal with some of the
 24 setbacks and step backs and liners, et cetera.
 25 But, as you can see, this was something that

Page 25

1 was very seriously tested and reviewed by our
 2 consultant, and also by Staff and different
 3 individuals who were interested in the topic.
 4 Next.
 5 We did include -- if you look at 2007, the
 6 Industrial District was a little bit unclear,
 7 so we did try to make that into a Design
 8 District. We changed the name to Design and
 9 Innovation District recently, following the
 10 recommendation of our Economic Development
 11 staff, but that was created, and, then, we also
 12 incorporated some regulations in a way that it
 13 was a little bit more clear, in terms of the
 14 re-organization for the North Ponce Overlay,
 15 for example.
 16 But I think that the big idea here is that
 17 nothing changed. One thing was pointed out
 18 last time, that the number of stories was wrong
 19 in one of the pages. We've corrected that. It
 20 was eight in the draft, and it should have been
 21 ten. So it's going to be ten.
 22 So, again, I want to make it clear, we are
 23 not taking away development. That has never
 24 been the objective, and any errors that deal
 25 with that issue are being corrected.

Page 27

1 reintroduced remote parking and payment in
 2 lieu, and Kevin Kinney, our Parking Director,
 3 is in the meeting and he could explain that
 4 further, if there are any questions. But those
 5 ideas used to be in the Code, and were removed
 6 at some point, some of the remote parking, and
 7 now they're back, and, again, they're meant to
 8 be just tools that allow, among multiple ways
 9 of regulating buildings, that allow development
 10 to occur in a way that enhances quality and
 11 enhances pedestrian activity.
 12 By itself, remote parking doesn't really
 13 mean much, but in the context of the small
 14 incremental development in Downtown, for
 15 example, it could be the difference between a
 16 one story building that has been there since
 17 the '40s or '50s or a redevelopment of that
 18 site with a two, three or four-story building.
 19 So I think those are very important changes
 20 that are going to fulfill the vision of the
 21 City as a continuous fabric for pedestrian and
 22 for high quality buildings.
 23 Next.
 24 We made some technical changes -- next --
 25 reducing, for example, some of the flexibility

Page 26

1 Next.
 2 There are some Multi-Family issues, MFSA --
 3 the elimination of MFSA probably is the biggest
 4 one, and now we have -- next -- some MF3 and
 5 MF4 that deal with the difference -- try to
 6 create a more compatible type of development
 7 within the Multi-Family neighborhood, but I
 8 think that was also fairly clear last time.
 9 Next.
 10 We changed some site design changes also.
 11 Next.
 12 And, basically, they were designed to
 13 encourage the incremental development of the
 14 Multi-Family and also encourage the incremental
 15 development of Mixed-Use sites.
 16 Next.
 17 Parking was -- we had some, actually,
 18 pretty good rules already in place, such as
 19 exempting some parking for one story buildings
 20 Downtown, and Historic buildings, the shared
 21 parking that you have worked on, and so on.
 22 So the parking changes -- next -- added, I
 23 think, opportunities for development, some
 24 reductions. Yes, we did reduce parking
 25 requirements in some places, and also we

Page 28

1 in the Code to be able to be more predictable,
 2 in terms of the development outcomes.
 3 Next.
 4 And we also tried to introduce some of the
 5 language that had been interpreted by the City
 6 Attorney in the past to make it part of the
 7 Code in some cases. This is really a very
 8 technical list that we prepared, but I think
 9 successfully we're trying to get away from the
 10 interpretation and have a Code that is a little
 11 bit more predictable.
 12 Next.
 13 Now, in terms of the updates that I was
 14 working on this week, I think that that's
 15 probably what we can focus in the discussion,
 16 if you would like. Some of the things that
 17 have been brought about, that were drafted in
 18 ways that could be improved, for example, the
 19 ground area coverage, we could clarify the Med
 20 Bonus lot coverage, and ground coverage are the
 21 same, certainly. I think that wasn't very
 22 clear in the Code.
 23 Residential MF2, we talked about some
 24 building facade regulations for liners, and
 25 maybe an incentive process would be better than

Page 29

1 a regulatory process, transparency for MF4
 2 which are the largest Multi-Family buildings.
 3 Maybe 60 to 90 was too much, so 40 to 60 could
 4 be better, or simply having a minimum of 40,
 5 that could be fine, too.
 6 Next.
 7 The Design District heights, as I mentioned
 8 before, it should be ten and that's what we're
 9 doing. It's not eight stories. It's ten. The
 10 ground floor retail, we drafted seventeen feet,
 11 upon discussions with the architects. I think
 12 fifteen may be a more realistic regulation.
 13 The North Ponce Overlay, there's a 40-foot
 14 parking setback, and even though some projects
 15 have been able to do it, it's been very
 16 difficult to meet, so 30, 30 feet, is a better
 17 setback.
 18 Next.
 19 The PAD regulations, the Planned Area
 20 Development, it wasn't very clear what the FAR
 21 was, so we can clarify that to say that it's
 22 pursuant to the underlying districts.
 23 The density, there was some density for
 24 hotels, which we don't regulate, so that
 25 language can be removed.

Page 31

1 that's also the trend, in terms of development.
 2 So I think that should be supported. And there
 3 was an interest in having less valet parking.
 4 There's one space per unit right now. We could
 5 have one per four or some appropriate number.
 6 That's certainly something that can be worked
 7 on.
 8 Next.
 9 Currently, the PAD major amendments can
 10 occur only once a year. That's in the current
 11 Code. It's not new language. And we could
 12 eliminate that requirement. It really has no
 13 practical application, in the sense that major
 14 amendments have happened maybe once or twice
 15 since I've been here. So they're not that
 16 typical. But I think that will be acceptable.
 17 And then there was a suggestion to have
 18 Transfer of Development Rights, TDRs, towards
 19 the Design and Innovation District, to make it
 20 a receiving site, a receiving area, which I
 21 think is a good idea. I think that certainly
 22 we can do that.
 23 Next.
 24 And then there were some miscellaneous
 25 changes that dealt with, for example, the TDR

Page 30

1 The height of buildings also should conform
 2 to the District, that Overlay. So those are
 3 cleanup type of changes that I think were very
 4 rightly pointed out by our professionals in the
 5 community.
 6 Next.
 7 The transition heights, it's a little bit
 8 ambiguous, because it talks about residentially
 9 zoned properties. That's in the Code and it's
 10 been in the Code for a while. This is not a
 11 new idea. So we can clarify that, that it's
 12 Single-Family and Duplex, which I think is the
 13 intent. Otherwise, you would also include the
 14 Residential High-Rises and so on.
 15 The PAD requirements, we can certainly
 16 include setbacks and step backs on that.
 17 The office parking minimum, there was an
 18 interest in changing it from one to 300 to one
 19 to 500. I think that's fine. That's a
 20 reasonable request. We could certainly get an
 21 opinion from our Parking Director, but I think
 22 that's fine.
 23 Next.
 24 The Multi-Family parking, there was a
 25 request to reduce it slightly, which I think

Page 32

1 process. Our attorney recommended that it
 2 should be via Resolution, instead of
 3 Ordinance -- instead of an unclear process that
 4 we have right now.
 5 Ms. Anderson suggested that existing trees
 6 should be preserved as public space within
 7 community visioning and planning efforts, which
 8 I think is a very good idea. We could
 9 certainly beef up the landscape section of the
 10 Code. And that's the other thing, the
 11 re-arrangement of the Code, that first
 12 Ordinance that you passed last time, gives you
 13 the opportunity, gives you the structure, to be
 14 able to really, really include very targeted
 15 regulations, in ways that are not going to get
 16 lost. So I think that's one of the benefits of
 17 the work that we're doing.
 18 The seawall height is an issue that was
 19 raised by Public Works. We can discuss it
 20 further with them.
 21 The Design and Innovation District, just a
 22 name. Before we called it the Design District.
 23 Now we call it Design and Innovation. And then
 24 townhouse parking to be reduced to one space
 25 per unit, as opposed to two, and you could do

1 two, if you want to, but having the minimum be
 2 one.
 3 Next.
 4 So, having said all of that, let me remind
 5 the viewers that we've had ten times website
 6 postings of our meetings. So this process has
 7 been going on since 2018, very publicly, and in
 8 the most transparent way possible, and, then,
 9 also, nine times we've had advertisement of the
 10 different Workshops for Planning & Zoning and
 11 City Commission.
 12 Next.
 13 So, at this point, the Staff recommendation
 14 is approval, and what I would recommend is
 15 approval with the comments that I made in the
 16 memorandum, all of the comments that I went
 17 through, and any others that you may have, and
 18 forward that to the City Commission, with the
 19 understanding that there's a few things that
 20 may not be a hundred percent worked out, that
 21 we need to finalize, in terms of the
 22 strikethrough and underline format, but I think
 23 that, if conceptually, we all agree that the
 24 ideas have been resolved, then that would be my
 25 recommendation.

1 Robert, if you would, please.
 2 MR. BEHAR: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
 3 And I would like to take, first, before I
 4 start, this opportunity to thank Mario
 5 Garcia-Serra, Jorge Navarro, Willy Bermello,
 6 and Hamed Rodriguez for working, you know, very
 7 hard to work with Staff, and I wanted to take
 8 this opportunity and you may not hear me say
 9 this very often, but I do want to thank Ramon
 10 Trias for the last two weeks that have been
 11 very, very instrumental and very willing to
 12 listen to us and I think incorporating a lot of
 13 the comments.
 14 And, yes, we have had numerous
 15 conversations with Ramon, particularly with
 16 Ramon, and we have gone through a whole series
 17 of lists, and even today, for example, and I
 18 want to do -- if it's possible, if we could put
 19 up that presentation and go back to the
 20 memorandum that Ramon put together, because I
 21 want to clarify a couple of things more, that
 22 him and I talked about today, and he asked for
 23 me to be able to explain it to you. So if we
 24 could get that PowerPoint to the memo, the
 25 memorandum that he put together, please.

1 Mr. Chairman, I would request, if you could
 2 ask Robert Behar to maybe make a brief
 3 presentation, since he has been so instrumental
 4 in making sure that we got to this point and we
 5 finalized all of those different comments. So
 6 I would think that that would be a good way to
 7 continue my presentation, and then you could
 8 have the public then later on.
 9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, Ramon. I
 10 agree with you. I was actually going to ask
 11 Robert for some input. If everybody recalls,
 12 at the last meeting, we had actually asked for
 13 a group of both, attorneys and architects,
 14 within the City, to go ahead and meet with
 15 Ramon and look at either some of deficiencies
 16 or some errors that were presented to us.
 17 We're very fortunate that both, Mario
 18 Garcia-Serra, Jorge Navarro, Hamed Rodriguez,
 19 who is on the Board of Architects, Willy
 20 Bermello, they were all able to meet, and
 21 before we proceed, on behalf of the Board, I do
 22 want to thank all of these individuals for
 23 their time and caring within our City and
 24 making sure that we have a good Zoning Code to
 25 work with.

1 MR. TRIAS: Certainly. Why don't you use
 2 the memo and I think you have it?
 3 MR. BEHAR: But I cannot put it on there.
 4 MR. TRIAS: No. No. I'm asking Arceli to
 5 do it.
 6 MR. BEHAR: Oh, okay.
 7 MR. TRIAS: She has it. She's ready. Here
 8 it is. So just tell her to go down or
 9 whatever.
 10 MR. BEHAR: Yeah. Arceli, go down to
 11 Number B -- to B.
 12 There, what we've done is, it's a little
 13 bit more further, and it says, drafted 80
 14 percent of the building facade facing the
 15 street, to be lined with Residential space.
 16 What we have done is, and this is a
 17 conversation that even today Ramon, Jorge
 18 Navarro, Mario Garcia-Serra and myself had, is
 19 to limit the liner to the ground floor only,
 20 because that's at the pedestrian level. That's
 21 where you are going to see it.
 22 If you could do it at the upper level,
 23 great, but we only limited it to the ground
 24 floor, and the maximum percentage not be 80, to
 25 be 60 percent, and the reason for that, and

1 Ramon will agree with me, is that, in any
 2 building, you have entrances to the garage, you
 3 have services, you have -- unfortunately we
 4 have to contend with FP&L and putting the
 5 vault, so sometimes 80 percent may be too much.
 6 So what we think is a maximum, 60 percent, and
 7 I think that would work a little better, and I
 8 think Ramon will agree with me, that we
 9 could -- you know, as we move on, from now to
 10 Commission, we could incorporate some of these
 11 comments.

12 The other comment that we need to clarify
 13 is that, on C, that the transparency for the
 14 MF4 from 60 to 90, to being incorporated the 40
 15 to 60, I think that's perfect. That works very
 16 well. We agree to that.

17 And the design -- on D, Design District, in
 18 the Design District, last meeting we already
 19 passed a Resolution to go up to 120 feet and 10
 20 stories. Actually, you know, that I remember,
 21 that was in part of the last meeting.

22 The big one here is -- Arceli, go down to
 23 F, please. And this is one that I looked at --
 24 as a matter of fact, I came in this morning and
 25 I told Ramon -- on the North Ponce Mixed-Use

1 Overlay parking setbacks, I came in this
 2 morning and I keep all of the binders over the
 3 years of all different projects that come
 4 before us, just as reference, and today I came
 5 in and I must have looked at, at least 40, 50
 6 projects, and I was trying to look at the depth
 7 of the property, because the depth of the
 8 property has to do a lot with what you could do
 9 with a setback, and I looked at some that are
 10 in excess of 110 feet, but there's a
 11 significant number of properties that are less
 12 than 110.

13 So one thing that we proposed is that, in
 14 property that is in excess, greater than 110,
 15 we provide a 20-foot setback, minimum setback,
 16 for parking, for property that are in excess of
 17 120. For property that are less than 120, that
 18 setback needs to be reduced to about 10 feet.
 19 Otherwise you are not going to be able to
 20 provide an adequate parking structure with the
 21 circulation.

22 Obviously, if you do, in a property that's
 23 more than 110, you could give more, but we're
 24 saying, a minimum of 10 feet.

25 There are quite other items that we -- him

1 and I and Mario and Jorge have discussed, such
 2 as the open space requirement, the setback and
 3 step back requirement, the rule of stories in
 4 the regulation of height, as well as a lined
 5 Mezzanine in parking garages. There was one in
 6 the back that did not allow parking in the
 7 Mezzanine level, that would prohibit it. We're
 8 saying that we should do that again.

9 The bicycle parking, personally, I think
 10 that the numbers should go even higher than
 11 four and I will give you a very quick example.
 12 If you're doing a hundred units, how many
 13 bicycle parking should you provide? Keep in
 14 mind that a lot of the owners have very
 15 expensive bikes and they're going to take it up
 16 to the units. One per unit was a lot, was too
 17 much, because I could imagine, if you're doing
 18 a residential building with a hundred units, a
 19 hundred bicycle parking spaces would be half
 20 the garage. But, again, we'll do that.

21 The other thing that we need to look at is,
 22 the best, you know, projects in the Development
 23 Review process, meaning that if a project has
 24 gone through the Board of Architects, it gets
 25 vested. It doesn't get penalized to

1 incorporate any of these criteria. And there's
 2 a few more. And I feel confident that Ramon
 3 has assured us that we will continue working
 4 together, up to the point of Commission, first
 5 Commission meeting, that we could work out all
 6 of the other minor tweaking that we have to do.

7 And, again, I want to thank Ramon and the
 8 group for working very hard to get to this
 9 point. So thank you all for your efforts, and
 10 I think we will end up with very successful
 11 changes to the Code.

12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, Robert.
 13 At this time, what I'd like to do is, Jill,
 14 do we have any speakers?

15 THE SECRETARY: No, no speakers. There was
 16 a question in the chat, though.

17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: If that person would
 18 like to go ahead and --

19 MR. BEHAR: Mr. Chair, before you open it
 20 up, a second.

21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.

22 MR. BEHAR: Can you find out if -- can we
 23 find out if Mario Garcia-Serra, Jorge Navarro
 24 or Hamed have any comments that I might have
 25 missed, please?

Page 41

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I was going to take
 2 them during the comments of the speakers.
 3 MR. BEHAR: Okay. Never mind. Thank you.
 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.
 5 Jill, any of the people that have sent a
 6 question, whether it's general or not, I'd like
 7 for them -- if they'd like to take their
 8 questions into consideration, I would like for
 9 them to speak, for everybody.
 10 THE SECRETARY: I have Barbara Tria.
 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. Could you
 12 please go ahead -- you have Barbara Tria, you
 13 have Mario Garcia, that I think would also like
 14 to speak, and Jorge Navarro, was my
 15 understanding, that they would like to speak.
 16 Those three people so far, and could you reach
 17 out to the gentleman that sent a text or a
 18 messages to anybody, if he would like to speak
 19 at that time, also?
 20 If we can start, please, with Mario Garcia.
 21 Mario. If we could unmute him.
 22 THE SECRETARY: Okay.
 23 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Good afternoon,
 24 Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. I think you
 25 guys can hear me loud and clear, right?

Page 43

1 open space and the relationship of setback with
 2 step back, bicycle parking. I have also thrown
 3 out the idea of perhaps having -- permitting
 4 townhomes in the MX1 District, which is sort of
 5 the transitional district between Commercial
 6 and Residential.
 7 And so, you know, I think there is an
 8 opportunity for this process to continue and
 9 for us to continue to interact with Staff and
 10 the consultants and yourselves to hopefully,
 11 you know, continue working on a document and
 12 only making it better and more effective.
 13 A lot of what we suggested was informed by,
 14 you know, our experience over the years of
 15 having to work with different projects and
 16 where we came across issues and where we came
 17 across language which wasn't clear. So, I
 18 think, overall this is a better document than
 19 what you had on the 29th. It's still a work in
 20 process, but I think we're getting close to a
 21 point that we can have a document that we're
 22 going to say, reasonably speaking, we made the
 23 best effort possible to come up with the best
 24 Code for the City.
 25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, Mario. I

Page 42

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes, thank you.
 2 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Excellent.
 3 Mario Garcia-Serra, with offices at 600
 4 Brickell Avenue. As you are aware, I'm a
 5 Zoning attorney that does a considerable amount
 6 of work in Coral Gables, and as has already
 7 been described, as of the July 29th meeting, a
 8 sort of small of subset of the working group,
 9 let's call it, with a few additional members,
 10 that has been going through the Code, reading
 11 it from cover to cover, and making comments,
 12 both on proposed changes, as well as comments
 13 to existing regulations, which weren't proposed
 14 to be change, but which we thought would be
 15 appropriate.
 16 We've made a certain amount of progress, as
 17 Ramon and Robert have summarized, identifying
 18 issues that were there, and which there's
 19 consensus on how they can be resolved. Many of
 20 those are summarized in Ramon's cover memo that
 21 he circulated yesterday. And as Robert
 22 mentioned, there are some issues, I think, that
 23 require further discussion, many of which I
 24 think will ultimately be policy issues decided
 25 by the City Commission, you know, regarding

Page 44

1 want to thank you for your time that you put
 2 into this, also.
 3 Jorge Navarro. If you can unmute yourself,
 4 please. Go ahead, please.
 5 MR. NAVARRO: Hi. Can you hear me?
 6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.
 7 MR. NAVARRO: Hi. Thank you.
 8 Jorge Navarro, for the record, with offices
 9 at 333 Southeast 2nd Avenue.
 10 As was stated, and I think that your
 11 Planning Director did a great job of presenting
 12 the Code, this Code does a lot of good things
 13 for Coral Gables. It moves it forward to a
 14 more urban and pedestrian friendly town and
 15 builds on all of the things that truly make
 16 Coral Gables the City Beautiful.
 17 I'd like to thank you, Mr. Chair, and the
 18 Planning Board Members, for organizing this
 19 working group. I can tell you that everyone
 20 worked very hard, in a short period of time. I
 21 want to thank Mr. Trias for taking all of our
 22 calls and participating in many meetings with
 23 us. I think it was very effective. I think we
 24 covered a lot of issues and worked out a lot of
 25 issues and many of the concerns that were

Page 45

1 raised at the last meeting, and these changes,
 2 I believe, are really going to lead to better
 3 development and better projects.
 4 There are a few items, as some of the
 5 speakers mentioned, that need to be worked out,
 6 but I'm very confident that we'll be able to
 7 work through those issues between now and the
 8 time that we go to City Commission, and, you
 9 know, we're here and available, as needed, to
 10 continue to help throughout this process.
 11 So thank you very much.
 12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you. Thank you
 13 very much.
 14 I think the next speaker, Barbara.
 15 MS. TRIA: Yes. Thank you very much. I
 16 appreciate the time.
 17 Barbara Tria, Coral Pine Real Estate, with
 18 offices at 500 South Dixie Highway. I've been
 19 a commercial broker in the City of Coral Gables
 20 for over 20 years, and I've seen a lot of
 21 change, obviously.
 22 I was very honored to be a member of the
 23 work group and participated in it since the
 24 middle of, I guess it was June, in 2018, and
 25 many of the people on this call were part of

Page 47

1 Jill, did the gentleman that sent a message
 2 to everybody, would he like to speak?
 3 THE SECRETARY: Yes. It's actually Jill
 4 Travieso-Silva.
 5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Mr. Silva. Oh, sorry,
 6 Mrs. I apologize.
 7 Can we unmute her, please?
 8 Okay. Go ahead, please.
 9 MS. TRAVIESO-SILVA: Okay. Good afternoon,
 10 everyone. My name is Jill Travieso-Silva. I'm
 11 currently the owner of the home located at 626
 12 Malaga, which is the only Single-Family home on
 13 that block, and I was actually -- I tuned in
 14 today to get some clarification as to Article
 15 10, 10-3, Section D, where it was actually
 16 crossed out. It reads, "Townhouse Parking
 17 Design Standard, all off-street parking for
 18 townhouses shall be accessed from the rear of
 19 the property, either off of an alley or off of
 20 a driveway acting as an alley at the rear of
 21 the property. No driveways or garage doors
 22 shall be permitted along the street frontage of
 23 any individual townhouse."
 24 There were a couple of references in this
 25 addendum here, and in the last one, it was

Page 46

1 that. There has been a lot of progress made to
 2 update and make more current and more
 3 streamlined the Zoning Code.
 4 As a commercial real estate broker, I don't
 5 use the Code on a daily basis, like those of
 6 you who had, basically, I guess, a war room
 7 experience over the last week, ten days to
 8 review it, but I, too, appreciate it, having
 9 that extra time to go through and read it.
 10 And I wanted to just say thank you to Staff
 11 at the City, DPZ and their professionalism in
 12 getting us to where we are, and to the Planning
 13 & Zoning Board for saying, hey, let's take a
 14 little pause here, go back to it, read it
 15 again, and make a couple of really powerful
 16 changes that are going to make it easier to get
 17 the finished product sooner.
 18 So thank you very much for being part of it
 19 and I appreciate everybody's work towards the
 20 finished project.
 21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.
 22 Before we proceed, I'd like to welcome
 23 Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk for coming in. Thank
 24 you very much for your work that you've put
 25 into the Zoning Code re-write.

Page 48

1 crossed out. So I tuned in to today's meeting
 2 to receive clarification on that, and if any
 3 decision has been made from the last meeting.
 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.
 5 Ramon, is it possible to answer that
 6 question? If you can unmute yourself, please.
 7 MR. TRIAS: Yes. We are not changing the
 8 requirement of the rear entry into the parking.
 9 The only thing that has been discussed is,
 10 instead of requiring two spaces, requiring one
 11 space at a minimum.
 12 MS. TRAVIESO-SILVA: Okay.
 13 MR. TRIAS: That's it. The rest of the
 14 design standards remain.
 15 MS. TRAVIESO-SILVA: Okay. So it remains
 16 that garage parking has to be in the rear of
 17 the building?
 18 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 19 MS. TRAVIESO-SILVA: Okay. Well, let me go
 20 on to kind of explain my unique situation. I
 21 have a Multi-Family designated home. I'm
 22 landlocked between two properties to each of
 23 the two sides of my property, and the current
 24 Code prohibits the construction of a garage in
 25 the front of the property, as you just

Page 49

1 clarified, and even though every other property
 2 on my block has garages in the front, this Code
 3 is not allowing for that anymore.
 4 The next door neighbor, right over at 620
 5 Malaga, it's three townhouse units, all three
 6 of them have the garage in the front, with
 7 access in the front.
 8 The problem with my unit is that I don't
 9 have an alleyway in order to access garages in
 10 the back. So I'm not --
 11 MR. TRIAS: What's the Zoning for your
 12 property?
 13 MS. TRAVIESO-SILVA: Multi-Family.
 14 MR. TRIAS: So it's not FMSA, right?
 15 I'll tell you what, I can look at your
 16 property, if you want come to my office.
 17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: That's what I was
 18 going to suggest.
 19 MR. TRIAS: I'll be happy to help you
 20 specifically.
 21 MS. TRAVIESO-SILVA: Okay. Great.
 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Jill, would you be so
 23 kind to send Ms. Silva the contact information
 24 for Ramon, so she can contact him directly?
 25 Thank you very much, Ms. Silva.

Page 51

1 you don't mind. It has -- no, you have to go
 2 down lower. Lower. It says, "9," on the
 3 bottom. Keep going down.
 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: It would be 9 on the
 5 bottom of the actual page?
 6 MR. TORRE: Yeah.
 7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: That was the page
 8 that's --
 9 MR. TORRE: No, it's actually much lower in
 10 the presentation, I believe.
 11 Yeah, there you go. Go to Slide 17, 18 --
 12 no, go to Multi-Family. There. There you go.
 13 I have a question. I know that somewhere,
 14 and I think it's in the second or third page,
 15 it talks about benefits on MF3, which is the
 16 one that was highlighted in orange, and in one
 17 of the boxes, it says, some of the benefits
 18 here is an allotment of density bonus for MF3.
 19 That's one of the benefits that are called out
 20 in your list of things that are changing.
 21 I wanted to ask, what is that density bonus
 22 for MF3, which was MFSA? I don't quite
 23 understand what that is. It's called out on
 24 your slide that follows, but it deals with MF3.
 25 MR. TRIAS: Where is it called out?

Page 50

1 MS. TRAVIESO-SILVA: Thank you.
 2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Jill, do we have any
 3 other speakers?
 4 THE SECRETARY: No one else has asked to
 5 speak.
 6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: No one from phone,
 7 either?
 8 THE SECRETARY: No.
 9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. Having no more
 10 speakers, at this time, I'd like to close the
 11 floor for public comment, and I'd like to open
 12 it up to the Board.
 13 I'd like to go ahead and start with Venny.
 14 Venny, would you mind starting the comments?
 15 MR. TORRE: Sure.
 16 All right. I want to refer to the
 17 presentation that Mr. Trias was making earlier,
 18 and I believe it had all of the graphics and
 19 the changes that had been made, particularly,
 20 Page 13. I have a couple of questions on Page
 21 13.
 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Arceli, is it possible
 23 to put Page 13 up, please?
 24 MR. TORRE: Yeah. This is the one that you
 25 showed us earlier, and -- do Page 9 first, if

Page 52

1 MR. TORRE: Go down to the box that says,
 2 "Select Multi-Family Changes."
 3 MR. TRIAS: Well, yeah. Yeah, I
 4 understand. That had to do with the Med Bonus
 5 application in MF3.
 6 MR. TORRE: Okay. Continuing with 3, and I
 7 mentioned this earlier, on the
 8 last (unintelligible) MF3 continues to be
 9 twenty units per acre. So, in terms of --
 10 MR. TRIAS: Keep in mind that the density
 11 is regulated by the Comp Plan.
 12 MR. TORRE: Understood.
 13 MR. TRIAS: So that's what -- yeah.
 14 MR. TORRE: I understand.
 15 So, you know, in terms of a 10,000 square
 16 feet property allowing Multi-Family, you're
 17 getting four units. The area is filled with
 18 post war buildings that are selling in the
 19 neighborhood of a million dollars or higher.
 20 It's going to be very difficult to take down
 21 these buildings with a density at twenty units.
 22 So, regardless of these benefits, I don't see a
 23 lot happening with the offerings that are being
 24 proposed.
 25 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. Let me address that

1 issue, Venny, specifically, in terms of
 2 process.
 3 Changing the density requires a Comp Plan
 4 change, and that's a policy choice that can be
 5 made later on by the Commission, if that's the
 6 way they want to go. It's beyond the scope of
 7 just the Zoning regulations that we have.
 8 So that's one of the things, that if you
 9 really believe that the density should be
 10 different, we can talk about it and propose
 11 that at some point as a change to the Land Use,
 12 just like we did with the neighborhood that was
 13 discussed last time, the District that was
 14 changed to Mixed-Use.
 15 MR. TORRE: All right. So when you go to
 16 the designations of MX1, MX2, MX3, you changed
 17 the Zoning plan, and one of the questions that
 18 was posed is Number 33, and it says, "The
 19 proposed new designations to the CBD look like
 20 a patchwork and appear to follow the existing
 21 Land Use designations, can perhaps be made more
 22 uniform," and the answer was, "We agree."
 23 Is there a desire to make some changes, so
 24 that that patchwork of buildings that are now,
 25 you know, next to a High-Rise, and the other

1 attachments. Those were done by other people,
 2 and they're very valid points, but your
 3 question is, are we suggesting some enhanced
 4 open space? And the answer is, yes. Now, it's
 5 mostly in the higher density, MF4, for example,
 6 but I don't think -- I think you should take
 7 literally the memo from Staff, which deals with
 8 the concepts more precisely, and then we can
 9 probably make some progress. The rest of the
 10 attachments are there for information, and some
 11 of it is accurate and some of it is less
 12 accurate.
 13 MR. TORRE: In regards to open space, can
 14 you go to the section dealing with open space
 15 for Mixed-Use? It talks about, for Mixed-Use 2
 16 and 3, you need 500 feet minimum and 10 feet --
 17 a width of not less than 10 feet --
 18 MR. TRIAS: Which is in the Code right
 19 now --
 20 MR. TORRE: Right. I understand.
 21 MR. TRIAS: -- if you'll remember.
 22 MR. TORRE: So, for the smaller buildings
 23 that you're trying to promote the no parking,
 24 if you're doing an addition to more green
 25 space, to more open space, and you're reducing

1 one's Low-Rise -- what is the intent of that
 2 area now that we're changing the Zoning Code?
 3 MR. TRIAS: One of the things that I said
 4 is that we are not changing the development
 5 rights. So the plans work that you see is
 6 exactly what the question says. It's the Land
 7 Use being translated into Zoning. Any change
 8 beyond that is a policy choice that requires an
 9 individual change, just like we did with the
 10 neighborhood for MX1.
 11 So it may be a good idea. I'm not saying
 12 it's not. But it would require a change.
 13 MR. TORRE: Okay. And another statement
 14 here that, small site changes that's listed --
 15 "For small site incremental developments in
 16 Mixed-Use," the first item says, "Allowing less
 17 open space requirements for Low-Rise Mixed-Use
 18 building."
 19 Isn't the opposite, that you're making open
 20 space requirements be more and not less?
 21 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 22 MR. TORRE: So is this the opposite of this
 23 statement?
 24 MR. TRIAS: You're reading some questions
 25 and answers that are not in my memo. Those are

1 space on that ground floor, you are reducing
 2 square footage, per se.
 3 Would it make sense, to instead of saying
 4 waive parking up to three stories, to say,
 5 waive parking up to 3.0 FAR or something that
 6 ties it to the square footage of the building?
 7 Because you are getting a lot of reduction from
 8 this green space.
 9 MR. TRIAS: That would be another way of
 10 doing it, certainly.
 11 MR. TORRE: Right, because you are
 12 decreasing the FAR of the building by making
 13 the ground floor be smaller. So I'm just
 14 asking, is that something that would be
 15 entertained?
 16 MR. TRIAS: Venny, if you want to discuss
 17 that further, prior to Commission, we can do
 18 that and look at some specific analysis that
 19 you may have.
 20 MR. TORRE: Okay. And then I have one
 21 more -- never mind. I may be wrong.
 22 In terms of transparency, which I wasn't
 23 sure why this was even here, for MF3, the
 24 transparency says, "Any reflective glass,
 25 curtain, blind, paper that obstructs visibility

1 shall not be permitted." We're saying you
 2 can't have a townhouse that has a curtain in
 3 the front?
 4 MR. TRIAS: No, we're not saying that. No.
 5 MR. TORRE: So is there a requirement for
 6 transparency in MF3, per se? Is that just
 7 there?
 8 MR. TRIAS: Well, I mean, the idea is to
 9 enhance the pedestrian experience. As you
 10 know, we've had some buildings that have
 11 basically no windows at the ground level at
 12 some point, and that's just not a good solution
 13 for pedestrians. So the regard for
 14 transparency, upon discussion with Mr. Behar
 15 and others, was changed, and we're changing it
 16 further. So if you want to be part of that
 17 discussion --
 18 MR. TORRE: All I'm saying is, it says,
 19 "Curtains, blinds, paper or material shall not
 20 be permitted." I'm just saying that people --
 21 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, that might be -- it could
 22 be written better, I think, because, you know,
 23 you may have some curtain, certainly, in the
 24 building.
 25 MR. TORRE: Okay. I have no further

1 understand?
 2 MR. TRIAS: Yes. Yes. And the discussion
 3 that I had with Ms. Anderson is that we can add
 4 a lot of language to the landscape chapter,
 5 which is very brief right now, that deals with
 6 design outcomes and goals and especially
 7 publicly owned public space. That is certainly
 8 something that we need to enhance, and we can
 9 do that further.
 10 MR. WITHERS: I'm not talking about
 11 publicly owned. I'm talking about privately
 12 owned.
 13 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, both. But right now we
 14 don't have a clear distinction, and I think, if
 15 we had more of a distinction, then both, the
 16 private and the public, would be enhanced.
 17 MR. WITHERS: Can we do that now?
 18 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 19 MR. WITHERS: Listen, I've been at this
 20 long enough to where we're going to say we're
 21 going to get to it, and it never seems -- no
 22 offense to you, but it never really seems to
 23 get done. You know, it's a great idea, and,
 24 then, two years from now, it's still a great
 25 idea. Is there any reason why we can't address

1 questions.
 2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you very much.
 3 I'd like to go ahead and call Chip.
 4 MR. WITHERS: Great. We started from
 5 the -- I just have a couple of questions.
 6 One of the things that Ms. Anderson brought
 7 to light last week, when we were talking about
 8 the 250 Bird Road project, was the need for
 9 green space, and I understand there has been
 10 increases in green space, but I think the
 11 positioning of green spaces should be looked
 12 at. There's a big difference between providing
 13 a thousand square feet of green space, when
 14 it's a three-foot corridor along the side of a
 15 building, which they must really maintain -- it
 16 doesn't look very good after a couple of
 17 years -- and the need to maybe take a green
 18 space and position it in a way that it can be
 19 used for the public, not just the residents of
 20 the building.
 21 So I would encourage that when we look at
 22 green space, that we still go with the
 23 percentages, but we try to allocate it in areas
 24 that are more useful to the overall public and
 25 not just the residents of the building. Do you

1 something like that now and have --
 2 MR. TRIAS: No, that's exactly what I'm
 3 saying. That's my intention, and I started the
 4 conversation today and I can continue with you
 5 and others in the next couple of weeks.
 6 MR. WITHERS: I mean, look, the
 7 opportunity -- obviously, what this is going to
 8 affect is that area between Le Jeune and Ponce,
 9 south of Almeria or whatever that is, and north
 10 of University. You know, I would hate two
 11 things to happen there. I would hate to see
 12 what we see on US-1, which is one building from
 13 one end of the block to the other, just a
 14 massive wall of building, which could easily
 15 happen if we're not careful and I don't know
 16 how we're going to prevent that.
 17 But if you require some kind of break-up
 18 and implementation of putting actual big
 19 parcels of green space and make developers pay
 20 for it -- and I'm not saying the City has to
 21 buy it. The City doesn't have -- you know, I
 22 drove that area looking for somebody's dog,
 23 believe it or not, and I just realized, that's
 24 a massive area. Those are very wide streets,
 25 and there's no reason in the world, that when

Page 61

1 someone comes in and they're obviously
 2 assembling properties there, everybody knows
 3 that, why not encourage developers to put in
 4 public space, other than just, you know, flower
 5 beds to enhance the look of their property.
 6 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, and I think, if a larger
 7 project were to be proposed there, for example,
 8 20,000 or more in area, the process that we
 9 have for conditional use review, et cetera, is
 10 the one that we typically use to design a
 11 better project. All of the projects that you
 12 have seen recently had those features.
 13 MR. WITHERS: Correct.
 14 MR. TRIAS: And there's a reason. The
 15 reason is that the Code allows that. Now, the
 16 Code allows that through the process. Now, we
 17 can add some additional language that talks
 18 about policy direction, fine, but I think it's
 19 a matter of trying to get the Commission to
 20 make those choices by the time we get to that
 21 point.
 22 So if you have some specific language, we
 23 can incorporate it tomorrow. If you don't, we
 24 can work on it and incorporate it by the time
 25 we get to the Commission.

Page 63

1 Commission has to step up and do it, if they
 2 want to create, you know, some green space for
 3 the neighborhood. That's just the way it goes,
 4 you know. And I have all the confidence that
 5 our Commissioners will do that. How is that?
 6 So what keeps someone from building a
 7 forty-foot building from Le Jeune to Ponce?
 8 MR. TRIAS: The Board of Architects, Number
 9 One, for the review, and also the -- you know,
 10 if it is a large enough project to require
 11 Conditional Use, conditions are always
 12 attached, and they are usually designed
 13 oriented and deal with public space, et cetera,
 14 and that's ultimately the decision of the
 15 Commission, upon the recommendation of the
 16 Planning & Zoning Board.
 17 MR. WITHERS: So the answer is, there's
 18 nothing in our Code to keep that from
 19 happening?
 20 MR. TRIAS: No. No. The answer is that
 21 the Code has a process to keep that from
 22 happening.
 23 MR. WITHERS: And the process is the
 24 prospective and Overlays and PADs and things
 25 like that.

Page 62

1 MR. WITHERS: Okay. The operative word
 2 was, if they're assembled. We know it's going
 3 to happen. We know there's going to be big
 4 projects there. So, you know, we might as well
 5 prepare for that.
 6 So the fact is, is that you're the expert,
 7 and I mean that sincerely. I have no idea how
 8 to put the language in there. I don't even
 9 understand it half the time that it's put in
 10 there, but you do, and, you know, I don't know
 11 how the rest of the group feels, but I think
 12 Ms. Anderson was on a very direct point,
 13 that -- think about that. If that area is
 14 developed into an apartment area, there is no
 15 green space, except the park there on Ponce.
 16 Where else are people going to go with their
 17 animals? So I just think it just makes a
 18 better environment.
 19 MR. TRIAS: Well, in addition, we have a
 20 world class consultant, Liz Plater-Zyberk, who
 21 is listening very carefully to this. So I
 22 think we can come up with some language.
 23 MR. WITHERS: Well, I mean, but does Liz
 24 want to trample on people's property rights? I
 25 don't know that she does. I think the

Page 64

1 You know, I think we all -- I shouldn't say
 2 we all agree, but I would think the biggest,
 3 oh, my gosh, can you believe it, is that
 4 building on US-1. And Number One, the
 5 Commission, obviously, didn't follow the height
 6 in the Code, they didn't follow the massing in
 7 the Code, and they've got this huge concrete
 8 canyon, and do you want to see that on, you
 9 know, those blocks between Ponce. I know you
 10 don't, Ramon, because we've talked about this.
 11 MR. TRIAS: Right. Right. Right.
 12 MR. WITHERS: You know, what can we do to
 13 protect that massive, you know, accumulation of
 14 properties, and someone building, you know, a
 15 penitentiary from one end of that block to the
 16 other? I just think it would destroy the look
 17 of that area, you know, and so I'm very
 18 concerned about that. I don't think our Code
 19 addresses that.
 20 Those are really the two -- you know, if
 21 we're going to get into land -- if we're going
 22 to get into Zoning use and stuff, I really
 23 think we should look at restricting, you know,
 24 ground floor retail in some of that area. I
 25 think Miracle Mile is going to take several,

1 several years to recover, and I don't know that
 2 we want to encourage any competitive retail in
 3 that Mixed-Use in that area. And that's my
 4 second comment.
 5 And my very the last comment, I think there
 6 are a couple of areas of the City, that we
 7 really need to address, that aren't addressed
 8 in this. One is the US-1 corridor. You know,
 9 I really want to encourage the Commission to do
 10 something, because right now it seems that the
 11 map and the pallet that they have to design and
 12 vision on US-1 is just -- you know, seems to
 13 be, you know, spot Zoning to me, and I know we
 14 have some large properties. We have that piece
 15 of property where Pier 1 just went under and
 16 Friday's is under. That's probably the deepest
 17 piece of property that can be developed along
 18 the Highway there, and there's really been no
 19 visioning for that area, and I also think that
 20 the Ponce corridor, between Bird Road and where
 21 Christy's Restaurant is, I think we need to do
 22 some visioning and decide what we really want
 23 to do with that area, as well.
 24 So those are my comments, and I thank you
 25 and your group for the hard work and all of the

1 I think are very good. In fact, I want to
 2 thank the people who suggested them, because
 3 they make the Code better, and allow, I
 4 believe, the Planning & Zoning Board to make a
 5 motion with some conditions or with some
 6 changes in a way that it's clear. So that was
 7 the purpose of the memo.
 8 And I added all of the information that we
 9 had as background.
 10 MR. MURAI: I know, Ramon, but what I'm
 11 trying determine from the memo is, what are we
 12 doing when Liz says, for example, "We advise
 13 conforming to the predating setback"? This is
 14 Item Number 3. For example, where it says,
 15 "This statement is incorrect," blah, blah,
 16 blah. "We advise confirming to the predating
 17 setback," how are we dealing with her comments?
 18 MR. TRIAS: The only official document that
 19 I'm providing to you is the Staff memo.
 20 Everything else is very good information for
 21 you to read, but you don't have to react to it.
 22 It just simply informs your opinion and you may
 23 agree or disagree. The memo that I've given
 24 you is the result of the work of some very good
 25 volunteers and Staff and it summarizes, I

1 volunteers that jumped in, because I know what
 2 it takes, and it's a nice product at this
 3 point. So thank you.
 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, Chip.
 5 Thank you very much.
 6 Rene, did you get your speaker to work?
 7 MR. MURAI: Can you hear me?
 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We can. Welcome.
 9 MR. MURAI: Thank you.
 10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Go ahead, please.
 11 MR. MURAI: I would like to understand the
 12 memo that was sent -- something happened
 13 here -- and the comments on the new proposed
 14 Code and Liz's responses and how we're dealing
 15 with all of that.
 16 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. Liz took the time to
 17 answer a list of comments that had been
 18 prepared by the group of people that were
 19 working with us, and then I took the time to
 20 try to summarize that into an outline for the
 21 purpose of tonight's meeting, to be able to
 22 have something to refer to, and maybe that will
 23 be helpful, in term of the discussion. That's
 24 all that is.
 25 And what it includes is a few changes that

1 believe, the points that can be supported very
 2 clearly.
 3 The additional information provided by the
 4 consultant is very, very good. I think it's
 5 very helpful. Most of the time it's consistent
 6 with what we provided.
 7 MR. MURAI: Okay. But I'm just trying to
 8 understand. That's all. Item Number 3 of the
 9 memo, of the recommendations, "The
 10 recommendation, a ten foot setback would be
 11 appropriate for the MF4 district. Step back
 12 should be tied to setback," blah, blah, blah --
 13 MR. TRIAS: But, sir, that is not the
 14 recommendation. The recommendation is in the
 15 memo. It's the memo that are the three pages
 16 at the front, and it's A, B, C, D, E. Those
 17 are not recommendations. Those are just
 18 discussion that took place.
 19 MR. MURAI: Those are suggestions for the
 20 future? What is it?
 21 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. I mean, those are
 22 suggestions to understand the Code better --
 23 MR. MURAI: I know, but those suggestions,
 24 for example, say, a recommendation is a
 25 ten-foot setback. That's not incorporated in

1 what you've done?
 2 MR. TRIAS: Which item are you --
 3 MR. MURAI: I'm just taking one as an
 4 example. Item Number 3. I'm just trying to
 5 understand whether those recommendations there
 6 have been incorporated, have not been
 7 incorporated.
 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Jill, is it possible
 9 to put that up on the screen, please?
 10 MR. TRIAS: We're not changing the setback
 11 recommendations at this point. We continue to
 12 have the same recommendation. The only
 13 twenty-foot setback is MF4.
 14 MR. MURAI: No. Okay. But I'm not going
 15 into those details. I just want to get the big
 16 picture. These comments --
 17 MR. TRIAS: Those are the comments, the
 18 ones that are on the picture right now, that
 19 Staff is recommending you follow.
 20 MR. MURAI: Okay. And then what follows
 21 after that, Comments on the Proposed Coral
 22 Gables Zoning Code, comments dated August 14,
 23 DPZ Draft Response August 18, that -- we're not
 24 dealing with that at this point?
 25 MR. TRIAS: No. No. That's just for

1 reference and information.
 2 MR. MURAI: No, but it's more than that,
 3 Ramon. It has recommendations --
 4 MR. TRIAS: Sir, I am very clear in what
 5 I'm saying. I am recommending the memo that is
 6 on the screen right now. That is what is being
 7 recommended by Staff.
 8 MR. COLLER: I think the confusion on that
 9 document is the word, "Recommendation." This
 10 was initially drafted by a number of lawyers
 11 that went through all of the various issues.
 12 The recommendation was a recommendation
 13 proposed by the group of lawyers, and, then,
 14 below that, is a response from DPZ. What's
 15 been incorporated, I believe, what Ramon is
 16 suggesting, from all of these comments, all of
 17 this discussion, what he is suggesting is being
 18 incorporated are those A through T.
 19 So that word, Recommendation, is not a
 20 recommendation from PDZ or Staff. It was a
 21 suggested change by the group that looked at
 22 this after our meeting.
 23 MR. MURAI: And what I'm trying to
 24 determine is whether the so-called
 25 recommendations in this part, in Attachment A,

1 were incorporated in Ramon's recommendations or
 2 were not.
 3 MR. TRIAS: Not all of them. Some of them
 4 were, some of them were not.
 5 MR. MURAI: Okay. And in the case of those
 6 that were incorporated, if our consultant
 7 disagreed with it, what was the treatment then?
 8 MR. TRIAS: I had several conversations
 9 with Liz and I didn't hear any disagreement.
 10 So I think it's fine.
 11 MR. MURAI: Okay. Didn't hear any
 12 disagreement with what you ultimately
 13 recommended?
 14 MR. TRIAS: Right.
 15 MR. MURAI: Because clearly in this --
 16 MR. TRIAS: In fact, the e-mail that she
 17 sent me was that it was excellent.
 18 MR. MURAI: She's a very --
 19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Actually, Liz is with
 20 us here.
 21 MR. TRIAS: She can explain it better.
 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Is she still with us?
 23 Can we unmute Liz, please?
 24 Go ahead, please.
 25 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: Yes. Good afternoon,

1 everyone. This has gone back and forth several
 2 times, Rene, and I think we agree that the
 3 Staff has been working on both of those
 4 documents to come up with the best results,
 5 and -- so we agree with their final
 6 recommendations.
 7 MR. MURAI: Okay. Because you have, for
 8 another example is, Item 4, where there's a
 9 recommendation due to parking, you would
 10 recommend blah, blah, and then you do not
 11 agree, parking shouldn't be exempted from the
 12 maximum ultimate height of the building.
 13 So I want to know whether the ultimate
 14 product conforms to your recommendations or
 15 your suggestions.
 16 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: You know, I think some
 17 of those were, in fact, contradictory along the
 18 way, but if you put up that part of the
 19 document that Ramon is putting in front of you.
 20 I think that's the one we should be speaking
 21 to.
 22 And let's see if that item is there. I
 23 don't have my own copy in front of me. Is that
 24 further down in the document?
 25 MR. MURAI: Regulation of height by stories

1 as opposed to just liner feet.
 2 MR. TRIAS: That item, in particular, is
 3 still under discussion, because that was an
 4 issue that the attorneys and the architects had
 5 some very specific concerns. I talked to them
 6 this morning, as recently maybe as a couple of
 7 hours ago, and I think we have a resolution
 8 that follows the Comp Plan and follows the
 9 existing Code, but that's one of the
 10 significant issues that we were not a hundred
 11 percent finished with.
 12 MR. MURAI: Okay. I'll go on to Number
 13 Five, Recommendation, eliminate or lower this
 14 requirement, and then Liz's response is, "The
 15 City made first floor parking garages, no
 16 matter how well screened, is an inferior
 17 vision." Again, I'm just trying --
 18 MR. TRIAS: That recommendation, we have
 19 not changed the Code. We're following what Liz
 20 recommended.
 21 MR. MURAI: Okay. Is there any point,
 22 Ramon, in Attachment A, where we're not
 23 following Liz's recommendation? Do you know?
 24 MR. TRIAS: I don't think so. You can ask
 25 her, but I don't believe so. And some of it is

1 been a lot of studies and we've been looking at
 2 the projects that people are bringing forward.
 3 So even though we may be disagreeing with some
 4 of what the other group brought forward on
 5 behalf of clients and developers, that we're
 6 heading for a quality -- a higher quality
 7 environment.
 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Ramon, let me ask you
 9 a question, just to clarify. The first three
 10 pages are your recommendations for the Board?
 11 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: The following pages,
 13 until Page 43, are just background material,
 14 with discussion; is that correct?
 15 MR. TRIAS: Yes, sir. Yes, sir. And in a
 16 legal context, which the City Attorney can
 17 explain, my recommendation is the competent and
 18 substantial evidence that is needed for you to
 19 make a decision.
 20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. Thank you.
 21 MR. MURAI: I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you.
 22 Repeat that, Ramon. What was that?
 23 MR. TRIAS: That the law requires competent
 24 evidence to be presented to you, and that is
 25 the evidence coming from Staff, and the

1 a discussion. Some of it is disagreement. But
 2 certainly we're following Liz's recommendation.
 3 MR. MURAI: Okay. Liz, did you get a
 4 chance to see the final product and compare it
 5 to what you desire?
 6 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: You know, I understand
 7 there are certain things that the City was
 8 still working on, so that, you know, the
 9 numbers don't follow precisely every single
 10 item, and some of the items are redundant, so
 11 they've been collapsed, but I think we're
 12 satisfied that we're very close to all of our
 13 recommendations.
 14 MR. MURAI: Yeah. I just want to be
 15 satisfied, to the extent that we're
 16 recommending something to the City Commission,
 17 that you -- is consistent with your
 18 recommendations, since I know what kind of an
 19 expert you are.
 20 MS. PLATER-ZYBERK: Well, you know, there's
 21 always -- the short answer is, yes. We think
 22 this is going forward in a very productive way.
 23 We understand that some of the concerns that
 24 are raised always come up at the last minute,
 25 but I think that we've studied -- there have

1 recommendation from your professional Staff.
 2 So you're able to make a decision based on it.
 3 MR. MURAI: I appreciate that, but I'm very
 4 interested in knowing whether the
 5 recommendations are consistent with what Liz
 6 has recommended.
 7 MR. TRIAS: Of course.
 8 MR. MURAI: Some instances here, in
 9 Attachment A, I see a recommendation from the
 10 group and I see Liz saying no.
 11 MR. TRIAS: And what I've said to you is
 12 that, in those cases, we haven't incorporated
 13 the comment.
 14 MR. MURAI: All right. So where Liz has
 15 not agreed with a recommendation, it was not
 16 incorporated?
 17 MR. BEHAR: May I say something, Mr. Chair,
 18 please?
 19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes. Go ahead,
 20 please.
 21 MR. BEHAR: Because I take it very serious
 22 when I do this, and Mr. Murai, I can tell you
 23 that, yes, I have done many, many, many, many
 24 buildings, particularly in the City of Coral
 25 Gables, that with the right application of the

Page 77

1 Code, they do work. What we have to be very
 2 careful, and Liz has done a fantastic job, but
 3 there may be instances that what she has
 4 proposed may not necessarily work the way that,
 5 you know, it should be, and that's why we're
 6 having this dialog back and forth between
 7 Ramon, it goes back to Liz and the group,
 8 because you have three very competent
 9 architects and two extremely competent Land Use
 10 attorneys that know the Code very well.
 11 So this is not just necessarily -- because
 12 there is a recommendation from that side,
 13 necessarily it has to be done, because what we
 14 have to be very careful here, very, very
 15 careful, is that we don't put the City of Coral
 16 Gables in a predicament, that we get into a
 17 lawsuit with developer, because they falls onto
 18 the Bert Harris Act, and in some cases that
 19 could potentially be the case.
 20 We're having a fantastic dialog today, and
 21 it's going to continue. Not everything that
 22 Liz proposed may be doable. Not everything
 23 that the group proposed is doable. We will
 24 come to a happy medium. But just the fact that
 25 it says, everything that she recommended and it

Page 79

1 competent and substantial evidence is the
 2 standard in a quasi-judicial setting, where you
 3 typically sit. This is a legislative item, so
 4 it's not the same standard. Basically you
 5 accept whatever is being presented to you and
 6 you either recommend it or you don't, but it's
 7 not a quasi-judicial hearing, where there has
 8 to be competent and substantial evidence to,
 9 you know, sustain your decision, as there would
 10 be in a quasi-judicial capacity, as you
 11 normally sit.
 12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.
 13 MR. MURAI: I agree with you a hundred
 14 percent.
 15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.
 16 Any further comments, Rene?
 17 MR. MURAI: No.
 18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: No?
 19 Rhonda, would you go next, please?
 20 MS. ANDERSON: Yes. I want to thank
 21 everybody that put in an enormous amount of
 22 hours to get us down to the memo that we
 23 received yesterday. I appreciate the time and
 24 effort that you've put.
 25 I'm going to start with the green space

Page 78

1 doesn't work, we have to accept, I respectfully
 2 disagree and I wouldn't be able to support
 3 something like that, because I think all of the
 4 professionals that deal with this on a daily
 5 basis will have to agree with what we're
 6 saying, and that's what we're at today.
 7 MR. MURAI: And all I'm saying, Robert, if
 8 I am going to make a recommendation, I want to
 9 know whether Liz disagrees with it or not, and
 10 then I can make a decision. I don't have to
 11 accept her disagreement, but I would like to
 12 know. I don't want to just take, you know,
 13 whatever the group, the architects and the
 14 developers' lawyers, recommend. That's all.
 15 MR. COLLER: Mr. Chairman, I've gotten a
 16 note from Miriam, because she's been muted. So
 17 she doesn't have the flexibility that I have,
 18 even though she is my superior.
 19 MS. RAMOS: They just unmuted me. I've
 20 been freed.
 21 MR. COLLER: Okay. Well, you're welcome to
 22 make the comments or I can. Whatever you'd
 23 like.
 24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Welcome, Miriam.
 25 MS. RAMOS: I just wanted to mention that

Page 80

1 comments, to clarify a couple of things,
 2 because I think we do have some great
 3 opportunities here, with areas that have
 4 recently been re-zoned or will be re-zoned in
 5 the future, that Chip was talking about, or may
 6 be re-zoned in the future. As far as the
 7 visioning --
 8 MR. MURAI: Can you speak louder, please?
 9 MS. ANDERSON: Can you hear me okay now?
 10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.
 11 MS. ANDERSON: Okay. Sorry about that.
 12 And rather than allow things to evolve
 13 depending on who purchases the property, I
 14 think we need to do visioning earlier than
 15 that, to determine what do you want to see in
 16 that area. Do we want to see a wall of
 17 buildings that goes from one end of the block
 18 to the other? Do we want mid block, or
 19 approximate mid block, depending on where
 20 existing trees are, to provide a corridor for
 21 some greenery and some park space, some
 22 benches? I see this in other apartment areas,
 23 other developments. So that's the type of
 24 vision that I think needs to be done ahead of
 25 time, before the parcels are purchased and

Page 81

1 developed one at a time, because we'll lose
 2 control if we don't, and that's something I
 3 think we should have possibly done when we did
 4 the Almeria section.

5 There were some natural corridors there,
 6 where people typically would cut through and
 7 even allowing just, you know, fifteen in
 8 between buildings, twenty feet in between
 9 buildings, with some nice greenery, would have
 10 made a difference and not made it a long
 11 endless block, that blocked, really, the flow
 12 of people the way they used to walk through
 13 there.

14 Next item I wanted to go over was the
 15 parking suggestions. Now, in the memo, there
 16 are discussions regarding reductions in office
 17 parking, and on Item, I think it's B -- this is
 18 my notations here. Yeah, office parking
 19 minimum --

20 MR. TRIAS: The Multi-Family, also, there
 21 was --

22 MS. ANDERSON: And the Multi-Family, also.
 23 I think that really needs to be not a blanket
 24 rule, but driven by which area we're in,
 25 because, for instance, there are some in the

Page 83

1 I mirror Chip's remarks regarding the area
 2 that we considered the last time changing the
 3 Zoning on, that there should be a
 4 recommendation (unintelligible) sample retail
 5 there, because we do have plenty of retail that
 6 needs the influx of the residential people
 7 coming to them not too far away, right over on
 8 the new development that's going to be going in
 9 on Ponce, when it's finished, and we have the
 10 Mile, as well, and with the freebie going
 11 around, I think it would be easily accessed.

12 The townhouse parking, it seems to be a
 13 blanket rule that's been recommended, Ramon --

14 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.

15 MS. ANDERSON: -- as opposed to something
 16 geared to the amount of square footage that the
 17 townhouse is.

18 MR. TRIAS: Well, yeah, but it's only one
 19 unit. So typically that's what you would do
 20 with Residential, per unit, so many parking
 21 spaces.

22 MS. ANDERSON: Per bedroom, you mean?

23 MR. TRIAS: No. No. Per living unit,
 24 apartment or townhouse or whatever. That's the
 25 way parking is calculated. It's not calculated

Page 82

1 North Ponce neighborhood where parking
 2 reductions would be problematic, because
 3 there's already a problem with the parking
 4 there, and if it's going to result in
 5 additional parking demands on a street that is
 6 inadequate already, that would not be an
 7 appropriate area to do that, because you have
 8 the offices on Ponce, as well as the units
 9 there. So I think it needs to be done on
 10 sectioned areas, as opposed to a blanket rule.

11 The bicycles, it really depends on a couple
 12 things. One, if you have Multi-Family
 13 individuals in there and you have kids' bikes,
 14 you know, the parents' bikes, if it's a lot
 15 parking area that's available, as is available
 16 in many Multi-Family buildings, people aren't
 17 going to want those bicycles inside of their
 18 units. So having one bicycle spot per ten
 19 units is going to be woefully insufficient, for
 20 four folks, because having four bicycles parked
 21 inside of your unit is going to be onerous. So
 22 I do disagree with the recommendation on
 23 bicycle parking for that reason and encourage
 24 some blocked parking spaces to enhance the
 25 living space of the units themselves.

Page 84

1 per bedroom most of the time. So what happens
 2 is that the only time that that changes is when
 3 you have the Multi-Family, with many bedrooms
 4 and so on, but that's why we have a blanket
 5 rule here. It's not per bedroom. It's one
 6 unit.

7 MS. ANDERSON: Well, if one unit has four
 8 bedrooms in a townhome, some of these townhomes
 9 are three stories tall, I respectfully
 10 disagree. I don't think that's appropriate --

11 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, and the Zoning Code
 12 simply says the minimum. You could do more,
 13 depending on the project.

14 MS. ANDERSON: I think it needs to be
 15 varied, as to how large the townhouse is.

16 MR. TRIAS: Okay.

17 MS. ANDERSON: You know, under so
 18 many square feet, and you have a better idea
 19 than I would, you know, if one would be
 20 sufficient, because you're going to have
 21 (unintelligible). If it's a one bedroom condo,
 22 you just need one parking space.

23 Did you include in your recommendations the
 24 discussion on Historic Preservation? Am I
 25 picking that up out of this latter part --

1 MR. TRIAS: Historic Preservation is in the
 2 Code already. We didn't propose any new ideas
 3 that are not in the Code.
 4 MS. ANDERSON: All right. Then I picked
 5 that up out of that other section.
 6 And I mirror Chip's comments on the US-1
 7 corridor. We need to do some visioning there,
 8 as well. And, you know, are there any thoughts
 9 about offering bonuses for this new
 10 designation, 20,000 square foot for
 11 development --
 12 MR. TRIAS: Can you repeat the question?
 13 MS. ANDERSON: Are there any thoughts about
 14 offering any bonuses for the new designation
 15 you have, the 20,000 square foot --
 16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Rhonda, it's hard to
 17 hear you. Maybe your battery is going on your
 18 unit.
 19 MS. ANDERSON: Maybe so.
 20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Now it's better.
 21 MS. ANDERSON: Okay. It was the
 22 connection. I had to put it in a little
 23 further to make it work.
 24 Regarding LEED requirements, we require
 25 them now for 20,000 square feet.

1 Rene, and I was looking at all of the
 2 recommendations and trying to figure out how
 3 they were incorporated or not. So I appreciate
 4 the clarification on that, and I'm happy to
 5 hear that the consultant's comments have been
 6 taken into account, and that she is still in
 7 the loop. I'm very excited and happy that
 8 Plater-Zyberk is involved, and as I said, I
 9 appreciate all of her efforts in this matter.
 10 Most of my comments have to do with
 11 parking, and I'm going to follow-up on
 12 Rhonda's. On the townhouse parking, I believe
 13 all of the new townhouse developments have two
 14 spaces.
 15 MR. TRIAS: Many of them have actually
 16 four.
 17 MS. VELEZ: Four. Okay, well, at least
 18 two, from what I've seen. I walk a lot, so I
 19 look -- and I walk through the alleys and I see
 20 what there is.
 21 My concern is that, if we make it only one,
 22 with curb cuts in the front, which I
 23 understand, because we want to have trees, we
 24 want to beautify our sidewalks and our streets,
 25 there really is no other place to park, and I'm

1 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 2 MS. ANDERSON: Are there any thoughts about
 3 offering a bonus for folks that do it for
 4 smaller properties, these 10,000 square foot
 5 Mixed-Use?
 6 MR. TRIAS: That's not an issue that we
 7 dealt with in this update, but certainly we
 8 could look into it.
 9 MS. ANDERSON: Yeah. That's what I'm
 10 saying. We should take a look at it, and
 11 perhaps there can be incentives there, as well.
 12 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. Sure.
 13 MS. ANDERSON: And then I'll also circle
 14 back with you about discussing of curb cuts and
 15 blocks where we need some additional signage
 16 for locating accessible parking in the CBD
 17 District.
 18 MR. TRIAS: Thank you.
 19 MS. ANDERSON: That's my comment. So thank
 20 you for all of your hard, hard work.
 21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.
 22 Maria.
 23 MS. VELEZ: Thank you for all of the
 24 efforts and the time involved in getting this
 25 together. I, too, was a bit confused, like

1 seeing already where, you know, that could be
 2 an issue. So I don't know what the solution
 3 is. I don't know if it's something that needs
 4 to be tied to the size of the townhouse or to
 5 the area where it is, but -- I love the
 6 townhouse look. I love what we're doing with
 7 them. But that is something that I'm very
 8 concerned about, what we're providing for the
 9 residents of the townhouse and visitors to the
 10 townhouses, even deliveries coming in. That's
 11 something that needs more time and more effort
 12 headed that way.
 13 The other items, I'm also very happy to see
 14 that Kevin Kinney is in the meeting, because my
 15 other items have to do with off-site parking.
 16 I know that we presently have off-site parking
 17 for existing buildings, and I'm happy to see
 18 that it's being made available to new
 19 developments. I think it's very necessary.
 20 I just had a question, what is being done,
 21 as far as violations? Do we presently have
 22 situations where these agreements for off-site
 23 parking are not being complied with and what
 24 are we doing in that regard?
 25 MR. TRIAS: Kevin --

Page 89

1 MR. KINNEY: Yeah.
 2 No, we, actually, Development Services,
 3 have somebody who tracks all of the off-site
 4 parking grievances we have, and if somebody is
 5 in violation, it actually becomes a Code
 6 violation. The ones that the City is directly
 7 involved in, there's a few that the Commission
 8 has approved, and those, everybody is complying
 9 with. At this point, I'm not aware of anyone
 10 who has gotten their parking requirements
 11 approved throughout off-site parking, that's
 12 currently in violation, but we do track it, and
 13 it becomes a Code violation, and they can be
 14 fined if they fail to provide that.
 15 One of the things we're proposing with the
 16 new possible payment in lieu is, if somebody
 17 has an off-site parking agreement and they are
 18 in default for some reason, they would make the
 19 full payment of the payment in lieu. Our
 20 intention is to keep track of all of those
 21 agreements ourselves.
 22 MS. VELEZ: I'm happy to see that the new
 23 agreements need to be recorded, in recordable
 24 form, as restrictive covenances, because that's
 25 a good way to put everyone on notice that it

Page 91

1 we're going to have a garage that would support
 2 the parking for whatever happens on Miracle
 3 Mile.
 4 MS. VELEZ: The North Ponce area, I'm happy
 5 to hear you say that there is a parking garage
 6 that's going to be going up in that area.
 7 MR. KINNEY: It's on Minorca, 200 Block of
 8 Minorca. That's already in design at this
 9 point and should be under construction next
 10 year. And, yes, part of the intention of that
 11 is to help support the Residential in the North
 12 Ponce area.
 13 MS. VELEZ: Yes. There's a lot of
 14 re-development in the North Ponce area and I
 15 know that many residents in that area are
 16 already concerned about lack of parking, and
 17 parking on the streets is also -- any street
 18 parking tends to be diminished every time we
 19 put up a new building. So we want to make sure
 20 that those people are taken care of.
 21 Thank you. That's about it with me. I
 22 mean, everything else that I had looked at has
 23 been touched on. Thank you.
 24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you very much.
 25 Robert, I know you spoke before when we

Page 90

1 exists, because if you're an owner of a
 2 building and you have leased out some parking
 3 spaces in your building to a developer, then
 4 you're going to go sell your building to
 5 someone, that's going to be something that will
 6 be very apparent and visible to everyone
 7 involved.
 8 And I know that you have already told us,
 9 on previous occasions, Mr. Kinney, that the
 10 City still has plenty of parking available at
 11 City garages. So I hope that we encourage the
 12 developers, who want to use off-site, to use
 13 the City parking lots. Beyond going to private
 14 owners, that the first step would be the City
 15 parking lots. I would like to see the money go
 16 there.
 17 MR. KINNEY: Yeah. We do that pretty
 18 intentionally. There are certain areas of the
 19 City where we would like to see less parking
 20 developed, Miracle Mile, even in North Ponce,
 21 and the developments we have in the pipeline
 22 for public parking are intentional to support
 23 that in the future.
 24 We've got one garage going up towards North
 25 Ponce, and, then, of course, on 200 Andalusia,

Page 92

1 asked you to comment after Ramon. Do you have
 2 any comments that you would like to make after
 3 the close?
 4 MR. BEHAR: Thank you, Eibi. No, I'm good
 5 for now. I'll wait for you to finish your
 6 comment.
 7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. Thank you.
 8 A couple of thoughts. One is, I very much
 9 agree with Chip and Rhonda about the green
 10 space. I think we need to -- or the City needs
 11 to go ahead and take a look at how to maintain
 12 good space within projects and to try to find a
 13 way to make them accessible to all residents.
 14 Also, I think, the City should start
 15 looking at -- when it looks into work here,
 16 live here, Mixed-Use, and there could be an
 17 issue with retail space on the ground floor,
 18 there's a certain limit of businesses that are
 19 going to come in and so forth. But one idea
 20 may be to go ahead and have, on the ground
 21 floor, double height or something, where you
 22 have the residence above and the office down
 23 below. I think that would help the area.
 24 I think the City, also, should take a look
 25 on how to maintain Miracle Mile to thrive as a

1 main area, and sometimes I feel that too much
2 development having retail space on the ground
3 floor, mandating that retail space on the
4 ground floor, you may be having issues with
5 other areas, such as Miracle Mile.

6 The parking for the townhouse, I also
7 agree. I was going to bring that up. I think
8 that needs to be looked at. Now, if you have a
9 garage on a townhouse, that's accessible by the
10 alley in the back, that's already one space,
11 Ramon, or am I wrong?

12 MR. TRIAS: Typically they do two spaces or
13 four. I mean, I've seen, the latest ones,
14 have, actually, two and two.

15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Right, but we're now
16 going to require just one, is the way I'm
17 looking at it.

18 MR. TRIAS: Well, that's the minimum. You
19 can do more.

20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: No. No. I
21 understand. But I think what I'm concerned
22 about is having too many cars in the swale or
23 in the outer areas parking and then they're
24 going to come to the Parking Director and
25 they're going to say, we've got to do this by

1 parking permit only, and so forth. You have to
2 be careful not to create other issues. That's
3 just my concern, that I have with it.

4 And, then, another question, actually,
5 which I had was, if you look at your
6 memorandum, on the first page of your
7 memorandum, under D, the Design District
8 type --

9 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: -- where you put to be
11 incorporated, correct, to 97 and 10 stories.

12 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Did we not pass that
14 to the 120 at the last meeting, Mr. Collier?

15 MR. TRIAS: You want me to answer that
16 or --

17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yeah, please. I
18 apologize.

19 MR. TRIAS: No. In the last meeting, what
20 you passed is the same information for the Comp
21 Plan. So now we have to put it in the Zoning
22 Code, also.

23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: But the way you've got
24 it written here, isn't it going to contradict?

25 MR. TRIAS: No. No. It's going to be the

1 same. It's exactly the same. We're trying to
2 be consistent. The issue we had before is that
3 it was contradictory and confusing, and very
4 rightfully so. That was pointed out and we are
5 correcting that.

6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So --

7 MR. TRIAS: So it's ten stories. It's not
8 eight, basically. That's what you passed the
9 last time.

10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So it's ten stories,
11 but we had a height on the ten stories or did
12 we not?

13 MR. TRIAS: There was an additional
14 regulation -- there's an additional regulation
15 that allows 120 feet and 10 stories, if the
16 Commission approves it.

17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. And now you're
18 saying here to do it 97 feet.

19 MR. TRIAS: That's the one that doesn't
20 require the Commission to go through that
21 process.

22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. So you're
23 doing --

24 MR. TRIAS: And I'm sorry, this is
25 complicated because of the --

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: You're doing, in other
2 words, conditional?

3 MR. TRIAS: Right. Right. Right.

4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay.

5 MR. TRIAS: That's what's in the Code now.
6 Those are not new ideas. That's simply what's
7 in the Code now.

8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. And then my
9 last comment is, actually, to Mr. Collier. The
10 memorandum that was sent to the Board was just
11 sent to us yesterday. Are you satisfied -- is
12 it okay with any posting requirements or being
13 part of the agenda that's up on the site with
14 enough time?

15 MR. COLLIER: No. What's posted is to
16 address the re-write. A memorandum from Staff
17 is not something that's required to be noticed
18 in advance. So there is no issue about
19 noticing a memorandum from Staff.

20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. To me, one of
21 the biggest concerns was, taking away rights
22 from property owners by doing the Zoning Code
23 re-write, and I'm happy that that has been
24 addressed and has been looked at by Staff, the
25 City Attorney and so forth.

1 I just want to thank everybody for all of
 2 their efforts and all of time that they've put
 3 in to get this to where we're at today. That's
 4 it for me.

5 At this point, would anybody like to make a
 6 motion?

7 MR. BEHAR: I'll make a motion that --

8 MR. TORRE: Can I make a couple of
 9 comments? I'm sorry to interrupt, Robert.

10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. Go ahead,
 11 Venny.

12 MR. TORRE: As to the parking, three of you
 13 have spoken about parking, and I just wanted to
 14 bring up a point, and it's a good point that
 15 you're making regarding the required parking
 16 for townhouses, but I do have a lot of
 17 experience with these things.

18 One of the goals that we should have is to
 19 try to reduce the size of these townhouses.
 20 All we can do now is build these monster
 21 townhouses. It's something that's not good.
 22 We should try to make them smaller, and the one
 23 parking requirement helps. And the way it
 24 helps, and maybe this is where it helps a lot
 25 is, on a PAD situation, you can get on-site

1 parking that's side by side and not necessarily
 2 in the building and still accomplish the
 3 parking requirements that you need, from a
 4 marketing standpoint, but not necessarily in
 5 the building. So you can get those buildings
 6 to be smaller.

7 Definitely, we want to get the cars off the
 8 street. These areas that have all of the cars
 9 parking in the swale, that's not a good thing
 10 at all. The goal should be to get them into
 11 the buildings. So I'm not opposed to trying to
 12 get maximum parking, but we need to figure out
 13 a way to let the smaller product show up, and
 14 this is one way that I think we could do that.

15 Also, parking cars outside of the
 16 townhouse, not necessarily inside of a
 17 townhouse, can fulfill the same thing. They
 18 don't have to be necessarily in a garage. We
 19 just have to be sure that we have another
 20 parking on the product. So there's two things
 21 going on there.

22 The second point that I want to make is, I
 23 really think very -- have a very strong feeling
 24 that we should try to bring the buildings sizes
 25 down, bring the scale down, and we need to

1 incentivize people to bring those smaller
 2 projects out into the public, try to get better
 3 streetscapes, better retail. The bigger
 4 buildings don't always do that, and I'd like to
 5 continue to try to incentivize the smaller
 6 buildings, that hopefully have better
 7 streetscapes, better feeling of urban space,
 8 and I hope that we're doing that with this
 9 process.

10 But my concern is, when you get these
 11 larger buildings that may show up, and, yeah,
 12 200 feet of retail, but what kind of retail?
 13 It's not the best. So I propose that we
 14 continue to strive for smaller developments to
 15 have a way to come out.

16 MS. ANDERSON: I would agree with you,
 17 Venny, and I think also the area, too, on the
 18 townhouses. If you have a townhouse on
 19 Valencia, you have an easy solution on the
 20 parking. But if you go down further on
 21 Almeria, where you want to maintain a green
 22 swale, it doesn't work so well. You'll end up
 23 tearing up the swales and it won't look pretty
 24 anymore. So I think it has to be judged based
 25 upon the size of the townhome and where it's

1 located.

2 And I concur and I mirror on your comments
 3 of getting smaller developments, because I
 4 think we can do a better job, and to maintain
 5 Coral Gables in the vision that we would like
 6 to, with more green space.

7 One other comment, and it's just a comment,
 8 is, we do need to continue to look at this
 9 off-street parking and clear definitions as to
 10 where that 1,000 foot entrance or location is,
 11 so that, you know, when we have projects that
 12 come in front of us, it's not unclear or it's
 13 clearer than it is right now.

14 So I think there's some workshop that we
 15 could possibly do to do some brainstorming.

16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

17 Robert, you were in the process of making a
 18 motion.

19 MR. MURAI: I had a couple of comments, if
 20 I could.

21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes, Rene.

22 MR. MURAI: I have two comments. One, and
 23 I don't know if this follows on Chip's
 24 comments, but, you know, to the extent that we
 25 encourage or -- let's say, encourage, Mixed-Use

Page 101

1 projects, we need to consider whether the
 2 retail component of the Mixed-Use project is
 3 going to be in an area that it can be
 4 successful. You know, if you're in the Central
 5 Business District -- even in the Central
 6 Business District, there are some areas there
 7 where retail is not going to flourish and
 8 people just put them up to get the bonuses or
 9 to -- you know, whatever they get for putting
 10 them in. So we need to think about that.

11 And then the other comment that I had or
 12 that I thought about while we were talking
 13 about public spaces -- not public spaces, but
 14 green spaces --

15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Open spaces.

16 MR. MURAI: -- or open spaces, I mean,
 17 there's a difference to me between a large
 18 project where you may require a developer to
 19 contribute some open space to the City and a
 20 smaller project where, I think, the green space
 21 is really, to me, is not something that should
 22 be there for the public to use. It should be
 23 there for aesthetic reasons and not for the
 24 public to use.

25 A large project, to give something to the

Page 103

1 requirements, we have to put retail space that
 2 doesn't work, you know. And the case in point
 3 is here, in the Gables Ponce. We had to go
 4 back, and, you know, modify that to live-work
 5 units, which is what we're trying to achieve
 6 today, and if I do that, I think we're going to
 7 be a lot more successful and eliminate, in some
 8 cases, you know, retail space that does not
 9 make any sense whatsoever.

10 So, I think, in that we all have -- we're
 11 in the same frame of mind, and I think that's
 12 going to be the way we achieve that. One,
 13 elimination or modifying the percentage of the
 14 one single use permitted in buildings, okay.
 15 That's One.

16 Look, I feel very comfortable, very
 17 confident, that this process is going to
 18 continue until the Commission meeting, which I
 19 think, correct me if I'm wrong, Ramon, is
 20 scheduled for September 15.

21 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

22 MR. BEHAR: Okay. I believe that we have
 23 another meeting of -- a Planning & Zoning
 24 meeting on September 9th. Is that correct?

25 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

Page 102

1 City is one thing, but to somehow or another
 2 say that somebody, who is not building a
 3 massive project, has to have the green space in
 4 such a way that the public can use it, it
 5 doesn't make any sense to me. There should be
 6 green space, because it's aesthetically
 7 pleasing and because that's the kind of City
 8 that we're trying to continue to build. That's
 9 it.

10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.
 11 Robert.

12 MR. BEHAR: Let me address, for instance,
 13 for a minute, the retail issue, which I agree
 14 with everybody, and that requirement, really,
 15 talking to Ramon about it, is by modifying the
 16 limitation of percentage of uses. In a
 17 Mixed-Use building, you have to have a minimum
 18 -- or a maximum of 85 percent of the uses to be
 19 in a single use. For example, in a Mixed-Use,
 20 85 percent have to be limited to Residential
 21 and the other 15 percent to a Commercial. In
 22 some cases, it has to be retail or office.
 23 That could be eliminated or modified to say,
 24 you know, for a portion of the ground floor.
 25 I have a project that, because of those

Page 104

1 MR. BEHAR: Okay. So what I propose, and I
 2 will make a motion to approve the Staff
 3 recommendation, with all you guys' comments and
 4 conditions, and that we continue working with
 5 Ramon to make sure that the comments, good ones
 6 or not, be incorporated, and before it goes to
 7 Commission, we'll have a meeting and we'll be
 8 happy to come back and give us a little report
 9 of where we got to.

10 But I am going to make a recommendation to
 11 move this item forward, with the condition that
 12 we continue the dialog with Ramon. And I say,
 13 we, which is the group that got together, the
 14 attorneys and the architect, to continue to
 15 improve the Code, you know, as provided.

16 MR. WITHERS: I'll second it.

17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Chip went ahead and
 18 seconded it.

19 Craig --

20 MR. COLLER: Can I get a clarification on
 21 the motion? So the motion is to approve
 22 according to Staff recommendation and the
 23 modifications that have been included in the
 24 memorandum, and, in addition, that the comments
 25 that the Board has made today be included as

1 part of the approval, but not -- I don't think
 2 these things can necessarily be incorporated in
 3 what's done, because many of these are
 4 generalized thoughts that may need to be
 5 further clarified. And you're proposing in the
 6 motion, to have, at the additional meeting on
 7 September 9th, for further consideration of
 8 these comments and other comments?
 9 MR. BEHAR: No, Craig. Maybe let me
 10 rephrase it. My recommendation is to move to
 11 approve, to continue the dialog, you know,
 12 working with Ramon and Staff and the consultant
 13 on getting, you know, the comments that we've
 14 made today, in addition to the other comments
 15 that we have from the past, you know,
 16 incorporated, you know, to Commission. And
 17 what I said about the day, is that fortunately
 18 we're meeting a week or so before the
 19 Commission meeting; therefore, we could have
 20 just a quick, quick, you know, report, you
 21 know, stating what we did. Not to go back to
 22 discussion. At that point, it's just to let
 23 the Board know what comments, whether it's the
 24 parking for townhomes or whatever other
 25 comments that they've made.

1 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 2 MR. WITHERS: Maybe we could actually see
 3 the work product that will be going to the
 4 Commission. Would that help in the review and
 5 help expedite it, do you think?
 6 MR. BEHAR: Chip, I don't have a problem.
 7 Obviously, Staff is the one that needs to
 8 prepare the document. From our point of view,
 9 you know, we're fine with that, I'm sure, and
 10 we will continue working with Ramon and Staff,
 11 because ultimately what we want, we want to
 12 make sure that we have a Code that does
 13 everything that is good for everybody.
 14 MR. WITHERS: Well, you know, like for
 15 instance, I think Ms. Anderson was asking
 16 about, do we measure the remote parking from
 17 the corner of the building or the front door of
 18 the building. And I think the recommendation
 19 was, well, we should be probably measuring it
 20 from the front door, where the valet is.
 21 So, I guess, those are the kinds of things
 22 that are going to be captured in this memo,
 23 Ramon?
 24 MR. TRIAS: Yes, sir. And I had the same
 25 conversation with Ms. Anderson today, and I

1 I happen to agree on the retail, and that's
 2 one of the comments that we made to Ramon, that
 3 we're looking at it now, and those are the
 4 percentages of uses.
 5 MR. COLLER: Those comments are to be
 6 looked at further on September 9th, and the
 7 Board is approving with the recommendation of
 8 Staff for this item?
 9 MR. BEHAR: Yes.
 10 MR. WITHERS: And that's what I understood
 11 now.
 12 I want to ask Ramon a question really
 13 quick. How do you present this Board's
 14 comments to the Commission? Are they Codified
 15 or are they listed separately on an additional
 16 sheet? How do you present our comments, Ramon,
 17 to the Commission?
 18 MR. TRIAS: There's a new memo that is
 19 prepared for the Commission, and usually what I
 20 do is, I list all of the issues in bullet
 21 forms, so it's very clear to them.
 22 MR. WITHERS: Okay. Robert, how about if
 23 we actually could see maybe a draft of that
 24 memo. Do you have time to prepare it by
 25 September 9th, do you think?

1 thank her for the input.
 2 MR. WITHERS: Okay.
 3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Ramon, a question.
 4 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: How does our September
 6 9th agenda look?
 7 MR. TRIAS: Well, right now we don't have
 8 any items.
 9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay.
 10 MR. TRIAS: We could have one item, which
 11 is a report from Staff on the ongoing
 12 discussions, if you want to.
 13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. Yeah, that
 14 would be fine.
 15 So we have a motion. We have a second.
 16 Any other comments? No?
 17 Jill, would you call the roll, please?
 18 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?
 19 MR. BEHAR: Yes.
 20 THE SECRETARY: Rene Murai?
 21 MR. MURAI: Yes.
 22 THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?
 23 MR. TORRE: Yes.
 24 THE SECRETARY: Maria Velez?
 25 MS. VELEZ: Yes.

Page 109

1 THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?
 2 MR. WITHERS: Yes.
 3 THE SECRETARY: Rhonda Anderson?
 4 MS. ANDERSON: Yes.
 5 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat?
 6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.
 7 Before we adjourn the meeting, once again,
 8 I'd really like to thank the consultant, the
 9 consultant group, that has worked very, very
 10 hard. Also, I'd like to thank very much Ramon
 11 for all of his efforts and the City Staff and
 12 the Building Department and all of the
 13 departments, actually, that are incorporated
 14 within the City for all of the hard work, and I
 15 also would like to thank all of the individuals
 16 that have gone ahead and put their efforts and
 17 their individual time to make this a better
 18 place. Thank you very much.
 19 Is there a motion to adjourn?
 20 MS. VELEZ: So moved.
 21 MS. ANDERSON: Second.
 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: All in favor?
 23 (Thereupon, all Board Members voted aye.)
 24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you very much,
 25 everybody. Stay well.

Page 110

1 (Thereupon, the meeting was adjourned at
 2 6:15 p.m.)
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

Page 111

1 CERTIFICATE
 2
 3 STATE OF FLORIDA:
 4 SS.
 5 COUNTY OF MIAMI-DADE:
 6
 7
 8
 9 I, NIEVES SANCHEZ, Court Reporter, and a Notary
 10 Public for the State of Florida at Large, do hereby
 11 certify that I was authorized to and did
 12 stenographically report the foregoing proceedings and
 13 that the transcript is a true and complete record of my
 14 stenographic notes.
 15
 16 DATED this 27th day of August, 2020.
 17
 18
 19 SIGNATURE ON FILE
 20 _____
 21 NIEVES SANCHEZ
 22
 23
 24
 25

1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25