

Page 1 CITY OF CORAL GABLES BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT HYBRID FORMAT MONDAY, APRIL 5, 2021, COMMENCING AT 9:03 A.M. Board Members Present at Commission Chamber: Maria Garcia, via Zoom Jorge Otero Kathleen Kauffman Gema Pinon Javier Salman Mike Sotelo John Thomson City Staff and Consultants: Ramon Trias, Planning Director Jill Menendez, Administrative Assistant, Board Secretary Arceli Redila, Principal Planner, via Zoom Stephanie M. Throckmorton, Assistant City Attorney Also Participating Via Zoom Platform: Anthony Lopez Glen Larson	Page 2 1 THEREUPON: 2 (The following proceedings were had:) 3 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Good morning. Happy 4 belated Easter. I hope everybody had a 5 wonderful weekend with their families and loved 6 ones. 7 So I think we are ready to start. We have 8 one item today. If you have your agenda, I'm 9 just going to go ahead through the initial 10 issues, and then we can start with the item 11 today. 12 So, good morning, everybody. The Board of 13 Adjustment is comprised of seven members. Four 14 Members of the Board shall constitute a quorum 15 and the affirmative vote of four Members of the 16 Board present shall be necessary to authorize 17 or deny a variance or grant an appeal. A tie 18 vote shall result in the automatic continuance 19 of the matter to the next meeting, which shall 20 be continued until a majority vote is achieved. 21 If only four Members of the Board are present, 22 an applicant shall be entitled to a 23 postponement to the next regularly scheduled 24 meeting of the Board. 25 Any person who acts as lobbyist pursuant to
Page 3 1 the City of Coral Gables Ordinance Number 2 2006-11 must register with the City Clerk prior 3 to engaging in lobbying activities or 4 presentations before City Staff, Boards, 5 Committees and/or the City Commission. A copy 6 of the Ordinance is available in the Office of 7 the City Clerk. Failure to register and 8 provide proof of registration shall prohibit 9 your ability to present to the Board. 10 I now officially call the City of Coral 11 Gables Board of Adjustments meeting of April 12 5th, 2021 to order. The time is 9:03 a.m. 13 Let's start with roll call. 14 THE SECRETARY: Jorge Otero? 15 Mr. Otero, please? 16 MR. OTERO: Present. 17 THE SECRETARY: Javier Salman? 18 MR. SALMAN: Present. 19 THE SECRETARY: Kathleen Kaufman? 20 MS. KAUFMAN: Present. 21 THE SECRETARY: Gema Pinon? Gema? 22 Gema Pinon? 23 MS. PINON: I'm here. I'm here. Present. 24 But we can't hear you. 25 MR. SOTELO: We can't hear. There's a very	Page 4 1 big echo on this side of the room. 2 THE SECRETARY: We'll get IT to help us 3 here. One second. 4 MS. THROCKMORTON: Jill, would you like me 5 to read the names, just for the record? 6 Mr. Salman? 7 MR. SALMAN: Present. 8 MS. THROCKMORTON: Mr. Sotelo? 9 MR. SOTELO: Present. 10 MS. THROCKMORTON: Oh, Mr. Thomson? I 11 apologize. 12 And Ms. Garcia? 13 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: I'm here. 14 MS. THROCKMORTON: Thank you. 15 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: So, next, please be 16 advised that this Board is a quasi-judicial 17 board and the items on the agenda are 18 quasi-judicial in nature, which requires Board 19 Members to disclose all ex parte communications 20 and site visits. An ex parte communication is 21 denied as any contact, communication, 22 conversation, correspondence, memorandum or 23 other written or verbal communication that 24 takes place outside a public hearing between a 25 member of the public and a member of a

Page 5 1 quasi-judicial board regarding matters to be 2 heard by the Board. If anyone made any contact 3 with a Board Member regarding an issue before 4 the Board, the Board Member must state on the 5 record the existence of the ex parte 6 communication and the party who originated the 7 communication. 8 Also, if a Board Member conducted a site 9 visit specifically related to the case before 10 the Board, the Board must also disclose such 11 visit. In either case, the Board Member must 12 state on the record whether the ex parte 13 communication and/or site visit will affect the 14 Board Member's ability to impartially consider 15 the evidence to be presented regarding the 16 matter. The Board Member should also state 17 that his or her decision will be based on 18 substantial competent evidence and testimony 19 presented on the record today. 20 Does any Member of the Board have such 21 communication or site visit to disclose at this 22 time? 23 Seeing as there is none, we'll continue on 24 now with the approval of the minutes from our 25 last meeting. If everybody would like to take	Page 6 1 a moment to review and if we have a motion to 2 approve those minutes. 3 MR. OTERO: Well, subject to -- is my mike 4 on? Subject to some speaker thing 5 unidentified, which I don't think is 6 material -- I think the content was accurate, 7 as I recall -- I move to approve the minutes. 8 MR. SALMAN: Second. 9 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Okay. Thank you. 10 Do we have roll call for the vote? 11 (Inaudible.) 12 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Stephanie, did you 13 want to do it, if you could hear us? 14 MS. THROCKMORTON: Ms. Garcia, Ms. Menendez 15 is reading. It might be a little difficult for 16 you to hear. I just confirmed all of the votes 17 so far have been yay. 18 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Oh, thank you. 19 MS. THROCKMORTON: Ms. Pinon? 20 MS. PINON: Yes. 21 MS. THROCKMORTON: Mr. Salman? 22 MR. SALMAN: Yes. 23 MS. THROCKMORTON: Mr. Sotelo? 24 MR. SOTELO: Yes. 25 MS. THROCKMORTON: Mr. Thomson?
Page 7 1 Ms. Garcia? 2 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Yes. 3 Okay. So motion passes unanimously? 4 Okay. Next we're going to be moving into 5 our next item. Everyone who speaks today must 6 complete the roster on the podium. We ask that 7 you print clearly so the official records of 8 your name and address will be correct. 9 Now, with the exception of attorneys, all 10 persons who will speak on agenda items today 11 before us, please rise to be sworn in. 12 (Thereupon, participants were sworn.) 13 MR. LOPEZ: I affirm. 14 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Thank you so much. 15 In deference to those present, we ask that 16 all cell phones, pagers or other electrical 17 devices be turned off at this time. 18 We'll now proceed with the agenda. Would 19 the City like to present first? 20 MS. REDILA: Yes, Madam Chair. 21 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Go ahead. 22 MS. REDILA: I'm going to share my screen. 23 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Okay. 24 Is someone speaking? I couldn't hear 25 anyone.	Page 8 1 MS. REDILA: I can't hear. 2 MS. THROCKMORTON: Can you hear me speaking 3 now? 4 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Yes. 5 MS. THROCKMORTON: I believe Staff or the 6 Applicant is going to present now. 7 MS. REDILA: Let me share my screen. 8 Good morning, Madam Chair, Members of the 9 Board. For the record, Arceli Redila from 10 Planning. The item before you this morning is 11 a variance request that came before you in the 12 last February 2021 meeting. After Board 13 discussion at that meeting, a motion was made 14 to deny the application, and the vote was a 15 tie, three-three. As a rule, a tie vote shall 16 result in the automatic continuance of the 17 matter to the next meeting, which shall be 18 continued until a majority vote is achieved. 19 So last -- March, we planned to have a 20 meeting, but we did not have a full Board, so 21 the applicant asked to defer to this month, and 22 that is why we are here today. 23 So a notice was again sent to the 24 surrounding property owners, it was 25 re-advertised in the paper, and the property

Page 9 1 was also posted. 2 So, to recall, this application was 3 submitted by Mr. Glen Larson on behalf of the 4 homeowner, Mr. Anthony Lopez. The request is 5 to allow a dock to protrude into the waterway 6 35 feet and six inches from the property line, 7 where five feet is the maximum allowed. 8 The property is located on Journeys End. 9 It is unique, as you can see here. It is 10 within a waterway cove. 11 So the property already has an existing 12 single-family home with a dock on the north 13 side of the property, which was also granted a 14 variance in 2009. 15 The request at this time is to allow a dock 16 on the east side to have the same projection -- 17 waterward projection of 35 feet and six inches. 18 So because of the dense mangroves on the site, 19 it from the property from the five feet 20 waterward setback. 21 So this request, if granted, would leave a 22 waterway -- navigable waterway of 78 feet and 23 75 feet is required. So it's still within the 24 regulation. 25 And Staff is supporting the request.	Page 10 1 That's my presentation, Madam Chair. If 2 the applicant would like to speak. We'll be 3 here if you have any questions. 4 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Thank you so much. 5 Would the applicant like to also speak now? 6 MR. LOPEZ: Yes, I would. 7 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: So this is Mr. Lopez? 8 MR. LOPEZ: Correct. Good morning. 9 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Good morning. Please 10 proceed. 11 MR. LOPEZ: Okay. Great. Thanks. 12 Good morning, everyone, ladies and 13 gentlemen. My name is Anthony Lopez. Thank 14 you very much for your time this morning. 15 I purchased this home in late 2019. One of 16 the reasons I bought the home was because of 17 the lush and beautiful landscaping and the fact 18 that the house was surrounded by water on two 19 sides. 20 I've lived in Coral Gables all of my adult 21 life, and, you know, for the first time, I 22 bought a property that I thought could 23 accommodate a larger boat. Unfortunately, the 24 existing dock, as configured, in the yacht 25 basin, where the boats turn around, the pilings
Page 11 1 don't provide for the mooring of a larger 2 vessel, which is why, unfortunately, we're here 3 before the Board today trying to or seeking the 4 Board to approve a dock on the other side of 5 the property. 6 What's unique about our house is the fact 7 that we have -- unlike our neighbors in Old 8 Cutler Bay, our entire property has mangroves 9 at the water's edge. As a result of the 10 mangroves at the water's edge, we have to build 11 the dock farther than the five-foot setback. 12 Fortunately, where the dock is going to be 13 put, the canal is extremely wide. I believe 14 the canal's about 146 feet in width, which 15 allows us to still put the dock and not impede 16 in the 75-foot setback requirement of the City 17 of Coral Gables. 18 There was some concern by some of our 19 neighbors in Old Cutler Bay that this dock 20 would somehow impede or adversely affect their 21 ability to navigate up the channel. Mr. Larson 22 and myself, I think, have spoken to most of the 23 neighbors and those concerns have been 24 alleviated, once we fully explained to them 25 exactly how this dock is going to work and how	Page 12 1 much space is going to exist with the dock and 2 with the boat at the dock. It provides more 3 than ample room for navigation. As a matter of 4 fact, one of our neighbors, Mr. Robert 5 Martinez, has a very large vessel, I think, a 6 97-foot boat -- he submitted a letter of 7 support for the project, because he realizes 8 it's not going to impact his ability to get 9 down the channel. 10 Essentially our dock potentially affects 11 eleven homes, but I think it's important to 12 note that in order to get to the ocean from Old 13 Cutler Bay and Journeys End, once you pass my 14 house, you still have to navigate a channel 15 that has canal widths as small as 42 feet. 16 That's an important fact, because my dock is 17 going to allow 75 feet. So once a neighbor 18 passes my home, they still have to go and 19 navigate up a channel that has widths as small 20 as 42 feet, and, on average, is between 50 to 21 57 feet in width. 22 So, my house, my dock, is not going to 23 adversely impact anyone's ability to navigate 24 up the waterway. If that was going to be the 25 case, I wouldn't go through all this, because

Page 13 1 being a boat owner myself, I understand how 2 important it is to be able to navigate up the 3 channel. 4 So, with that said, I humbly request that 5 this Board support our variance, and if you 6 have any questions, myself or Mr. Larson is on 7 the line and can answer any technical 8 questions. 9 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Mr. Larson, would you 10 like to say anything before we open it up for 11 questions? 12 MR. LARSON: Yeah. I'd like to give a 13 little synopsis of my meetings with the 14 neighbors. 15 Glen Larson, Dock and Marine Construction, 16 752 Northeast 79 Street. 17 At the first meeting, there were concerns 18 brought up by a few of the neighbors regarding 19 navigation. I met with the neighbors and their 20 concerns were valid. They didn't think that 21 the maps provided and the measurements given 22 were possibly accurate. 23 I, with a survey crew and tape measurers, 24 hard physical tape measurers, with the owners 25 present, measured the width of the canal and	Page 14 1 confirmed all of the measurements are correct 2 on the plan, the width of the waterway is 3 correct, and they were satisfied that there was 4 no restriction to navigation. 5 The Board also expressed some concerns 6 about, you know, the fact that there were two 7 docks on the property and that enlarging the 8 dock and the basin would be a better scenario, 9 and after talking with some of the neighbors, 10 that basin is a turning basin. It's for the 11 purpose of rotating a boat around. If we were 12 to change the configuration of that existing 13 dock and make the slip larger, it would 14 interfere with the ability specifically of the 15 gentleman with the 97 footer at the end of the 16 canal, to spin the boat around to leave the 17 canal. 18 So all of the eleven properties that this 19 dock would affect, if we were to seek a 20 variance to lengthen the existing dock or 21 enlarge the mooring piling, that would have a 22 more severe effect on them than the 23 construction of this dock. If anybody has any 24 questions. 25 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Thank you, Mr. Larson.
Page 15 1 MS. PINON: Hi, good morning. I have a 2 question regarding the adjoining property where 3 there was a variance granted. Are there any 4 mangroves in that area significantly similar to 5 the ones that are on this existing property? 6 MR. LOPEZ: Are you referring to 7 Mr. Wolfson's property that has almost the 8 exact same dock with the mangroves? Because if 9 you are, I believe the answer is, yes. 10 MS. PINON: Well, because you said that 11 your property was very unique, because the 12 entire length of the property had the 13 mangroves. And my question is whether the 14 adjacent property that you referred to, owned 15 by a gentleman, I think you said, Martinez, who 16 had a 97 mega yacht there also, was that they 17 have the amount of mangroves that are on in 18 your property? 19 MR. LOPEZ: So I don't know the exact 20 answer as an amount, but all of the property 21 owners at Journeys End all have mangroves at 22 their water's edge. I don't know when he built 23 that dock. I believe he's been an owner there 24 since 2000. So I don't know if those mangroves 25 were in the same condition as they are now, but	Page 16 1 suffice it to say that all of the houses in 2 Journeys End have mangroves and all of the 3 houses that have mangroves have docks similar 4 to the one that we're requesting. 5 MS. PINON: Thank you. 6 MR. OTERO: I have a couple of questions. 7 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Go ahead. 8 MR. OTERO: There seems to be neighbors on 9 the basin side and neighbors across the canal. 10 Do we have -- this is for the City, do we have 11 any letter of recommendation of neighbors on 12 the Balada side, east of the canal? 13 Mr. Martinez, as I recall, is from the 14 basin side. Do we have any letters of 15 recommendation on the east side, which would be 16 the most affected one? 17 Is my mike on? 18 MS. PINON: Yeah. 19 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Would someone like to 20 answer the question? 21 MR. LOPEZ: This is Anthony Lopez. I don't 22 know the answer to that question. I don't 23 think I was privy to it. 24 MR. OTERO: No. I asked the question to 25 the City. You mentioned Mr. Martinez, but we

Page 17 1 had seen Mr. Martinez's letter last month and 2 Mr. Martinez does not live across the canal. 3 He lives on the basin side of the canal. This 4 dock would not affect him either way, frankly. 5 MS. THROCKMORTON: Arceli, are you able to 6 hear? I believe the question was for Staff. 7 MR. OTERO: It was for Staff. 8 MS. REDILA: We don't have a letter 9 submitted by the applicant. That would have 10 been provided by the applicant, if they had 11 received a letter for the neighbors adjacent or 12 abutting. 13 MR. OTERO: What my package shows is one 14 letter in support from Mr. Martinez, I believe 15 two in opposition and one e-mail across the 16 canal in opposition. I believe that's what the 17 minutes reflect and that's my recollection. 18 MR. LOPEZ: Oh, I'm sorry, just to correct 19 the record, there's a letter of support from 20 Mr. Martinez, a letter of support from Raul 21 Campos, and Journeys End president, Louis 22 Wolfson, as well. In terms of the Old Cutler 23 side, I haven't seen anything to that effect. 24 MR. OTERO: Mr. Lopez, the second letter is 25 also on the basin side, the second letter of	Page 18 1 support? 2 MR. LOPEZ: I believe all of the letters of 3 support are on the same side as my property, if 4 that's -- 5 MR. OTERO: Thank you. 6 MR. LOPEZ: Yes. 7 MS. REDILA: Yes, it's all on the same side 8 of the property, not the opposite properties of 9 the canal. 10 MR. LARSON: For the record, I think there 11 was only one letter of objection from a 12 gentleman named Alain on Balada Street. I 13 don't have his exact address. But I did speak 14 with him about the matter, and he said that 15 based on the -- we had supplied an additional 16 map, with additional measurements -- when he 17 first saw this presentation, he felt that we 18 were going to restrict his access to the bay 19 more than the restriction of the canal that 20 runs out to the bay along the Matheson Hammock 21 Park, which, as Mr. Lopez said, has several 22 areas that are 42 feet clear. 23 Once we sent him a map showing him the 24 exact measurements and confirmed the 25 measurements with the gentlemen that were
Page 19 1 attending the Zoom meeting, he indicated that 2 he had no concerns with this construction. 3 MR. OTERO: Ms. Delman, from another Board, 4 had raised a question as to that navigable 5 width. I don't see the 143 feet in my paper. 6 Perhaps the City or Staff can provide it to me. 7 It seems to me that we're here because 8 Mr. Lopez has a large boat. If the neighbor 9 across the canal also opts to purchase a large 10 boat, with the same beam width, aren't we now 11 infringing and reducing the waterway width? I 12 mean, once we allow one because of the size of 13 the boat, because Mr. Lopez mentioned that the 14 existing dock would not fit his boat, this 15 is -- my concern last month, that we're opening 16 up Pandora's box, in the sense that now 17 everybody will have a right to a variance, 18 unless we give it only to the first applicant 19 and not subsequent applicants from across the 20 canal. 21 So could someone explain to me or to the 22 Board the distances one more time? Because my 23 notes and the minutes show it was reduced to 63 24 feet, after taking into consideration the beam 25 width of the hundred foot boat.	Page 20 1 Mr. Larson, you mentioned -- I heard 143 2 feet somewhere. 3 MR. LARSON: 143 is the correct measurement 4 from bank to bank. Width -- and you have to 5 keep into consideration the clear measurement 6 that we provide with the plan of 65 feet is 7 with Mr. Anthony Lopez's boat present at the 8 property and a boat of similar size present 9 across the canal. The neighbor across the 10 canal has since purchased a boat, I don't know 11 the length of it, but it appears to be about an 12 80 footer. He is docked there. And if Mr. 13 Lopez's dock were present, with his boat on the 14 dock, all of the vessels of similar size would 15 have no problem navigating past the neighbor 16 across the canal and Mr. Lopez's property. 17 So the measurements that we've provided 18 with the City are a worst case scenario, with a 19 boat of similar size mirrored across the canal. 20 MR. OTERO: And what was that number, with 21 boats of similar size, if a dock was also 35 22 feet out? 23 MR. LOPEZ: I'll let Glen -- 24 MR. LARSON: I don't have it up, Anthony. 25 Go ahead and give him -- I think it was 67

Page 21 1 or -- 2 MR. LOPEZ: It's 63 feet three inches, and, 3 again, the reason I brought up the navigability 4 of the waterway up to the ocean is, if you 5 can't pass 63 feet, you certainly can't get to 6 the waterway, because once you pass my house, 7 you still have to clear 41 feet, and then 8 several houses that have 50-foot clearance, and 9 all of those homes somehow were able to put 10 docks and lifts, which made the clearance of 11 that waterway as small as 41 feet. 12 So I don't think there's a navigation -- no 13 "I don't" -- there is no navigation issue with 14 my dock and a boat put at my dock. And like I 15 said, my neighbor has a boat at his dock 16 already and the clearance is going to be more 17 than adequate for the waterway. 18 MR. OTERO: The next question is to the 19 City. In the minutes, it showed that the City 20 said that this would meet the regulation of 75 21 feet required for navigable waterway. What do 22 you mean by regulation? 23 MR. LARSON: The regulation is that fixed 24 structures -- like you're not allowed to build 25 something -- Mr. Lopez is not allowed to have	Page 22 1 mooring pilings without requesting another 2 variance from you. This variance is not to 3 exceed the 75-foot clearance for fixed 4 structures. 5 So the opposing waterway mooring piling 6 included, with Mr. Lopez's boat included, is 63 7 feet. The dock without the boat is, at the 8 tightest area of the canal, 78 feet eight 9 inches. 10 MR. OTERO: Could the City answer my 11 question? I appreciate that, Mr. Larson. I 12 guess I asked the City the question. 13 MS. THROCKMORTON: Mr. Otero, I can read 14 you the exact section, and, Arceli, please 15 correct me if this is incorrect, it's the new 16 number -- we've renumbered our Code, so it's 17 3702. Docks and mooring piles may be placed on 18 both sides of the waterway, at similar 19 distances from the bank, open unobstructed 20 navigable water between such piles, docks and 21 similar structures shall maintain a cleared 22 distance as set forth below for the following 23 geographic areas. And I believe that this 24 section is 75 feet, south of US-1, excluding 25 Block 92, Riviera Section Number 2.
Page 23 1 MR. OTERO: Thank you. 2 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Are there any other 3 questions? 4 MR. THOMSON: I have a question. 5 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Please go ahead. 6 We can't hear you. 7 MS. REDILA: Who is speaking? 8 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Mr. Thomson I believe 9 is trying to speak, but we can't hear him. 10 MS. THROCKMORTON: Mr. Thomson, we have to 11 turn on your microphone, I believe. 12 MR. THOMSON: Okay. Go ahead. Is it 13 there? Okay. I'm sorry. 14 For the record, this applicant has -- the 15 prior owner received a variance for the dock 16 that's in the basin area, which was enough to 17 handle at least a 36-foot boat, if not larger, 18 and now there's a second request for the same 19 property to have a variance on the canal side. 20 I understand that the dock that's being 21 constructed does not have my mooring poles out 22 to give a better dockage for the boat, because 23 that would also restrict the passage in the 24 waterway. 25 My problem overall with this request is	Page 24 1 that I have an aesthetic problem with a couple 2 of boat docks, boats on boats, for people 3 across the canal to be looking at, and if we 4 can address that to our Board, I would 5 appreciate it. 6 MR. LARSON: I'd like a chance to address 7 that. In all fairness to everyone that lives 8 along the waterways, the Solano Prado side is 9 seawall and dock continuous, one property to 10 the next. Almost every property has a dock 11 that's constructed setback to setback, with 12 boat lifts and multiple docks. Property widths 13 vary from 120 feet to 140 feet, so you have 14 constant docks everywhere. 15 Mr. Lopez's property is, I believe, 260 16 feet, which we are only proposing to put a dock 17 on less than 50 percent of the waterway of that 18 canal, so it's not going to aesthetically 19 create a marina look. The opposing neighbors 20 across the canal, the gentleman that just 21 purchased the boat, he can't even see 22 Mr. Lopez's property through his boat. 23 So we're not asking to create a scenario 24 where we're going to have a marina look or an 25 industrial look. It's just a similar situation

Page 25 1 to what you have in the Cocoplum waterway, that 2 has mangrove shorelines with docks built 3 setback to setback. Only this is going to be 4 on scale, percentage wise, much less. It's not 5 going to have that aesthetic marina look that 6 you have a concern about. 7 MS. PINON: I have a follow-up to that. 8 And I find it hard to believe how you can argue 9 that it's not going to have a marina look, when 10 you're putting a 105-foot mega yacht on the 11 waterway. I mean, I don't think the intention 12 of the waterway is to be a marina. 13 MR. LOPEZ: May I comment? I agree with 14 everything you just said about the waterway, no 15 one wants it to look like a marina. I, least 16 of all. I want my house, that I just spent a 17 significant amount of time and money in 18 remodeling, to look beautiful. I don't want it 19 to look like a marina at all. 20 The proposed boat that is being discussed 21 in this discussion doesn't -- is not going to 22 live at the house all year around. It's going 23 to live mostly in the Caribbean. I obviously 24 want to have the ability to bring my vessel to 25 the house to unload and have staff, you know,	Page 26 1 do whatever needs to be done on the boat, but 2 realistically I don't think this beautiful 3 Italian vessel is going to negatively impact 4 the look of the waterway. 5 Most of my neighbors in Gables Estates have 6 vessels much larger than this one, on houses 7 that have much less water than my house does. 8 One of the beautiful things about my property 9 and what we're trying to maintain is the 10 mangroves and all of the trees that about the 11 property line. And the concept we're trying to 12 do with this dock is to build it, so that it 13 becomes -- almost blends in to the natural 14 landscape. 15 And like Mr. Larson said, every single one 16 of my neighbors in Old Cutler Bay have docks. 17 Most of them have a dock and a boat lift. So 18 all you see, when you look at their homes, is a 19 large vessel and a small vessel. Here, this 20 boat is going to be minuscule compared to the 21 amount of landscaping and land that we have 22 that abuts the waterway. 23 So I'm very big on aesthetics. I want this 24 house to continue to be beautiful. I think 25 adding this dock is going to add a lot of value
Page 27 1 to the property and the neighborhood, and, you 2 know, obviously increased home values are good 3 for taxes and good for the City. 4 But I, in no way, want to have a mega yacht 5 marina look, but, you know, I don't think 6 putting a dock and a boat at my property is 7 going to be any worse than the current 8 condition that the City of Coral Gables already 9 allows other neighbors to have, that have a 10 smaller amount of water frontage. 11 I mean, even if you just look at the map 12 that was provided by Mr. Larson, you can scan 13 all of the houses at Old Cutler Bay, and as I 14 look at this map, you can see, you know, maybe 15 forty percent of the houses have multiple 16 boats. 17 So, you know, I'm not trying to adversely 18 impact the aesthetic of the neighborhood or of 19 my property. 20 MR. THOMSON: Okay. The comment that the 21 people across the -- the owners across the 22 canal could not see your boat through their 23 boat was kind of a revealing fact. I was 24 concerned about the aesthetics of that home. 25 But if it already has blocked its view by a	Page 28 1 large boat, then I have no concern about that 2 man's aesthetics. 3 I do have a concern that, the owner here 4 would be satisfied to tie this boat to his dock 5 without the mooring lines being -- mooring 6 poles being established, that is on the other 7 dock on his property? Is that true? 8 MR. LOPEZ: So is the question about tying 9 the boat up without mooring pilings? 10 MR. THOMSON: Yeah. Right. Are you 11 satisfied with tying it to the dock or are you 12 going to need mooring piles to give you better 13 protection on tying up the boat? 14 MR. LOPEZ: We are satisfied with this 15 proposed plan. We did not put mooring pilings 16 in on purpose. Again, frankly, I believe 17 they're ugly, which was, Number One. I wanted 18 to be able to fish on this dock with my son and 19 hang out there with my family in the 20 afternoons, and I don't like the way mooring 21 pilings look, Number One. 22 Number Two, I think that would just be -- 23 you know, we'd then be having a conversation 24 about the potential width of the canal again, 25 and, you know, my insurance, like most large

Page 29 1 vessels, if a storm is coming, my boat's not 2 allowed to be at the property anyway and would 3 not be at the property in the event of a storm. 4 So the mooring pilings didn't really 5 concern us, in terms of being able to dock the 6 vessel there. We're very fortunate that this 7 part of the canal, being so far back, is 8 extremely well protected. There's barely any 9 current or wind, so we feel comfortable that we 10 don't need mooring pilings. 11 MR. THOMSON: Okay. That satisfies my 12 inquiry. 13 MR. SALMAN: Mr. Chair, I have a question. 14 Through the Chair, I have a question. 15 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: No. Does anyone else 16 have one? 17 MS. THROCKMORTON: Mr. Salman, I think you 18 have to turn on your microphone. 19 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Yeah. I couldn't hear 20 anybody. 21 MR. SALMAN: Can you hear me now? 22 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Yes. 23 MR. SALMAN: Okay. A question for 24 Mr. Larson or Mr. Lopez. What is the beam 25 width of the prior vessel?	Page 30 1 MR. LOPEZ: Twenty feet, plus or minus. I 2 think it's about 20 feet. 3 Glen, do you know exactly? 4 MR. LARSON: I think it's like 20 feet and 5 a few inches. 6 MR. SALMAN: Okay. Second question, you're 7 going to be putting bumpers between the boat 8 and the dock, I would assume? 9 MR. LOPEZ: So the dock has rubber -- or 10 the proposed dock, and I guess Glen can answer 11 this, but we specified a dock that has rubber 12 bumpers, I guess, on the actual pilings. 13 MR. LARSON: Okay. Those bumpers are only 14 four inches in width. 15 MR. SALMAN: It's the depth I'm concerned 16 with. 17 MR. LOPEZ: So the depth of that area, 18 there are already neighbors of our side that 19 have boats that range anywhere from 80 to 97 20 feet, that go past where our house is and 21 there's plenty of depth back there. Actually, 22 one of the reasons we bought the property was 23 because low tide or high tide doesn't affect 24 the ability to navigate the channel. Honestly, 25 the biggest concern is, and I hope Miami-Dade
Page 31 1 County fixes this, is the mangroves shooting 2 out from Matheson Hammock, because every year 3 they continue to make the waterway a little bit 4 tighter. 5 MR. LARSON: I can answer the depth 6 question, also. Miami-Dade County DERM and the 7 State of Florida and the Army Corps of 8 Engineers all reviewed the proposed vessel and 9 the water depths and all part of the depth 10 requirement code were satisfactory to those 11 agencies for this location of the dock. 12 MR. SALMAN: Two more questions and I'm 13 done. 14 The pile dimension across the canal, from 15 the northeast corner of the proposed pile, to 16 the pile opposite side, what is that dimension? 17 MR. LARSON: 78 feet eight inches. 18 MR. SALMAN: Okay. Would the applicant be 19 amenable to accepting a limitation of no more 20 than, say, a 22 feet projection beyond the dock 21 or the mooring of his vessel? 22 MR. LOPEZ: So are you asking, would I be 23 okay with a limitation of a beam of 22 feet on 24 the boat? 25 MR. SALMAN: No, 22 feet projection from	Page 32 1 the dock. Forget the boat. 2 MR. LOPEZ: Okay. 3 MR. SALMAN: The whole question was to find 4 out and gauge how big a space you would need, 5 the limit. So what I'm suggesting is, that 6 would you accept the limitation of projecting 7 no more than 22 feet from the base of the 8 proposed dock? 9 MR. LOPEZ: I don't think I'd have a 10 problem with that. Mr. Larson, would I have a 11 problem with that? 12 MR. LARSON: I don't see a problem with 13 that. 14 MR. LOPEZ: No. I don't have a problem 15 with that. 16 MS. THROCKMORTON: Mr. Salman, I'm sorry to 17 interrupt. I'm not sure that's something 18 within the purview of the Board of Adjustment, 19 to state here -- to restrict on the property 20 owner. This is an application for a variance 21 from a certain provision of the Zoning Code. 22 The width or the beam of the boat is not -- 23 MR. SALMAN: I'm not talking about the 24 width of the boat. 25 MS. THROCKMORTON: -- is not legislated by

Page 33 1 the City in any way. It is not dictated by the 2 Zoning Code in any way, is my understanding. 3 MR. SALMAN: It's specifically about the 4 projection beyond the dock. 5 MS. THROCKMORTON: So, Arceli, is there a 6 code section that dictates the projection from 7 the edge of the dock? 8 MS. REDILA: Let me clarify Mr. Salman's 9 limitation. So the request -- this variance 10 request is a projection of 35 and six inches. 11 So are you saying that they can only project 12 20, instead of 35? 13 MR. SALMAN: No. I'm saying that they can 14 only project 20 feet into the navigable 15 waterway beyond the variance being contemplated 16 at the moment. 17 MS. REDILA: So that's the boat. 18 MR. SALMAN: It could be a boat. It could 19 be anything. I'm talking about a projection 20 beyond the space of the proposed dock to limit 21 the impact into the waterway. 22 MS. REDILA: After the top, that would be 23 the boat that is moored there. As the City 24 Attorney said, we cannot restrict the width of 25 the boat that the applicant can have.	Page 34 1 MR. LOPEZ: Mr. Salman, if I may, I 2 appreciate your question, and, frankly, I have 3 no problem with that, and I understand what 4 you're saying. And suffice it to say, I've 5 been in this City, like I said, most of my 6 adult life. If, for some reason, I had a 7 vessel there that was -- which I wouldn't have 8 something that had more than a 22 foot 9 projection, because I don't currently and I 10 don't plan on it, but if for some reason one of 11 my neighbor said, "Look, there's a problem 12 here, we can't get past your boat," I would be 13 the first person to move the boat or do 14 something different or figure out another place 15 to keep it. 16 I am in no way trying to adversely impact 17 the neighborhood or my neighbors at all. So I 18 have no objection to what you're proposing. I 19 don't know how we legally memorialize that, you 20 know, if the City said that there are certain 21 rules, but I have no problem with what you are 22 proposing. 23 MR. OTERO: Ms. City Attorney, from what 24 I'm hearing, what's before the Board today does 25 not give the Board the power to amend, to
Page 35 1 address distance of mooring or size of boat; am 2 I correct? 3 MS. THROCKMORTON: Moorings are part of the 4 distance and the calculation with the navigable 5 waterways and things like that. So the 6 moorings may be capped in certain instances. 7 But it's my understanding, and Staff please 8 correct me if I'm wrong, but the limitations 9 that the City has imposed in the Zoning Code 10 that are relevant here are the distance of the 11 dock and perhaps boat lifts, et cetera, but 12 that's not -- it's my understanding that's not 13 contemplated here; is that correct, Ramon? 14 MR. OTERO: There's nothing you can limit 15 in terms of the size of the boat. The next 16 boat can have a 30-foot beam, correct? 17 MS. THROCKMORTON: I believe Mr. Larson 18 mentioned that DERM had approved the size of 19 this boat. I'm not sure if DERM has 20 limitations on the sizes of boats that can be 21 allowed in areas, but -- 22 MR. OTERO: But neither DERM, nor the City, 23 nor the Board can limit or address the size of 24 a potential new boat which is larger? 25 MS. THROCKMORTON: I'll ask Mr. Trias if	Page 36 1 there's anything in the Zoning Code about that. 2 MR. TRIAS: Madam Chair, what I would 3 suggest is that if the applicant proffers a 4 size of the vessel, that would be appropriate. 5 It's not something that a city can request 6 within the Zoning Code; however, a proffer from 7 the applicant is -- 8 MR. SALMAN: I'm looking at this from the 9 point of view that every variance, by 10 definition, is unique and it's an attributed 11 right to a property that we're looking at it, 12 and that we can make any kind -- or impose any 13 kind of restriction to that. 14 MR. TRIAS: Well, the applicant has already 15 proffered that that's what he wants to do. So 16 I think we should accept that and make that 17 part of the record. 18 MR. SALMAN: We can accept it. I just 19 wanted to see if we could memorialize it. 20 You're telling me we can't. 21 MR. TRIAS: No, I think we should. I think 22 we should memorialize it as part of the record 23 as a proffer by the applicant, something that 24 the applicant has suggested. 25 MS. THROCKMORTON: And Mr. Trias, can you

Page 37 1 just address, that's this applicant. If there 2 was a future owner, the variance would be 3 granted as to the dock. How would that work 4 with the future owner? 5 MR. TRIAS: Well, the variance is as to the 6 dock. I mean, those are the facts. So, in 7 addition, if the applicant is suggesting that 8 he wants to limit the width of the vessel, 9 that's acceptable, but the future -- frankly, 10 the only action that the Board is taking has to 11 do with what's in the Zoning Code. 12 MR. SALMAN: I'm trying to respond to the 13 comment that we had at the initial meeting in 14 February, whereby a couple of neighbors who are 15 across the canal came in to object, and their 16 objection was the projection of the boat into 17 the navigable waterway, as I recall it. 18 MR. LOPEZ: And you were correct, and I 19 just want to -- just for the record to be 20 clear, Mr. Larson, at my request, visited the 21 neighbors to discuss this, because I don't 22 think it was clear, based on what their 23 understanding was, of the projection of the 24 boat. They thought that somehow the canal was 25 going to be made smaller than the existing	Page 38 1 condition on the way to the bay, and as you can 2 see from our plans and what's been discussed 3 today, that is not the case, and I think the 4 neighbors that were objecting, all of them, 5 except maybe one, have withdrawn their 6 objections. 7 And, again, I have no problem -- and just 8 so we're clear, most vessels that could fit at 9 this size of dock are not going to have a beam 10 that's larger than 22 feet. So, to the extent 11 that -- and I have no plans on selling the 12 house. My son is two years old and I can't 13 wait to send him off to college from this 14 house, but I don't think any future owner is 15 going to be able to put a boat there that is 16 larger than what currently exists in the canal, 17 because of the limitation of the width of the 18 canal to the ocean. 19 Old Cutler Bay, next to Matheson Hammock, 20 like we said, has widths of 41 feet in certain 21 areas. 41 feet. I mean, that's extremely 22 tight. So, I mean, I don't think that's a 23 concern, but I'm happy to memorialize and I 24 will proffer that I will never have a vessel 25 there that has a beam greater than 22 feet and
Page 39 1 I'm happy to make that a covenant or whatever 2 you guys want to come up with, if you can come 3 up with something, I don't care, but I 4 absolutely proffer that, on the record, under 5 oath. 6 MR. OTERO: Does the City have any record 7 of any objections having been withdrawn? 8 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Would someone like to 9 answer? We can't hear anyone. 10 MR. TRIAS: I don't know of any, but if 11 Arceli could add any additional information, 12 that would be helpful. 13 MR. OTERO: The reason I'm bringing that up 14 is because, many of the factors related to 15 granting a variance by the Code have to do with 16 how they impact neighbors and other similarly 17 situated. On the record, we have three 18 objections, none in favor, from across the 19 canal. If that has changed, I would like to 20 see the change, but on the record now, we have 21 three objections. That's what I'm trying to 22 say. The owner has indicated they have 23 changed, I would like to see it having changed, 24 but on the record now we have three objections. 25 That's what I was trying to say. Mr. Lopez	Page 40 1 indicated that they've changed their minds. I 2 have no reason to doubt Mr. Lopez's veracity, 3 but I would like to base this recommendation on 4 what's on the record. 5 MR. TRIAS: Madam Chair, if there are no 6 further questions, what I would suggest is that 7 you open the public hearing. I don't think 8 that has been done yet. And then have 9 discussion with the Board, after you have a 10 motion. 11 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Okay. Thank you, Mr. 12 Trias. 13 Do we have anybody else who would like to 14 speak? 15 MR. LARSON: I have one more point I'd like 16 to bring up, if that's possible. 17 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Okay. Mr. Larson, go 18 ahead. 19 MR. LARSON: Just that the properties 20 within the basin that Mr. Lopez would have an 21 effect on, every property on Balada and the 22 opposing bank of Balada and every street within 23 the Old Cutler Bay area that has a dock, none 24 of these other applicants would have to make 25 any presentation to park a 90-foot boat at

Page 41 1 their property, and that everyone on the 2 Journeys End side would have to present a 3 variance for this because of the mangroves 4 shoreline only. 5 So we are reviewing with good intention 6 what needs to be reviewed, the distances and 7 calculations and encroachments into the 8 waterway, but please keep in mind that the 9 people on the opposing shoreline, anybody that 10 does not have a mangrove shoreline is going to 11 have to go directly – or they don't have to go 12 through any process at all. They can park 13 their boat there without having to have a 14 variance or any review from the Board. That's 15 it. 16 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Thank you, Mr. Larson. 17 Is there anybody else who would like to 18 speak? 19 MS. REDILA: As to the question of the 20 letter of support, Staff received three letters 21 of support, but for properties that are on the 22 same side as the applicant. There was an 23 objection on the opposite. Let me find the 24 address. 25 There was an objection from Alain Monie,	Page 42 1 resident -- the address is 9320 Balada Street. 2 It's on the opposing side, but it's on the 3 north -- north side, not the immediately 4 opposing. It's on the opposite side, but on 5 the north side. 9320 Balada. 6 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Thank you so much, 7 Arceli. 8 Do we have anybody else, then, before we go 9 ahead and vote? 10 Okay. If we don't have any other further 11 comments or questions from the Board or anybody 12 present, then we'll go ahead and see if we can 13 call this to a vote. Do we have anybody who 14 would like to make a motion on this request? 15 MR. OTERO: I move that the Board of 16 Adjustment deny Application BA-21-01-5875, a 17 request by Glen Larson for a variance for a 18 single-family home located at 9501 Journeys 19 End, a variance to allow a wood deck for a 20 single-family residence extend into the 21 waterway 35 feet six inches from the property 22 line versus no dock shall be constructed over 23 or in any canal, waterway, lake or bay more 24 than five feet outward from the bank or 25 seawall, whichever is most restrictive,
Page 43 1 pursuant to Article 3, Uses, Section 3-702.A, 2 formerly Section 5-802.A of the Coral Gables 3 Zoning Code. 4 This motion is based upon the testimony 5 presented, along with the application submitted 6 and Staff report which constitute competent and 7 substantial evidence. The Board may hereby 8 make findings of fact that each of the 9 standards in Section 3-806 of the Zoning Code 10 have not been met. 11 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Do we have a second on 12 the motion? 13 MS. THROCKMORTON: Mr. Otero, can I just 14 clarify your motion, just for a matter of 15 clarification here? 16 The Staff report makes different findings 17 than what you just suggested for the factors, 18 so just to be clear, your motion is denying and 19 finding that none of the eight factors have 20 been met? 21 MR. OTERO: None. I think they all have to 22 be met. 23 I'm reading from the text I was given. My 24 intent was, that ones I have reviewed, have not 25 been met and if you want to, in particular, I	Page 44 1 can go through the ones I don't believe have 2 been met. 3 MS. THROCKMORTON: I think that would be 4 helpful for the motion, because if you adopt 5 the Staff report, you know -- on the other 6 hand, there are certain findings there, so if 7 you want to make particular findings as to the 8 factors in that motion, that might be helpful. 9 MR. OTERO: There are eight factors 10 presented under Standards for Variances, in 11 Section 3-806. 12 First factor is that special conditions and 13 circumstances exist peculiar to the land, 14 structure or building involved, which are not 15 applicable to other land structures or 16 buildings in the same Zoning District. I don't 17 know the answer to that. I don't think that 18 that's been presented. 19 The second one is that the special 20 conditions and circumstances did not result 21 from the actions of the applicant. My comment 22 on that is, if it's a special condition related 23 to the geography and natural habitat, that is 24 correct, but the testimony has been that the 25 reason we're here is because of the size of the

Page 45 1 vessel, as opposed to inactions of the 2 applicant. 3 The third one, the granting of the variance 4 requested will not confer on the applicant any 5 special privilege that is denied by these 6 regulations to other land, buildings, 7 structures in the same Zoning District. As I 8 mentioned earlier, I don't know the answer to 9 that, because if everyone applied for the same 10 variance and the width of the navigable 11 causeway is reduced, it would affect others in 12 the same district. 13 Four, that literal interpretation of the 14 provisions of these regulations would deprive 15 the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by 16 other properties in the same Zoning District, 17 under the terms of these regulations, and would 18 work unnecessary and undue hardship on the 19 applicant; I have not seen testimony to that 20 effect. 21 Five, that the variance granted is the 22 minimum variance that would make possible the 23 reasonable use of the land, building or 24 structure. Again, I don't agree that's been 25 shown, because the reasonable use does not	Page 46 1 contemplate a hundred foot vessel. 2 Six, by granting the variance will not 3 change the use to one that is not permitted in 4 Zoning District or different from other land in 5 the same District. I don't really -- I can't 6 comment on that. 7 MS. THROCKMORTON: It's still residential 8 use. It's not changing the use of the 9 property. 10 MR. OTERO: That does not change the 11 residential. 12 MR. TRIAS: So that standard is met. I 13 think so. 14 MR. OTERO: That's been met, yes. 15 7, that the granting of the variance will 16 be in harmony with the general intent and 17 purpose of these regulations and that such 18 variance will not be injurious to the area 19 involved or otherwise detrimental to the public 20 welfare. 21 This will be directed into the waterway, 22 navigable waterway. That has not been shown. 23 Eight, that the granting of the variance 24 is appropriate for the continued preservation 25 of a historic landmark or historic landmark
Page 47 1 district, et cetera. 2 I hope that helped some. 3 MS. THROCKMORTON: So, to clarify, the 4 motion is to deny based on the evidence 5 presented today and the fact that, at least 6 based on your testimony, at least various 7 factors haven't been met? You say Number 6 has 8 been met, and the other ones are -- 9 MR. OTERO: And Number 8 is not applicable. 10 MS. THROCKMORTON: Ms. Pinon, do you accept 11 that clarification to the motion. You seconded 12 it. 13 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: I'm sorry, we can't 14 hear Ms. Pinon. 15 MS. PINON: Yes, I agree. 16 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Okay. So there's no 17 further comments or discussion, then we'll go 18 ahead and do a roll call on the motion. 19 THE SECRETARY: Jorge Otero? 20 MR. OTERO: Yes. 21 THE SECRETARY: Kathleen Kaufman? 22 MS. KAUFMAN: I vote to deny, just to be 23 clear, so, yes. 24 THE SECRETARY: Javier Salman? 25 MR. SALMAN: No, on denial.	Page 48 1 THE SECRETARY: Mike Sotelo? 2 MR. SOTELO: No. 3 THE SECRETARY: Jack Thomson? 4 MR. Thomson: No. 5 THE SECRETARY: Maria Garcia? 6 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: I vote, no, against 7 the motion. 8 MS. THROCKMORTON: The Motion fails. The 9 Board can entertain another motion, to grant 10 the variance or a different motion. Do you 11 have another one? If anyone has a motion to 12 present? 13 MR. SALMAN: I'd would like to make a 14 motion. 15 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Go ahead, Mr. Salman. 16 MR. SALMAN: I would like to make a motion 17 that we approve the variance request, subject 18 to limitation of the beam width of the dock and 19 the boat to be no more than 22 feet. 20 MS. THROCKMORTON: The beam width as 21 proffered by the applicant? 22 MR. SALMAN: As measured by anybody with a 23 tape measurer. 24 MS. THROCKMORTON: Sure. I just mean that 25 the applicant has proffered that width.

Page 49 1 MR. SALMAN: Yes. 2 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Do we have a second? 3 MS. KAUFMAN: I second that motion. 4 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Who was that, that 5 second? 6 MS. KAUFMAN: Kathleen. 7 MR. TRIAS: Ms. Kaufman has seconded it. 8 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Okay. Thank you, 9 Ms. Kaufman. If we don't have any discussion, 10 we'll take a roll call. 11 MS. THROCKMORTON: Mr. Salman, just to 12 clarify, is that adopting the Staff report's 13 finding as to substantial competent evidence, 14 as well? 15 MR. SALMAN: Yes, ma'am. 16 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Okay. Let's go ahead 17 and do the roll call, if there's nothing else. 18 THE SECRETARY: Kathleen Kaufman? 19 MS. KAUFMAN: Yes. 20 THE SECRETARY: Gema Pinon? 21 MS. PINON: No. 22 THE SECRETARY: Javier Salman? 23 MR. SALMAN: Yes. 24 THE SECRETARY: Mike Sotelo? 25 MR. SOTELO: Yes.	Page 50 1 THE SECRETARY: Jack Thomson? 2 MR. THOMSON: Yes. 3 THE SECRETARY: Jorge Otero? 4 MR. OTERO: No. 5 THE SECRETARY: Maria Garcia? 6 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Yes. I vote to pass 7 it. 8 MR. TRIAS: The motion passes. 9 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Okay. Thank you, 10 everybody. I believe we don't have any other 11 agenda items. So unless there's anything else 12 to address, we will go ahead and adjourn the 13 meeting today. 14 (Inaudible.) 15 MR. TRIAS: We don't have any items yet. 16 CHAIRPERSON GARCIA: Okay. Thank you so 17 much. So we're going to call this meeting 18 adjourned a 10:01 a.m. Thank you, everybody, 19 for your time today. Have a great day and stay 20 safe. 21 (Thereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 22 10:01 a.m.) 23 24 25
Page 51 1 C E R T I F I C A T E 2 3 S T A T E O F F L O R I D A : 4 S S . 5 C O U N T Y O F M I A M I - D A D E : 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 12th day of April, 2021. 17 18 19 20 21 _____ 22 NIEVES SANCHEZ 23 24 25	