

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 1</p> <p>1 CITY OF CORAL GABLES 2 LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY (LPA)/ 3 PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING 4 VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT 5 CORAL GABLES CITY HALL 6 405 BILTMORE WAY, COMMISSION CHAMBERS 7 CORAL GABLES, FLORIDA 8 WEDNESDAY, MARCH 15, 2017, COMMENCING AT 6:05 P.M.</p> <p>9 Board Members Present: 10 Jeffrey Flanagan, Chairman 11 Maria A. Menendez, Vice Chairperson 12 Marshall Bellin 13 Robert Behar 14 Frank Rodriguez 15 Julio Grabiell 16 Alberto Perez</p> <p>17 City Staff and Consultants: 18 Cathy Swanson-Rivenbark, City Manager 19 Peter Iglesias, Assistant City Manager 20 Ramon Trias, Planning Director 21 Charles Wu, Assistant Director Development Services 22 Craig E. Leen, City Attorney 23 Craig Coller, Special Counsel 24 Cristina Suarez, Assistant City Attorney 25 Scot Bolyard, Principal Planner Javier Betancourt, Director Economic Development Jill Menendez, Administrative Assistant, Secretary</p> <p>Public Speakers: Mario Garcia-Serra, Esq., on behalf of Alliance Starlight, LLC and FIPRO Taciaana Amador, BID President Barbara Tria, BID Vice-President Albert Poza</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 3</p> <p>1 present to the Board. 2 And, Mr. Chair, if you'd like to call the 3 meeting. 4 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We will call the March 5 15th Planning and Zoning Board meeting to 6 order, and the time is 6:05 p.m. 7 MR. WU: Roll call, please. 8 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar? 9 MR. BEHAR: Here. 10 THE SECRETARY: Marshall Bellin? 11 MR. BELLIN: Here. 12 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell? 13 MR. GRABIEL: Here. 14 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez? 15 MS. MENENDEZ: Here. 16 THE SECRETARY: Alberto Perez? 17 MR. PEREZ: Here. 18 THE SECRETARY: Frank Rodriguez? 19 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Here. 20 THE SECRETARY: Jeff Flanagan? 21 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Here. 22 MR. WU: Mr. Chair, the items today are all 23 legislative in nature, so we do not have any ex 24 parte communication to declare. 25 At this time, anyone who wishes to speak</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 2</p> <p>1 (The following proceedings were held.) 2 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Good 3 evening, everyone. 4 Go ahead, Charles. 5 MR. WU: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you. 7 MR. WU: Good evening. The Board is 8 comprised of seven members. Four Members of 9 the Board shall constitute a quorum, and the 10 affirmative vote of four Members of the Board 11 present shall be necessary for the adoption of 12 any motion. A tie vote shall result in the 13 request moving forward for the Commission's 14 consideration without a recommendation, if the 15 applicant does not request a continuance. 16 Lobbyist Registration and Disclosure: Any 17 person who acts as a lobbyist pursuant to the 18 City of Coral Gables Ordinance 2006-11 must 19 register with the City Clerk prior to engaging 20 in lobbying activities or presentations before 21 City Staff, Boards, Committees and/or the City 22 Commission. A copy of the Ordinance is 23 provided in the Office of the City Clerk. 24 Failure to register and provide proof of 25 registration shall prohibit your ability to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 4</p> <p>1 today must complete the roster on the podium. 2 We ask that you print clearly, so the official 3 records of your name and address will be 4 correct. 5 With the exception of attorneys, all 6 persons who will speak on agenda items before 7 us this evening, please rise to be sworn in. 8 Anyone who would like to speak tonight, please 9 rise to be sworn in. 10 We have three, four -- 11 (Thereupon, all participants were sworn.) 12 MR. WU: Thank you. 13 In deference to those present, we ask that 14 all cell phones, pagers and other electronic 15 devices be turned off at this time. Now we'll 16 proceed with the agenda. 17 Mr. Chair, back to you. 18 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Thank you, 19 Mr. Wu. 20 Next item on the agenda is the approval of 21 the minutes. 22 MR. BEHAR: Motion for approval. 23 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Second. 24 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Does anybody 25 have any comments or changes to the minutes?</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 5</p> <p>1 Hearing none, Jill, if you'll call the  2 roll, please.  3 THE SECRETARY: Marshall Bellin?  4 MR. BELLIN: Yes.  5 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabel?  6 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.  7 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?  8 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.  9 THE SECRETARY: Alberto Perez?  10 MR. PEREZ: Yes.  11 THE SECRETARY: Frank Rodriguez?  12 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.  13 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  14 MR. BEHAR: Yes.  15 THE SECRETARY: Jeff Flanagan?  16 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes.  17 Okay. I don't know of any changes to the  18 agenda. Seeing none, we'll stick with the  19 agenda in the order that we have it.  20 Items 5 and 6 -- they're all public hearing  21 items. 5 and 6 are related. And I know our  22 City Attorney, Mr. Leen, wanted to, I think,  23 talk about the process or procedure.  24 MR. LEEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  25 This matter came before the Planning and</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 7</p> <p>1 It's actually been amended. This is an  2 unsigned version of the Resolution. I'm to  3 read to you from the signed version. "To  4 present the guidance of the City Commission, as  5 well as her own views on implementation of that  6 guidance," and I can see that the City Manager  7 is here.  8 Welcome Madam City Manager. I know that  9 she's going to provide you the views of the  10 Commission from the meeting, as well as her own  11 views on that guidance.  12 In addition, the proposed Ordinances shall  13 be brought to the City Commission as soon as  14 possible, for Second Reading, after the  15 Planning and Zoning Board meeting.  16 Any reference to Workforce Housing shall be  17 removed from the proposed Ordinances and the  18 item. That was a concern of the Planning and  19 Zoning Board. I remember that you wanted to  20 see the report from Staff about Workforce  21 Housing. The Commission understood that, so  22 they asked that Workforce Housing not be part  23 of this Ordinance. That will be addressed  24 separately.  25 In addition, the Ordinance shall include a</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 6</p> <p>1 Zoning Board at the last meeting, and the  2 Planning and Zoning Board voted to continue it.  3 It ended up going up to the Commission on First  4 Reading, and the Commission adopted the  5 provisions on First Reading, and then they  6 remanded it to back to the Planning and Zoning  7 Board, to basically get your guidance before  8 they take it up on Second Reading.  9 So I just wanted to note that the  10 Commission did want to hear the matter on First  11 Reading. So that's why they went forward and  12 did it. It was placed on the agenda by  13 Commissioner Keon, and they proceeded, but they  14 were very respectful of the fact that you  15 wanted another chance to address this and  16 really give your guidance, so that's why they  17 remanded the matter.  18 I just wanted to -- you have a Resolution  19 in your packet, Attachment C, to the Zoning  20 Code Text Amendment Residential Infill  21 Regulations Staff Report, and if you look at  22 that, the instructions from the Commission are  23 listed in there, A through H. The important  24 ones for you are that the City Manager should  25 appear before the Planning and Zoning Board.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 8</p> <p>1 minimum square footage per unit of no less than  2 650 square feet. The Ordinance should provide  3 that consideration be giving to including  4 plants and/or foliage on buildings. And City  5 Staff and the Planning and Zoning Board should  6 consider whether the Ordinance should allow for  7 a base density of at least a hundred units per  8 acre.  9 In addition, I was asked by Commissioner  10 Vince Lago to let you know that as Attachment E  11 is a memorandum that he wrote to the City  12 Commission, that states his views on the topic,  13 following the meeting.  14 That's all I wanted to say at this time. I  15 see that the City Manager is here, and I know  16 that she wanted to present to you, at the  17 instruction of the Commission, her views on  18 this.  19 Thank you, Mr. Chair.  20 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you, Mr. City  21 Attorney.  22 Madam City Manager, welcome.  23 MS. SWANSON-RIVENBARK: Thank you --  24 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you for being  25 here.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 9</p> <p>1 MS. SWANSON-RIVENBARK: -- Mr. Chair and  2 Members of the Board. We genuinely respect all  3 of the good work that you do. I have to give a  4 special shout-out to my appointee, because I  5 know she reads everything and works really hard  6 on it, and I'm grateful. At all points, she  7 knows that her job is to do whatever she  8 believes is in the best interest of the City,  9 and I am proud of her role on this Board, in  10 addition to all of yours.</p> <p>11 I do bring you greetings and guidance from  12 the City Commission. At the February 14th  13 Commission Meeting, the Commission was confused  14 as to why Workforce Housing was a focus of the  15 discussion at the Planning and Zoning Board  16 meeting. It's the Commission's intention to  17 review and consider the North Ponce  18 Re-Development Plans, a review that has spanned  19 decades of discussion, separate and apart from  20 City-wide initiatives that are in the  21 preliminary stage of drafting, such as  22 Workforce Housing, open space and possible  23 future incentives.</p> <p>24 As you know, I should say, I reviewed your  25 meeting on tape, and we do have it now, again,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 11</p> <p>1 Commission in great detail.</p> <p>2 The general concept, we like. The concept,  3 as it applies to Coral Gables' economy, not  4 Miami-Dade, but how that is actually applied,  5 way too early for us to begin discussing.</p> <p>6 I noticed, though, in your minutes, your  7 Staff Reports and other discussions, that our  8 Staff is enthused by the concept and that they  9 may have talked a lot about it, but from the  10 Commission's perspective, it's premature, until  11 we can really see what the drafts entail, where  12 it will be applied, how it will be measured,  13 who will enforce it. It's a good concept, but  14 we're not ready to move forward with it.</p> <p>15 There are some other projects that the  16 Commission is also really interested in, that  17 we're just not ready to move forward with yet,  18 but it means that in time we will.</p> <p>19 At some point, we're going to come to you  20 with a draft proposal on open space. We'll be  21 revising what open space requirements are, what  22 counts, what should not count, how much should  23 be required, and how the presence of open space  24 within projects, as well as neighborhoods,  25 should be encouraged and protected. We're also</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 10</p> <p>1 on video. I'm not sure why it ever stopped,  2 but you're back on video, and we're going to  3 capture all of the old ones and put them in  4 place, but I was able to watch your meeting,  5 after the fact. I watched the Commission  6 meeting, again, twice, so that I had a really  7 good understanding of your discussions, your  8 good discussions, as well as what the  9 Commission's real intentions were.</p> <p>10 And I will tell you, Mr. City Attorney,  11 they laughed when Vice Mayor Quesada talked  12 about foliage on the buildings, so I wouldn't  13 necessarily frame that as a strong direction  14 from the Commission.</p> <p>15 MR. LEEN: Fair enough. Fair enough.</p> <p>16 MS. SWANSON-RIVENBARK: As you know, we are  17 in the early stages of proposing a Workforce  18 Housing program City-wide, not unique or direct  19 to one particular area. So it's too early to  20 know what that will entail, where it will be,  21 how we will apply it, and what the concepts  22 really will be City-wide. We have not  23 presented it to you. I have not seen it  24 myself. We haven't had our public  25 conversations, nor have we spoke to the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 12</p> <p>1 studying the Transfer of Development Rights for  2 open space, not just Historic.</p> <p>3 We had a great Workshop with the City  4 Commission in February, and they provided  5 important policy direction, and we are putting  6 those concepts to paper, but they are not ready  7 to be incorporated into the plans, nor the  8 recommendations.</p> <p>9 At some point in the future, we hope to  10 bring you a Community Benefit Program, to  11 ensure better transitions between Commercial  12 and Residential areas, while also encouraging  13 neighborhood improvements, like LED street  14 lighting and neighborhood amenities, but that's  15 not ready to be brought back to you, either.  16 It also hasn't gone out for community review,  17 so it's premature for us to require, mandate or  18 encourage them, separate and apart from a PAD  19 or a Site Plan process.</p> <p>20 Here's what we do know. Your Board will be  21 instrumental in shaping and framing these  22 Ordinances in the future, but we're just not  23 ready to bring them forward to you at this  24 point. The recommendations, nor the plans, are  25 ready.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 13</p> <p>1 What we are ready to do, though, is  2 finalize the North Ponce studies, a two-year  3 process that has involved Charrettes, community  4 meetings and hearings. The Commission is  5 asking for your input on several matters, such  6 as minimum unit size. Not a minimum standard  7 for Miami-Dade County, but what is the right  8 unit size for Coral Gables, and what should a  9 one bedroom be, a two-bedroom, a studio be,  10 what types of amenities should be in place,  11 both on site and near site of these  12 developments; what amount of FAR is the right  13 amount for an infill area, is it a 2 FAR, is it  14 with an extra .5 for architectural incentives,  15 is it higher, but what are those circumstances  16 that it should be and what benefits must be in  17 place for the City before it is considered; how  18 many units per acre are desired and needed,  19 desired for the community scale and needed to  20 be viable. Is it 60 units per acre, is it 75  21 with architectural incentives, is it a hundred,  22 is it another number. Is 97 feet the right  23 building height in that area or should it be a  24 hundred for more floor to ceiling.  25 I've been asked to present to you a sense</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 15</p> <p>1 We are interested in having those developed  2 as soon as possible. We worked with the  3 Business Improvement District. They're here  4 tonight regarding the item. And so that has a  5 sense of urgency. The other does not.  6 So any questions I can provide regarding  7 the Infill and the Commission's intentions or  8 related to the Overlay District in the  9 Downtown, I'm happy to answer them.  10 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.  11 Anybody have any questions based on what we  12 just heard or do we want to get started with  13 the Staff presentation?  14 MR. BEHAR: Started.  15 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Mr. Trias,  16 it's all you.  17 MR. TRIAS: Thank you, very much. May I  18 have the PowerPoint, please?  19 Just very briefly, because both, the City  20 Attorney and the City Manager, did a great job  21 summarizing the ideas, for the benefit of the  22 public, I will just go through the PowerPoint.  23 As the City Manager very clearly explained,  24 this process has been going on for decades in  25 the City, and at least for the past two years,</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 14</p> <p>1 of the Commission and also a sense of my  2 thoughts. As you consider the recommendations  3 for the Infill District, free of Workforce  4 Housing considerations, you need the time to  5 consider what is the best recommendation for  6 that re-development area, and you should know  7 that you have that time. You do not need to  8 finalize your views, your recommendations  9 tonight, but when you are ready and your review  10 is finalized, the Commission looks forward to  11 hearing your recommendations. They valuable  12 your input, and so do I.  13 Those are general comments the Commission  14 wanted me to present to you. I will say,  15 you're hearing this from a First Reading  16 action, you're hearing it in the middle, and  17 there's no Second Reading date that has been  18 set. There's another item that you're hearing  19 tonight, and there was a First Reading. This  20 is the action related to the Overlay District  21 in the Downtown. The rush for this is because  22 we are progressing with streetscape, and so we  23 want to have those signs, those -- it's not a  24 physical re-development, it's more a signage  25 and operations guide.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 16</p> <p>1 as far as our involvement and your involvement  2 in these regulations.  3 As you know, this North Ponce area has  4 multiple issues, multiple Ordinances that you  5 have addressed and reviewed and so on, and this  6 is the last one. This is the last one of this  7 comprehensive view of the North Ponce area.  8 And it applies to every area within the  9 boundaries that is not -- that is not a part of  10 the Overlay in Ponce de Leon. The Ponce de  11 Leon Overlay is shown in the blue or white line  12 in those two pictures. The rest of it, the  13 rest of the area, is part of this review today.  14 There are two requests, a Comprehensive  15 Plan Amendment, and also a Zoning Text  16 Amendment. That has not changed. That's the  17 same review you had before. The summary of the  18 request was explained very, very clearly by the  19 City Manager. There's an Overlay for the whole  20 North Ponce area. That Overlay would allow or  21 would propose up to a hundred units per acre,  22 if the parcel is 20,000 square feet. So this  23 only applies for parcels that are 20,000 square  24 feet or larger. We're talking about up to 100  25 units per acre, up to a 2.5 FAR, and that would</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 17</p> <p>1 be with the Mediterranean Architectural Bonus 2 provisions. 3 So that really is it, in terms of the 4 content of the request, and what's being asked 5 of you is to evaluate that proposal and see 6 whether or not it makes sense at a hundred or 7 not, and at 2.5 or not, or if you have some 8 other alternative ideas. 9 The text of the proposal includes some 10 other things, such as landscape, et cetera. 11 That is consistent with the other Ordinances 12 that you have reviewed for the North Ponce, but 13 the only content that is significant is the 14 density and the FAR. Again, that's addressed, 15 both, in the Comp Plan, and in the Zoning Text 16 Amendment, and it's included for your review in 17 full detail in the Staff Report. 18 And Staff has reviewed both, the 19 Comprehensive Plan changes and the Zoning 20 changes for compliance with the Comprehensive 21 Plan, and we find that they do comply with the 22 appropriate goals and policies of the 23 Comprehensive Plan, and Staff has determined 24 that the application is consistent with the 25 Comprehensive Plan and recommend approval.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 19</p> <p>1 review. 2 I think, in this sort of process, it's good 3 sometimes to take a step back and sort of see, 4 okay, overall, what are we trying to achieve, 5 and I think what we're trying to achieve is 6 pretty clear. The North Ponce area has not met 7 its full potential, so we're looking for the 8 sort of re-development that everyone can agree 9 would be welcomed along certain corridors and 10 along certain parcels which have been vacant or 11 underutilized for considerably a long time and 12 simply have not been incentivized sufficiently 13 so as to be re-developed and are sort of 14 declining as time passes. That's been sort of 15 the overall goal. 16 It's been approached in three different 17 segments; the Ponce corridor, which you've 18 already reviewed, it's gone up to the City 19 Commission, I believe approved on First 20 Reading, but not yet on Second Reading; the 21 Preservation District, which has already been 22 finally approved, and then this Residential 23 Infill District. We're just trying to target 24 those properties that I mentioned before, over 25 20,000 square feet in size, that are either</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 18</p> <p>1 If you have any questions, I'll be able to 2 answer. We also have some members of the 3 BID -- I'm sorry, some members of the public 4 that may be interested in speaking on this 5 issue. 6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you, Ramon. 7 All right. This is a public hearing item, 8 so we'll open up the public hearing. Jill, do 9 we have any speakers signed up? 10 THE SECRETARY: Yes. We have four. 11 Mario Garcia-Serra. 12 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Good evening, Mr. Chair, 13 Members of the Board, Mario Garcia-Serra, with 14 Offices at 600 Brickell Avenue, representing 15 both, the Alliance Startlight Companies, as 16 well as FIPRO Holdings, both companies have 17 multiple properties within the North Ponce 18 area. 19 We've been involved in the whole North 20 Ponce study since the very beginning, over two 21 years ago, and have been active participants, 22 generally supportive of all of the initiatives 23 that have been undertaken by the City, reviewed 24 by this Board, and ultimately approved by the 25 City Commission or are still in the process of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20</p> <p>1 vacant today or dramatically underutilized, as 2 far as what their density is and what's 3 permitted right now. 4 The biggest incentive, I think, that's been 5 discussed, or the two biggest incentives, have 6 been density and FAR, an increase in those, and 7 I think really where the discussion has now 8 boiled down to is, what's the appropriate 9 density, and we've been sort of hearing 10 everything from a floor of 75 units an acre to 11 potentially a hundred units to the acre. 12 The reason we, as you may have seen in the 13 minutes, were proposing or advocating for the 14 hundred units to the acre is the idea of how 15 that affects average unit size. The higher 16 density count, generally the smaller the unit 17 size will be, and smaller, not meaning going 18 too small, because, of course, there's a 19 concern with units just being too small and not 20 being sufficient or not being really suitable, 21 but the idea is also tied into what sort of -- 22 what market do you want to address in the North 23 Ponce, and the idea is, I think, to try to 24 address the next generation of Coral Gables 25 families, young professionals, you know,</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 21</p> <p>1 couples starting out with the family.</p> <p>2 And so the idea has been to try to get a</p> <p>3 target, I think, of somewhere around a 900 to</p> <p>4 1,000 square foot unit, and I could take out</p> <p>5 sort of the chart that we had, indicating, on a</p> <p>6 20,000 square foot site, you know, how much</p> <p>7 floor area you get, and when you have a 75 unit</p> <p>8 per acre requirement, versus a hundred unit per</p> <p>9 acre requirement, then you'll see that on the</p> <p>10 hundred unit per acre requirement, is when you</p> <p>11 start getting to the point of a 900 to a</p> <p>12 thousand square foot unit, which is, I think,</p> <p>13 the target sort of unit that we're looking for</p> <p>14 to address the particular needs of the City and</p> <p>15 the idea of re-developing this part of Coral</p> <p>16 Gables.</p> <p>17 We, of course, are advocates of moving</p> <p>18 forward, in general, with the planning process,</p> <p>19 and, you know, we do have something of an</p> <p>20 emphasis on wanting to be able to move forward</p> <p>21 as soon as possible. The market is the market,</p> <p>22 and we need to try to, you know, move forward</p> <p>23 with trying to get approvals for these new sort</p> <p>24 of developments as soon as possible. And most</p> <p>25 importantly, this has been a two-year process.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 23</p> <p>1 this come back to us with a strong hand, to get</p> <p>2 a little law and order in front of this Board.</p> <p>3 And as far as I'm aware, this Board operates at</p> <p>4 all times with law and order and respect. And</p> <p>5 so I just want to put that on the record, that</p> <p>6 we try very hard to treat everybody fairly.</p> <p>7 The process is the process. Some people</p> <p>8 may not like it, but it takes a long time</p> <p>9 before it ever gets to this Board. And we do</p> <p>10 hear this a lot, that when it comes to us, we</p> <p>11 hear complaints that they've been at it for so</p> <p>12 long, and we need to push it along. But I hope</p> <p>13 the public and the applicants understand that</p> <p>14 when it comes to this Board, it's the first</p> <p>15 time that we are seeing it. We get our packets</p> <p>16 on the Friday before the meeting, and so it's</p> <p>17 sometimes quite understandable that we need</p> <p>18 time to digest it and to review it and fully</p> <p>19 understand it, and the understanding and</p> <p>20 appreciation of the public for that part of our</p> <p>21 process will be appreciated going forward.</p> <p>22 Robert.</p> <p>23 MR. BEHAR: Mr. Chairman, I could not agree</p> <p>24 with you more. Well said.</p> <p>25 If we start with -- and I want to give you</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 22</p> <p>1 Two other components of it have already been</p> <p>2 reviewed and approved by the City Commission.</p> <p>3 We think it's only fair for the process to</p> <p>4 finish with this final segment being able to be</p> <p>5 reviewed by the City Commission, which</p> <p>6 initiated the process to begging with.</p> <p>7 Those are all of my comments. We're</p> <p>8 available, of course, to provide more</p> <p>9 information, if you'd like, similar to what we</p> <p>10 presented to the City Commission.</p> <p>11 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.</p> <p>12 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Thank you.</p> <p>13 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Thank you.</p> <p>14 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's it, Jill?</p> <p>15 THE SECRETARY: The other speakers are for</p> <p>16 the other item.</p> <p>17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So we'll close</p> <p>18 the public hearing on this item, and open it up</p> <p>19 for discussion amongst the Board.</p> <p>20 MR. BEHAR: Anybody wants to start?</p> <p>21 MS. MENENDEZ: No.</p> <p>22 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, before you get</p> <p>23 into the details, just so our record is clear,</p> <p>24 in reading the minutes that we got from the</p> <p>25 Commission Meeting, somebody suggested that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24</p> <p>1 my thought on this item, before we do much</p> <p>2 more. I think I am pretty -- I have a lot of</p> <p>3 experience doing multi-family buildings very</p> <p>4 similar to what we're going to be considering</p> <p>5 today. And I've done my math back and forth,</p> <p>6 to the point where it's a very simple process,</p> <p>7 and something that we need to keep in mind in</p> <p>8 the Gables is that our FAR also takes into</p> <p>9 account common areas, such as corridors. If</p> <p>10 you do a multi-purpose room, if you do a</p> <p>11 fitness center or gym, all of that is taken</p> <p>12 into consideration when you calculate the FAR.</p> <p>13 If we try to do -- which the goal, the</p> <p>14 intent, is, I think, and I agree, is to do</p> <p>15 units in the range of 650 to, let's say, a</p> <p>16 thousand square feet, that's an average of</p> <p>17 about 850 to 900 square feet per unit.</p> <p>18 When you add a common area factor, which in</p> <p>19 my case, and we may have disagreement with</p> <p>20 other design professionals, what we normally</p> <p>21 put into the projects, to be in a competitive</p> <p>22 market, is between 20 to 22 percent common area</p> <p>23 factor.</p> <p>24 So if I take a unit that averages between</p> <p>25 650 and a thousand, let's say it's about 850 to</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 25</p> <p>1 900, and I add 20, 22 percent, my average unit  2 sizes come up to 1,100 square feet.  3 If I do that, and I want to say, okay, how  4 could I get my density, and I take a 20,000  5 square foot lot, and I multiply that not times  6 2.5, but, let's say, 2.75, gives me an FAR,  7 maximum FAR, for that property of 55,000. When  8 I divide 55,000 divided by 1,100 per unit, I  9 get 50 units on half an acre. So when I  10 multiply times the acre, that equates to about  11 a hundred units per acre. Those are the unit  12 sizes that, again, give us a net rentable of  13 650 for the small one, maybe for a one bedroom,  14 and a thousand for the two bedrooms.  15 So we've got to look at it, when we  16 calculate -- when we, you know, figure out the  17 FAR and the density, based on the actual we're  18 going to be doing, not just taking the FAR that  19 you're allowed to do and divide it by an  20 average of 650, because that will give you a  21 much higher density.  22 I think you have to take into consideration  23 the common area that goes into these projects  24 in order to be able to do the proper  25 calculation, in my opinion. That's the only</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 27</p> <p>1 consider the a hundred feet versus 97.  2 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, I neglected to  3 say that the 100 feet is also included in the  4 Ordinance, in the proposal.  5 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.  6 MR. BEHAR: Don't worry. I did that for  7 you.  8 But, you know, that's my opinion, you know,  9 and I base this -- so you know, I mean, I have  10 done, over the last fifteen years, luckily, a  11 lot of the units, a lot, I mean, probably in  12 excess -- not in Coral Gables, throughout,  13 probably in excess of 15, 18,000 units. And  14 when you do the equation, we do it for purposes  15 of fees and all, what I could get, how many  16 units could I get on a project, and the math  17 works out almost perfect when you do those  18 numbers. That's my opinion.  19 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I just want to make sure  20 I'm understanding this correctly. Is the  21 matter that's been voted on by the City  22 Commission, are they -- and I'm not sure I'm  23 looking at the right thing, that's why I want  24 to make sure that my colleague set me straight  25 here, if I'm going awry, the way I read this,</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 26</p> <p>1 way that you could, you know, do it correctly.  2 To me, and we could go back and forth,  3 since, you know, last time, I'm a believer that  4 a hundred units per acre is a right number to  5 be assigned for the properties, which, in a  6 smaller lot, in a half an acre lot, 20,000,  7 you're only going to get a 50-unit building,  8 but that's going to give you the sizes. The  9 FAR, I think that the 2.5 is okay. I think the  10 2.75 will work much better.  11 Just to go back and touch on something that  12 our City Manager mentioned, the height, those  13 three -- going from 97 to a hundred is a huge  14 difference, because you don't -- in order to go  15 from like an eight-foot ceiling, you know, to  16 like an eight-foot-eight, that is what you  17 need, because if not, in the bathrooms, in the  18 closet, you have very low ceilings. Those  19 eight inches mean a lot.  20 And in order to get a ten-story building,  21 which you will do, in 97 feet, you're really  22 compromising the finished floor height on a  23 unit. Those additional three feet makes an  24 incredible difference.  25 So I will support, you know, for us to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 28</p> <p>1 and I'm not looking at one that's signed, but  2 it seems that they -- what they are looking at  3 and they voted, at least on First Reading, is a  4 maximum of 60 units per acre or 75 units per  5 acre with architectural incentives. Am I  6 looking at the right thing?  7 MR. LEEN: No.  8 MR. BEHAR: No.  9 MR. LEEN: Are you looking at the  10 Resolution, Attachment C?  11 MS. MENENDEZ: No.  12 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I'm looking at Attachment  13 A.  14 MS. MENENDEZ: You're looking --  15 MR. LEEN: You're looking at what they  16 approved.  17 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Attachment A.  18 MR. LEEN: On First Reading? The First  19 Reading Ordinance.  20 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Is that Attachment A?  21 MR. LEEN: Yes.  22 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay. So that is what  23 they --  24 MR. LEEN: But they had some comments, as  25 well. Because, remember, they approved it on</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 29</p> <p>1 First Reading, and they have Staff go back and  2 look at it, and there were a number of  3 inquiries to Staff, which the City Manager  4 mentioned, and also is mentioned in the  5 Resolution that's Attachment C.  6 So they're not -- they have not made a  7 final determination at all as to any of those  8 matters.  9 Mr. Trias, do you have anything further?  10 MR. TRIAS: No. You're correct. And the  11 facts are that on Page 3 --  12 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay. I'm following.  13 Thank you.  14 MR. TRIAS: Page 3 summarizes the issue.  15 MR. LEEN: Yes. So what they wanted was  16 your guidance, so that you could provide that,  17 and then on Second Reading they could make  18 amendments to some of those things. And, in  19 particular, they emphasized in the  20 Resolution -- I'm having a signed copy brought  21 for each of you of the Resolution so that you  22 can have it. Cristina Suarez is going to get  23 it for me.  24 But, in particular, they identified -- they  25 looked at square footage per unit. They didn't</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 31</p> <p>1 questions for my peace of mind.  2 Originally, when we first looked at this  3 Infill area, we were looking at just one  4 section.  5 MR. TRIAS: Yes.  6 MS. MENENDEZ: And then, either one meeting  7 ago or two meetings ago, the entire North Ponce  8 area came into effect. I'm having a hard time  9 understanding why that happened.  10 MR. TRIAS: That happened as a result of  11 the very good input we got from the Board and  12 from different people involved in the process.  13 And it is my recommendation that this should  14 apply to the whole area. And I say that,  15 because we're talking about 20,000 square feet  16 parcels or larger, and that's a limited number  17 of parcels.  18 If you look at the realistic application of  19 this Infill, there's only a handful of places  20 where this would apply, and it became very  21 clear to me, from the point of view of the  22 professional Staff, that this was a good  23 transition between the Conservation District  24 ideas and the Mixed-Use ideas at the core, at  25 the center of the North Ponce. It was a good</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 30</p> <p>1 want it to be any less than 650 square feet.  2 They wanted Workforce Housing removed. But  3 they asked you specifically whether the  4 Ordinance should allow for a base density of at  5 least a hundred units per acre. So they asked  6 you a specific question. They wanted to know  7 what you thought was the appropriate units per  8 acre.  9 MR. TRIAS: And Mr. Chairman, if I could  10 help, also. Staff included a chart that  11 analyzes the numbers in ways that are very  12 consistent with what Mr. Behar said.  13 We basically took a 25 percent common area  14 number, which is close or probably very  15 optimistic, in terms of the size, and I have to  16 say that our data is exactly what -- consistent  17 with the opinions of Mr. Behar, in terms of  18 sizes, and in terms of the overall dimensions  19 of units. And we can go over it, if you want  20 to, but we have a couple of examples, that are  21 built examples. We have a couple of  22 theoretical examples, at 20,000 square feet,  23 and the numbers, I believe, work very well.  24 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Maria.  25 MS. MENENDEZ: No. I just have a few quick</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 32</p> <p>1 way to transition between the two.  2 So that's our recommendation. Clearly, you  3 can provide whatever opinion or recommendation  4 you believe.  5 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.  6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Marshall.  7 MR. BELLIN: Yeah. I think the  8 recommendations that the Commission came up  9 with make a lot of sense. The a hundred units  10 an acre is something that I think will work  11 well with the unit size.  12 I don't agree with the 650 minimum size. I  13 think that's too big. If you want to provide  14 studios or efficiencies, 650 is too large. The  15 Code now allows for a minimum of 575, and I  16 think we ought to keep that.  17 MS. MENENDEZ: For a studio or for a one  18 bedroom?  19 MR. BELLIN: The minimum size of 575. And,  20 generally speaking, it would be for a studio.  21 MS. MENENDEZ: Yeah, it has to be for a  22 studio, because one bedroom is tough.  23 MR. BELLIN: No, a one bedroom --  24 MS. MENENDEZ: I have a one bedroom, 700  25 square feet, and that's tough.</p>



<p style="text-align: right;">Page 33</p> <p>1 MR. BELLIN: Yeah. A one bedroom should be  2 around 750 to 800, and two bedrooms maybe a  3 thousand, but that's up to the developer, how  4 to work that out. But I would like to see the  5 575 kept as is.  6 MR. TRIAS: Okay. Again, that was -- the  7 Commission's recommendation was 650. The  8 numbers we looked at is that 600 or so is a  9 reasonable number for efficiencies.  10 MR. BEHAR: To me -- and I would agree,  11 some of the units that we did at the Gables  12 Ponce, and I'll walk you through, some of the  13 units are very small. They're about that size,  14 maybe just a little bit tight.  15 MS. MENENDEZ: What size?  16 MR. BEHAR: 580. 580 Square feet --  17 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.  18 MR. BEHAR: -- you know, and they work.  19 And we only did 20 units like that. Those 20  20 units went very quickly, out of 300 something  21 units. So there is a need for that.  22 At the end of the day, it really doesn't  23 matter if we -- you know, if you have 575, you  24 have a density cap, so it's not like you could  25 say, "Okay, if I do units that are going to be</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 35</p> <p>1 take 25 percent off for common areas, at a  2 hundred units.  3 MR. BEHAR: You're going to be -- you're  4 going to be probably less -- if you do that,  5 less than a hundred units per acre. You're  6 going to probably drop to closer to like 90  7 units per acre, if you do the 2.5, you know.  8 And we could do that. We can select to -- you  9 know, opt to do the 2.5. My recommendation is,  10 you know, the 2.75. Not the normal, like you  11 allow in other areas, that you're allowed to go  12 with Med Bonus up to 3.5. 2.75 gives you  13 enough to provide wider corridors, you know,  14 common area spaces, multi-purpose rooms,  15 fitness center, that, in today's market, is  16 needed in order to be competitive.  17 The days of having small corridors and no  18 amenities are no longer there. If you want to  19 compete and you want to be able to get a  20 market, you know, you have to do that. And  21 that's based on my experience on a daily basis.  22 MR. RODRIGUEZ: That's based on your belief  23 that a hundred units per acre is the right  24 number.  25 MR. BEHAR: Yes. Yes, Frank.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 34</p> <p>1 an average of 800 or 850, and I want to reduce  2 them to the 575, I'm going to get more units."  3 The density is going to cap you, no matter  4 what.  5 So, you know, that's not -- I will agree  6 that it will be good to keep some units just a  7 tad smaller. If a developer wants to provide,  8 you know, a more reasonable priced unit, maybe  9 he will do 10 percent of the units or, you  10 know, 20 percent of the units. That way he  11 could afford to put it at a lower number.  12 So I don't have a problem putting, you  13 know, like a studio or something at 575, like  14 Marshall, you know, suggested, that is today in  15 the Code, and then going from there. I think  16 that's going to -- that's going to allow for  17 more affordable priced units, not affordable  18 units, but more affordable priced units.  19 MR. BELLIN: So I think what we need to do  20 now is, since we've gotten guidance with  21 respect to density, and you know my opinion on  22 unit size, what is the proper FAR.  23 MR. TRIAS: The recommendation is 2.5, with  24 Med Bonus, at this point, and that gives you  25 800 or so square feet for the average, if you</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 36</p> <p>1 MR. RODRIGUEZ: And I'm just throwing this  2 out to you and also to Ramon, I was reading the  3 memo circulated by Commissioner Lago, and he  4 expresses a concern, on the part of the  5 residents, of congestion and density. And he,  6 in his memo at least, recommends no more than  7 75 to 85 units with all incentives considered.  8 And I'm wondering -- I want to hear from Robert  9 on this, too, but, first, Ramon, is that  10 something that was considered by the Staff?  11 You know, I understand you had meetings with  12 residents, and did they share with you the  13 concerns that they apparently shared with  14 Commissioner Lago about the density and not  15 wanting any more than 75 to 85 units per acre?  16 MR. TRIAS: Yes. And I think that the  17 concern is the impact, in terms of traffic.  18 That's the way that I hear that discussion.  19 People sometimes are concerned that more units  20 mean a lot of more automobile traffic, and that  21 is true.  22 But what I would like to propose here is  23 that, because of the existing conditions and  24 because of the fact that this is going to be  25 really applicable in only a few locations,</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 37</p> <p>1 because the minimum size is 20,000 square 2 feet --</p> <p>3 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I'm sorry, Ramon, I have a 4 question about that. Excuse me for 5 interrupting.</p> <p>6 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, go ahead.</p> <p>7 MR. RODRIGUEZ: It could be naivety on my 8 part, but can't you acquire like lots and put 9 them together and get 20 --</p> <p>10 MR. TRIAS: Yes.</p> <p>11 MR. RODRIGUEZ: So what you may have today 12 may not be the same circumstance you have 13 tomorrow, if somebody gets industrious and 14 ambitious and starts acquiring lots.</p> <p>15 MR. TRIAS: That is true, and what happens 16 is that -- I would say that because you have 17 changed already the Conservation District, and 18 that encourages the preservation of buildings 19 that are there and the addition of buildings -- 20 additions to those buildings, they have become 21 much more valuable, in terms of buildings that 22 can be restored and can become very, very 23 attractive.</p> <p>24 And I say this, because the densities that 25 are existing right now with two-story buildings</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 39</p> <p>1 again, I'm a strong believer that a hundred 2 units is the right number, for the reason that 3 I explained earlier. And I will agree with 4 Ramon. This is not going to be a free-for-all 5 throughout the whole area.</p> <p>6 It goes further, when you start looking at 7 the requirements, if you're abutting a property 8 that is not of 20,000 square feet, then you may 9 not even reach this density, because the 10 setback requirements are greater and all. So 11 this will only happen in certain pockets, 12 certain areas, that you could do -- you know, 13 that is conducive to that, not just anywhere.</p> <p>14 MS. MENENDEZ: Have we identified those 15 areas? Ramon, have we done a study?</p> <p>16 MR. TRIAS: Well, let me give you an 17 example from today. Today I met with a person 18 that controls these two parcels right here on 19 Eighth Street. Both of them are less than 20 20,000 square feet. And I had a discussion 21 with him about, "Well, maybe you can assemble 22 some land," and they had tried, but that had 23 not worked. So, for example, it's very 24 unlikely that these changes take place. 25 Now, when you look at this aerial, and the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 38</p> <p>1 are very high, because they don't have parking, 2 and because they tend to be very small units. 3 So the number of units that you have in 4 existing buildings, sometimes you cannot even 5 match with the proposed regulation. So they 6 have value.</p> <p>7 So what happens is that I believe -- I 8 believe that there's going to be some 9 assemblage, certainly, but I don't believe that 10 the neighborhood is going to disappear all of a 11 sudden and we're going to have only 20,000 12 square foot parcels. That is not a likely 13 scenario, because of the different incentives 14 that we have created.</p> <p>15 So I think that the impact -- just to make 16 it simple, I think that the impact is going to 17 be limited. I don't think the impact can be 18 measured precisely, because of exactly what 19 you're saying, but I don't think it's going to 20 be a wholesale impact, in terms of the whole 21 area. I think it's going to be limited and 22 it's going to be very beneficial to the area, 23 because it brings residents, and that, in 24 itself, creates a much higher quality of life.</p> <p>25 MR. BEHAR: You know, Frank, I think the --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 40</p> <p>1 white line is the Mixed-Use District along 2 Ponce de Leon, you don't see too many green 3 open parcels, and those are the ones that I 4 would say -- to answer your question, have I 5 identified some, yes. I mean, there's one 6 right here. There's another one maybe right 7 here. But this one, for example, I believe 8 it's an ownership on both sides of this line, 9 so even that requires some thinking, in terms 10 of what is the best approach to development, 11 and the rest of it, if you look at this -- for 12 example, this vacant parcel right here, that's 13 in the Mixed-Use District, so that's not one of 14 the likely parcels. So that is the best 15 explanation that I can give you, in terms of 16 likelihood.</p> <p>17 Likelihood means that there are two or 18 three parcels that are already assembled. 19 Anything else would have to be assembled. And 20 from my conversations with individuals, it is 21 difficult to assemble.</p> <p>22 So the impact is -- unless you have a 23 different experience.</p> <p>24 MR. BEHAR: No. No. You're absolutely 25 correct. I could attest that it's very, very</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 41</p> <p>1 difficult to assemble parcels, you know,  2 greater than 20,000. It's very difficult,  3 unfortunately. I mean, I don't want to say  4 impossible, because nothing is impossible, but  5 it's very difficult to do that.  6 MR. PEREZ: For the sole purpose, it just  7 becomes cost prohibited for the purpose of  8 making sense of your land basis. So I would  9 agree that the chances of an assembling in that  10 area being greater than 20,000 square feet  11 would be very difficult.  12 MR. WU: But I have to ask you to speak  13 into the mike.  14 MR. PEREZ: Sure.  15 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And then I also think,  16 and, of course, one of the architects or Ramon  17 can tell me I'm wrong, but, of course, the  18 number of units will dictate the traffic  19 impact, but I also think the number of bedrooms  20 surely contributes to that. And if you reduce  21 the density, but you don't reduce the FAR,  22 you're going to end up, I think, with just  23 larger units and more bedrooms, which, really,  24 doesn't offset any traffic impact, as opposed  25 to higher density, but smaller units.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 43</p> <p>1 You know, it's a different mentality, the  2 young folks, that want to participate, and  3 that's what we need to, I think, gear to.  4 MR. TRIAS: I don't think we should  5 underestimate traffic. Traffic is a serious  6 issue, a very important issue. We certainly  7 think about it. But, in this case, we're  8 dealing with an urban infill situation, where  9 people are much more important than cars, and  10 certainly the opportunity to have that  11 transition between the very large buildings  12 that are allowed on Ponce de Leon and the  13 historic fabric of the Conservation District,  14 that transition is what we're talking about,  15 and I think -- I think it's a limited impact, a  16 limited transition, but very valuable, from an  17 aesthetic point of view, and also from the  18 point of view of having more people in the  19 neighborhood.  20 MR. GRABIEL: I agree. We've been looking  21 at this area now for months, I think, or years,  22 and we've always identified it as the place  23 where we can make housing that can fit our  24 extended families, our children, you know, in  25 some cases, even our grandchildren, you know,</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 42</p> <p>1 MR. BEHAR: You know, I'm curious, we sit  2 in the middle of a big urban area, Coral Gables  3 does, and I will say, like, I don't know, 80  4 percent of the traffic that comes through the  5 Gables is from the outside, that passes through  6 Coral Gables.  7 It has been proven that if you have more  8 residential units within the City, the traffic  9 decreases, the local traffic decreases. We  10 cannot avoid having people pass through our  11 streets. Unfortunately, you know, it's every  12 day, you know, in the morning and afternoon,  13 but if you generate -- you start providing more  14 residential units within the corridor, this  15 area, we're going to be better off, you know,  16 because it has been proven the trolley -- and I  17 wish I had those statistics -- how much the  18 users have increased.  19 You know, I'm telling you, my daughter --  20 the perfect example, she lives above my office.  21 I don't get to see her very often, but she  22 lives right above us at the Gables Ponce.  23 Probably, four days a week, she takes the  24 trolley. She works on 2525 Ponce. She takes  25 the trolley to work.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 44</p> <p>1 who are looking for smaller units, that would  2 like to live in Coral Gables, and it's a  3 perfect location to do the smaller unit, the  4 higher density.  5 You have the buses on Eighth Street, the  6 buses on Douglas. You have the trolley going  7 down Ponce de Leon. If we want people to live  8 in Coral Gables and work in Coral Gables, this  9 is the place where we can provide the kind of  10 housing that would allow that to happen.  11 MS. MENENDEZ: Julio, how small is small  12 for you?  13 MR. GRABIEL: I would like to go below 600.  14 MS. MENENDEZ: Really?  15 MR. GRABIEL: You know, I agree. I agree  16 that we should be below 600. I don't know if  17 575 is the one. 25 square feet --  18 MS. MENENDEZ: For studios?  19 MR. GRABIEL: Yes, for a studio, because  20 there are couples and singles who can live in a  21 studio, and would like to live in Coral Gables,  22 you know, because they work in Coral Gables,  23 from Douglas Entrance all of the way to  24 Downtown Coral Gables, and they can't afford  25 the one bedroom -- a two bedroom or the one</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 45</p> <p>1 bedroom apartment, but a studio fits in an  2 economic model that is very attractive to some  3 people.  4 So, you know, I don't know where 650 came  5 from, if there was an analytical study done for  6 the 650 or it was just --  7 MR. TRIAS: My opinion is that there was an  8 interest in having some higher quality units in  9 the City of Coral Gables, and that was one way  10 to achieve that. Now, that may not be the best  11 way. If you have a different suggestion,  12 certainly we can forward that to the  13 Commission.  14 MR. LEEN: May I add something?  15 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Sure.  16 MR. LEEN: You know, the Resolution  17 indicated that the Ordinance should include a  18 minimum square footage per unit of no less than  19 650 square feet.  20 So when this goes back to the Commission,  21 it will have this in there, no less of 650  22 square feet; however, you should vote on -- if  23 you don't agree with that, you have the right  24 to recommend anything you think --  25 MS. MENENDEZ: Is that for a studio, Craig?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 47</p> <p>1 MR. TRIAS: Absolutely.  2 MR. BELLIN: I thought I was recommending  3 something other than 650. What I was  4 recommending was 575.  5 MR. LEEN: What did you say? You're  6 saying, from the Commission or from this Board?  7 MR. PEREZ: From the Board.  8 MR. BELLIN: No, it's my recommendation  9 from this Board --  10 MR. LEEN: Oh, no, no. I definitely heard  11 that recommendation, and what I would say is  12 that -- I think it would be useful if you did a  13 straw pole or you do a vote to let the  14 Commission know what you think the minimum  15 should be. All I was saying was that Staff,  16 when they present it on Second Reading,  17 according to the Resolution and the  18 instructions of the Commission, it can't be  19 less than 650 square feet.  20 The Commission can then consider your  21 recommendation and they could lower it on  22 Second Reading.  23 MR. TRIAS: So, Mr. Chairman, I've heard  24 two issues so far. One is the 575 square feet.  25 The other one is 2.75 FAR. So if at some point</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 46</p> <p>1 MR. LEEN: That was the minimum square  2 footage per unit.  3 MS. MENENDEZ: Regardless?  4 MR. LEEN: Yeah. Now, my own thought was,  5 there was a concern that this was turning into  6 a Workforce Housing Ordinance, and so they  7 wanted to make it clear that it wasn't, and  8 that if there's going to be smaller units for  9 Workforce Housing, that would be handled  10 separately, in a different Ordinance.  11 I think that that's part of the reason why  12 this came in, but, I mean, ultimately, you have  13 the transcript or you could look at the  14 transcript and decide. What their Resolution  15 says is no less than 650 square feet. You are  16 free to recommend something different, but it  17 will go in the Ordinance as 650 square feet, at  18 least as the minimum.  19 MR. TRIAS: 650 is a very large efficiency.  20 I mean, that will be a large efficiency.  21 MR. BEHAR: That's a very comfortable one  22 bedroom.  23 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. Yes.  24 MS. MENENDEZ: It's a nice one bedroom,  25 yeah.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 48</p> <p>1 you would like to take a straw vote or even put  2 in --  3 MR. BEHAR: You know, the 575 -- maybe  4 what, and I will, when the time of  5 recommendation, I will recommend that maybe a  6 certain percentage of the units, you know, is  7 575, the rest have to be 650 or above.  8 And, for example, I would say, maybe 25  9 percent of the units cannot be less -- you  10 know, could be only 575. The rest have to be  11 650 or higher. So you provide a little bit of  12 both within the project.  13 MR. PEREZ: So I'm in agreement, as well,  14 of keeping the flexibility of a smaller unit.  15 At the end of the day, in my opinion, I think  16 it's going to boil down to the builder and the  17 developer and what type of unit he wants to  18 deliver and what type of nitch he seems or  19 feels there's a demand for.  20 I wouldn't want to see a requirement to  21 keep a certain percentage of smaller units. At  22 the end of the day, I feel that you should  23 give, you know, autonomy or the right to that  24 builder, that developer, to deliver that  25 minimum size as he sees fit. At the end of the</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 49</p> <p>1 day, if he wants to deliver bigger units, I 2 think he has the right to do that, as well. 3 So I would want to keep the smaller units 4 at where they are right now, but I wouldn't 5 want to put any requirement as to how much 6 they're forced to deliver. 7 MR. BEHAR: The only reason, Albert, I 8 suggested that is, coming from the Resolution 9 from the Commission, that, you know, they voted 10 on 650. I would want to, you know, have the 11 ability to at least lower it, and as a 12 compromise, you know, because, let's say, we 13 don't want to allow smaller units, then we're 14 going to keep, you know, 650. At least maybe 15 there's a possibility, as an option for them, 16 to say, okay, we'll allow some units to be 17 smaller, you know. 18 From the beginning, I thought 575 could 19 work. 20 MR. PEREZ: So just to make sure I 21 understand, what you're saying is, if, in fact, 22 we allow or we propose to reduce that to 575 or 23 580, what you're saying is, if, in fact, a 24 developer wants to go that small, to put a cap 25 on those number of units?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 51</p> <p>1 point the developer or the builder is going to 2 rent them at. And, at the end, that's what we 3 need, to keep those numbers to be within an 4 ability for, you know, the young people or 5 whoever -- because not only young people, you 6 know, anybody could afford to do it. 7 MR. WU: Mr. Chair, as a thought, maybe if 8 the 650 pertains to one bedroom, and the 575 to 9 efficiencies, would that make more sense to you 10 all? 11 MR. BELLIN: Well, I don't think you're 12 going to do a one bedroom at 575. 13 MR. WU: That's why I'm saying, if we just 14 quantify it -- qualify it, that 650 pertains to 15 a one bedroom minimum. 16 MR. BELLIN: I think it's just going to 17 evolve all on its own. 18 MR. WU: So you would like the 575 -- 19 MR. BELLIN: Because 575 is the minimum, 20 and generally speaking, that's going to be an 21 efficiency or a studio. It's not going to be a 22 one bedroom. 23 MR. WU: Okay. 24 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Ramon. 25 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, you could choose</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 50</p> <p>1 MR. BEHAR: And the reason -- yes, because 2 the Commission is -- the Resolution says, 650, 3 and they may not want to give a hundred 4 percent, you know, freedom to do all small 5 units, so, you know, maybe a percentage of 6 them. 7 And, look, and you're right, the market 8 would dictate. From my experience, typically 9 you -- typically you do 45 percent one 10 bedrooms, 45 percent two bedrooms, and 10 11 percent three bedrooms. Those are typically 12 the numbers, how they work out. The two 13 bedrooms always is a split plan, okay. So you 14 have, bedroom and bathroom, bedroom and 15 bathroom, because that way you could have two 16 roommates. 17 The one bedroom -- again, 650 is the one 18 bedroom. A smaller unit, yeah, you could do 19 the 575. You could even do less. But let's 20 say, 575, since it's currently in the Code. 21 The two-bedroom will range between 850 to 22 1,050. It depends whether it's a corner unit 23 or it's, you know, an interior unit, but those 24 are the numbers that the market would dictate. 25 And all of this is driven by the price</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 52</p> <p>1 to be silent on that issue, and then regulate 2 with the density and the FAR and the existing 3 minimum size, and just simply be silent. I 4 think I agree with the comment that the market 5 should be able to dictate some of this. I 6 think that's a good strategy. And I think that 7 the only issue that I think we need to discuss 8 a little bit further is that if you truly 9 believe that 2.5 is not sufficient to build the 10 100 units, then the additional FAR could be 11 warranted. 12 In our analysis, it appeared to work at a 13 hundred, but -- 14 MR. BEHAR: You know, I'm saying it, 15 because I've done my calculations, and that's 16 what it really would take, the 2.75, to do it. 17 You get -- actually, what it does, it will give 18 you the flexibility to have the minimum size 19 units, you know, comfortably. 20 MR. TRIAS: I mean, certainly the units 21 will be larger, and I'm a hundred percent 22 sure -- 23 MR. BEHAR: And more important, something, 24 again -- the City uses the FAR, which, you 25 know, takes into consideration the corridors.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 53</p> <p>1 You know, I have not done a five-foot wide  2 corridor in the last ten years. Typically we  3 do a six-foot wide corridor, because that's  4 what -- it looks better. Why? Because when we  5 do the interior design, you know, the doors are  6 set back in. You're allowed to do  7 articulations in the hallway, not just a flat  8 hallway, so you start, you know, doing  9 something of nicer quality. So that's a  10 six-foot hallway, what it requires, minimum.  11 So that is taken into consideration in the  12 FAR. You know, if we were doing a really low,  13 low end residential units building, then you  14 could do the five-foot hallways and you do what  15 I do for the Pinnacles and the Conifer, which  16 those are really affordable housing projects,  17 not what we want to do here.  18 MS. MENENDEZ: I mean, but there's no  19 regulation saying you have to have a six-foot  20 corridor.  21 MR. BEHAR: The market will dictate that,  22 Maria. The market will dictate the quality of  23 the product you do. Walk with me Gables  24 Residential, the Gables Ponce Project. You  25 know, look at the amenities. Why are they</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 55</p> <p>1 means the unit will be -- the average of the  2 units will be smaller. Instead of being an  3 average of, let's say, 900, your average will  4 be 825, okay. The 650 and two-bedroom will  5 drop, you know, enough, to get you those  6 numbers. You're still going to achieve the  7 hundred units, but the average, you know, will  8 be smaller. The common areas may not be as  9 much. And, I mean, I don't know if any of  10 the --  11 MR. TRIAS: Our analysis was 820. So it's  12 exactly what you're saying, in terms of the  13 average.  14 MS. MENENDEZ: Your analysis said, what?  15 MR. TRIAS: The analysis of the unit that  16 Robert said was 825, ours was 820, so we agree  17 completely. And that's included in your  18 package. That's this chart.  19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Anybody have any  20 other comments? Questions?  21 MR. BELLIN: I have some comments. It's  22 mostly some -- maybe some housecleaning  23 comments. Mediterranean architecture, in order  24 to take advantage of what's being offered, the  25 hundred units an acre and the 2.75, if that's</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 54</p> <p>1 getting one of the largest, if not the largest,  2 rent in the whole Miami-Dade County? Because  3 of the quality of the product that they're  4 delivering.  5 You know, the multi-purpose, you got a  6 multi-purpose who is probably, I don't know,  7 3,000 square feet. You've got another room,  8 that's called the Club Room, that's probably  9 another 1,800. The fitness center, you should  10 drive by that ground floor fitness center. It  11 is really -- you know, it's a lot of units, 300  12 units in total, but it's like a 4,000 square  13 foot, you know, fitness center, because that's  14 what today is required, those amenities, in  15 order to be competitive.  16 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Frank.  17 MR. RODRIGUEZ: If you wanted to stay with  18 a -- I'm talking to Robert now, since, you  19 know, you've been speaking on these issues. If  20 you wanted to stay with the 2.5 FAR, I think --  21 did I hear you say that 90 units would be the  22 appropriate?  23 MR. BEHAR: No. To do it at the ratio --  24 at the square footage that I'm talking about,  25 you're going to get a hundred units, but that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 56</p> <p>1 the number, Mediterranean architecture is  2 mandatory.  3 MR. TRIAS: Yes.  4 MR. BELLIN: It just seems like it all  5 ought to be tied together. You know, it's  6 mandatory, so you've got to provide it, so  7 you're getting incentives to provide it.  8 MR. TRIAS: Well, you get the additional  9 density. You can do less density, if you  10 choose not to do the Mediterranean.  11 MR. BELLIN: Well, then you go back to 50  12 units an acre.  13 MR. TRIAS: No, 75. 75 units per acre.  14 MR. BELLIN: Okay. 75 units an acre.  15 MR. BEHAR: But without Med Bonuses, for  16 lack of a word, 75; with Med is a hundred, the  17 density.  18 MR. TRIAS: Right. Exactly.  19 MR. BELLIN: Yeah, but there's a whole  20 other things that come with that. You get the  21 density. You get the FAR. You get a whole  22 range of things. And you've got to provide a  23 bunch of things, according to the table.  24 MR. TRIAS: But you get the additional  25 density and the additional FAR. So it's a</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 57</p> <p>1 bonus program.</p> <p>2 MR. BEHAR: What are the specific</p> <p>3 requirements that is part of the Resolution?</p> <p>4 MR. BELLIN: So much from Table 1 and so</p> <p>5 much from Table 2.</p> <p>6 MR. BEHAR: But I think that's something</p> <p>7 then we have to really -- I think, today, in my</p> <p>8 opinion, we vote on the density, the FAR, or we</p> <p>9 recommend, and then those housecleaning, which</p> <p>10 is a good way to put it, we've got to go back</p> <p>11 and see what it will entail to do that.</p> <p>12 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. Tonight we are not</p> <p>13 changing -- Staff is not proposing to change</p> <p>14 the Mediterranean Bonus Ordinance. That's</p> <p>15 something that, it exists, it's applied. What</p> <p>16 we're saying is, you can do 75 units or a</p> <p>17 hundred. A hundred would require compliance</p> <p>18 with the typical regulations of the Med Bonus</p> <p>19 Program.</p> <p>20 MR. PEREZ: What's the FAR with</p> <p>21 non-Mediterranean Bonuses?</p> <p>22 MR. TRIAS: Let me read it again. 2.0.</p> <p>23 MR. PEREZ: 2.0?</p> <p>24 MR. TRIAS: 2.0, and 2.5 would be the</p> <p>25 bonus.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 59</p> <p>1 Text.</p> <p>2 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And then the Zoning</p> <p>3 Text, correct.</p> <p>4 MR. TRIAS: No, both do the same thing. So</p> <p>5 the concepts don't change.</p> <p>6 MR. BEHAR: I will make a motion to approve</p> <p>7 the Staff recommendation with the -- you know,</p> <p>8 a modification is to increase the FAR from 2.5</p> <p>9 to 2.75.</p> <p>10 MR. WU: Mr. Chair, I suggest we have</p> <p>11 different motions. Item Number 5 is the</p> <p>12 Comprehensive Plan. That is strictly dealing</p> <p>13 with the density, to a hundred dwelling units</p> <p>14 per acre. The FAR and the unit size pertain to</p> <p>15 Item Number 6, which is the Zoning --</p> <p>16 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah, we will, but</p> <p>17 let's --</p> <p>18 MR. LEEN: You can do separate</p> <p>19 recommendations as to each, by motion, but it</p> <p>20 will be good to hear them --</p> <p>21 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We will. We're going</p> <p>22 to go down them separately, but let's get the</p> <p>23 thought.</p> <p>24 MR. LEEN: Exactly.</p> <p>25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We always like to get</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 58</p> <p>1 Now, that's an issue that you are</p> <p>2 discussing at this point, but that is what's in</p> <p>3 the text of the Ordinance.</p> <p>4 MR. BEHAR: Mr. Chair, how are we going to</p> <p>5 do this today? Are we going to make -- I mean,</p> <p>6 at the end of the conversation and discussions,</p> <p>7 are we going to make a motion to approve</p> <p>8 something or --</p> <p>9 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, we are in between</p> <p>10 that stage between First and Second Reading.</p> <p>11 So they're looking for recommendations, as I</p> <p>12 understand it. The City Commission is looking</p> <p>13 for some input on some of the areas we've been</p> <p>14 talking about.</p> <p>15 MR. TRIAS: Right.</p> <p>16 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And so I think what we</p> <p>17 ought to do, we have a Staff recommendation,</p> <p>18 which seems to follow the will of the</p> <p>19 Commission, and so we can maybe add comments to</p> <p>20 that, either recommend approval, like as it's</p> <p>21 presented, or like we would any other time, or</p> <p>22 approval with some modifications. And there's</p> <p>23 two before us. One is related to the Master</p> <p>24 Plan and then --</p> <p>25 MR. TRIAS: The Comp Plan and the Zoning</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 60</p> <p>1 all of the thought processes out on the table,</p> <p>2 and then we step back and motion one and then</p> <p>3 the other.</p> <p>4 So, Robert, you were saying --</p> <p>5 MR. BEHAR: I will recommend the a hundred</p> <p>6 units per acre. I will recommend increasing to</p> <p>7 2.75. And I will recommend that the smallest</p> <p>8 units would be 575 square feet.</p> <p>9 I am perfectly fine with no limit on how</p> <p>10 many you can do, because, at the end of the</p> <p>11 day, you know, it really doesn't matter to us.</p> <p>12 Those would be my recommendation, a hundred</p> <p>13 units, 2.75 FAR, and minimum unit sizes, 575.</p> <p>14 MR. BELLIN: I'll second it.</p> <p>15 MR. LEEN: And just to be clear, those</p> <p>16 would be the amounts with architectural</p> <p>17 incentives?</p> <p>18 MR. BEHAR: That's correct, yes.</p> <p>19 MR. LEEN: Okay.</p> <p>20 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. And that</p> <p>21 would -- once we get to it, that would be</p> <p>22 towards Item 6. So, don't worry, we'll take a</p> <p>23 step back, like we always do, but we have a</p> <p>24 motion and a second on the table.</p> <p>25 And, Frank, you started to say something.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 61</p> <p>1 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yeah. Are we still able to</p> <p>2 have questions?</p> <p>3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Of course.</p> <p>4 MR. RODRIGUEZ: All right. Look, I have a</p> <p>5 question for you, Ramon. With regard to the</p> <p>6 unit sizes, if you have less units, with more</p> <p>7 rooms, wouldn't you have less need for parking,</p> <p>8 and, you know, less traffic, because if you</p> <p>9 have more rooms, you don't necessarily assume</p> <p>10 that more rooms means you're going to have, you</p> <p>11 know, adults or driving age roommates, you</p> <p>12 could have children, for example?</p> <p>13 So isn't the circumstance where you have</p> <p>14 larger units, with more rooms, when you're</p> <p>15 comparing that to a circumstance where you have</p> <p>16 smaller units, with less rooms, and more of</p> <p>17 them, wouldn't you necessarily have less</p> <p>18 traffic?</p> <p>19 MR. TRIAS: Yes. And I think that the key</p> <p>20 is that, more of them. You will have less</p> <p>21 units, because they're larger, so -- in a</p> <p>22 general sense, yes, traffic will be less.</p> <p>23 MR. BELLIN: Then the problem becomes, what</p> <p>24 we're trying to do is arrive at a rent that's</p> <p>25 affordable. That's the bottom line. A</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 63</p> <p>1 MR. PEREZ: What was the question?</p> <p>2 MS. MENENDEZ: What recent project --</p> <p>3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Does anybody ever leave</p> <p>4 density and square footage on the table?</p> <p>5 MR. PEREZ: Absolutely.</p> <p>6 MS. MENENDEZ: These seem --</p> <p>7 MR. TRIAS: Yes.</p> <p>8 MR. LEEN: Wait. Wait. Wait. One at a</p> <p>9 time, please.</p> <p>10 MR. PEREZ: I think, in my opinion, what's</p> <p>11 being proposed gives the developer and the</p> <p>12 builder flexibility, because to Robert's point,</p> <p>13 I think it's a great idea to go to a maximum of</p> <p>14 2.75, because that gives you flexibility to go</p> <p>15 over and above amenities. Once again, if I</p> <p>16 want to build something that I feel was a void</p> <p>17 in the market, and I want to deliver nice</p> <p>18 amenities, I had the flexibility, because now I</p> <p>19 could go up to the 2.75.</p> <p>20 But to your question, absolutely. Density</p> <p>21 and FAR is left on the table all of the time,</p> <p>22 because there are developers and there are</p> <p>23 builders that feel that bigger isn't always</p> <p>24 necessarily better. Now, at the end of the</p> <p>25 day, it's a matter of being comfortable with</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 62</p> <p>1 three-bedroom unit is going to rent for \$6,000.</p> <p>2 For me, it makes no sense.</p> <p>3 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, and certainly a developer</p> <p>4 can build less units than a hundred units per</p> <p>5 acre that are larger. That's a choice.</p> <p>6 MR. BEHAR: Exactly.</p> <p>7 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.</p> <p>8 MR. BEHAR: And if they want to do -- you</p> <p>9 know, what it is-is, if they want to do a</p> <p>10 hundred units, small units, it's going to be a</p> <p>11 smaller building, but -- so you're not going to</p> <p>12 get as tall a building or as big of a building,</p> <p>13 because the units may be smaller.</p> <p>14 MS. MENENDEZ: But realistically that</p> <p>15 doesn't really happen --</p> <p>16 MR. BEHAR: No, that's why I don't have --</p> <p>17 MS. MENENDEZ: -- if they have the</p> <p>18 potential to build all that's being proposed.</p> <p>19 MR. BEHAR: But you're capping the density,</p> <p>20 so it doesn't matter.</p> <p>21 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But does anybody ever</p> <p>22 leave density and floor area on the table?</p> <p>23 MR. BEHAR: Yes. Yes. Yes.</p> <p>24 MR. PEREZ: What was the question?</p> <p>25 MR. BEHAR: Unfortunately, yes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 64</p> <p>1 the product that you're delivering and</p> <p>2 designing, ultimately, once again, that you</p> <p>3 feel that you're delivering something to the</p> <p>4 market that's going to be well received.</p> <p>5 So I'm of the opinion that what's being</p> <p>6 proposed, with the 2.75, with the density of a</p> <p>7 hundred units per acre, and the minimum size, I</p> <p>8 believe we're giving flexibility to future</p> <p>9 builders to work within that realm of filling a</p> <p>10 void of what is required in that portion of the</p> <p>11 City.</p> <p>12 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I have another follow-up</p> <p>13 question --</p> <p>14 MR. TRIAS: Yes.</p> <p>15 MR. RODRIGUEZ: -- regarding an item that</p> <p>16 we touched upon earlier, about the possibility.</p> <p>17 And I take very -- I know, your opinion and</p> <p>18 Alberto's, I weigh, you know, very seriously,</p> <p>19 regarding the compilation of lots, you know,</p> <p>20 getting the lots together, and I understand</p> <p>21 from what both of you have said that that is</p> <p>22 difficult -- economically difficult to do, and</p> <p>23 hasn't happened a great deal up to now.</p> <p>24 And my question is, with the changes that</p> <p>25 are being proposed, assuming that the</p>



<p style="text-align: right;">Page 65</p> <p>1 Resolution or the motion -- I'm sorry, the  2 motion that Robert has proposed passes, and  3 let's say that the Commission then, upon our  4 recommendation, acts upon it and passes it in  5 the City Commission, would that circumstance,  6 the fact that now you're talking with totally  7 new rules that apply to parcels of 20,000  8 square feet or greater, would that -- might  9 that possibly change the economic equation, so  10 something that has not happened too much in the  11 past, all of a sudden becomes not only  12 economically viable, but maybe economically,  13 you know, something that people are looking to  14 do, and, you know, that concerns me somewhat?</p> <p>15 MR. TRIAS: Certainly the conditions will  16 change, yes, and there will be some of that,  17 but I think that the time frame that we're  18 talking about, in terms of major change, will  19 be very long. And I say that, because Coral  20 Gables is a very strong market, and there are  21 very few vacant properties. There are  22 buildings everywhere.</p> <p>23 Now, in my prior experience, where I've had  24 the chance to work in cities that were not  25 Coral Gables and they didn't have the economic</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 67</p> <p>1 take place there.</p> <p>2 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Anybody else?</p> <p>3 MR. LEEN: So, Mr. Chair, with the motion  4 as to the Comp Plan change, which is Attachment  5 A, it looks like the motion is consistent with  6 the Staff recommendation, with the current  7 writing, because right now it would be 75 units  8 per acre, up to a hundred with architectural  9 incentives. It doesn't address FAR.</p> <p>10 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Correct.</p> <p>11 MR. TRIAS: The FAR, the recommendation was  12 2.5. They are recommending maybe 2.75.</p> <p>13 MS. MENENDEZ: The Staff recommends 2.5.</p> <p>14 MR. TRIAS: Yes.</p> <p>15 MS. MENENDEZ: And do you have a minimum  16 square footage in your recommendation? I  17 didn't see it.</p> <p>18 MR. TRIAS: It is in the text of the  19 Ordinance, and it's 650.</p> <p>20 MS. MENENDEZ: Right. The Ordinance I saw,  21 but it's not in your recommendation.</p> <p>22 MR. TRIAS: That is the recommendations.  23 We're recommending that Ordinance.</p> <p>24 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.</p> <p>25 MR. LEEN: Ms. Menendez, what I meant was,</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 66</p> <p>1 vitality that Coral Gables has, an image like  2 that aerial photograph will be mostly vacant,  3 and then I would say, yes, certainly things are  4 going to change dramatically, because look at  5 all of this vacant land, because of -- that's  6 not the case here. That's not the case.</p> <p>7 The other thing is, as I said before, you  8 have reinforced and encouraged the preservation  9 of some of the fabric of the smaller buildings.  10 Those are very dense. Those buildings have  11 comparable densities to what we're talking  12 about here. It's just that they don't look it,  13 because they're small, but they have value.  14 They certainly have value.</p> <p>15 So if you ask me a question, do I believe  16 that in the next, let's say, five years, all of  17 a sudden every parcel is going to be assembled  18 into -- no, I don't believe so. In the next  19 fifty years, I don't know. But, certainly, in  20 the immediate future, I think what we have is  21 pretty much close to what we're going to get,  22 except for the parcels that have been assembled  23 already, and probably we will get a better  24 chance of re-development along Ponce de Leon.  25 I think it's more likely that assemblages will</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 68</p> <p>1 the proposed Comp Plan change, the Text that's  2 on Page 2 of Attachment A, right now it's 75  3 units per acre or a hundred with architectural  4 incentives. It sounds like you're not  5 addressing the height, which is up to a hundred  6 feet maximum, with architectural incentives.  7 Those are the only two things that are  8 addressed by the Comp Plan.</p> <p>9 MR. TRIAS: The Staff recommendation is a  10 hundred feet, which is about three or four feet  11 more than what we allow typically. That allows  12 a much better fit for parking. So it does make  13 a difference. So we believe that's important.</p> <p>14 MR. LEEN: So, Mr. Chair, the point --  15 Mr. Behar, are you okay -- is your motion  16 consistent with that? Do you want to keep it  17 the way it is? The Comp Plan change.</p> <p>18 MR. BEHAR: Yes. Yes, it is, because this  19 is going from 75 to a hundred, and from 97 feet  20 to a hundred feet, correct?</p> <p>21 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes.</p> <p>22 MR. LEEN: Yes.</p> <p>23 MR. BEHAR: And it doesn't mention FAR  24 here.</p> <p>25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 69</p> <p>1 MS. MENENDEZ: No, it doesn't.</p> <p>2 MR. TRIAS: The Comp Plan deals with</p> <p>3 density.</p> <p>4 MR. BEHAR: Yes. I'm --</p> <p>5 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So, Robert, do</p> <p>6 you want to move Item 5, as recommended?</p> <p>7 MR. BEHAR: I'll make a motion to move Item</p> <p>8 5, as per Attachment A.</p> <p>9 MR. PEREZ: I'll second it.</p> <p>10 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Motion and a second.</p> <p>11 Any further comment on that item? That's the</p> <p>12 one that says it's 75 units to the acre or a</p> <p>13 hundred with Med Bonus and up to a hundred feet</p> <p>14 max.</p> <p>15 Okay. Hearing none, Jill, call the roll,</p> <p>16 please.</p> <p>17 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell?</p> <p>18 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.</p> <p>19 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?</p> <p>20 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.</p> <p>21 THE SECRETARY: Alberto Perez?</p> <p>22 MR. PEREZ: Yes.</p> <p>23 THE SECRETARY: Frank Rodriguez?</p> <p>24 MR. RODRIGUEZ: No.</p> <p>25 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 71</p> <p>1 MR. BEHAR: Exactly. From 2.0 to 2.75.</p> <p>2 MR. WU: And E pertains to the size.</p> <p>3 MR. TRIAS: And there you have two options.</p> <p>4 You could propose a different number or simply</p> <p>5 eliminate it and be silent.</p> <p>6 MR. BEHAR: I will say, on E, as well --</p> <p>7 thank you, Charles -- on E to reduce that</p> <p>8 number to 575, as it's currently in the Zoning</p> <p>9 Code.</p> <p>10 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.</p> <p>11 MR. PEREZ: I'll second it.</p> <p>12 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: A motion and a second.</p> <p>13 Do we have any discussion on that one?</p> <p>14 Hearing none, call the roll, please, Jill.</p> <p>15 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?</p> <p>16 MS. MENENDEZ: No.</p> <p>17 THE SECRETARY: Alberto Perez?</p> <p>18 MR. PEREZ: Yes.</p> <p>19 THE SECRETARY: Frank Rodriguez?</p> <p>20 MR. RODRIGUEZ: No.</p> <p>21 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?</p> <p>22 MR. BEHAR: Yes.</p> <p>23 THE SECRETARY: Marshall Bellin?</p> <p>24 MR. BELLIN: Yes.</p> <p>25 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 70</p> <p>1 MR. BEHAR: Yes.</p> <p>2 THE SECRETARY: Marshall Bellin?</p> <p>3 MR. BELLIN: Yes.</p> <p>4 THE SECRETARY: Jeff Flanagan?</p> <p>5 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes.</p> <p>6 All right. Robert, was your earlier motion</p> <p>7 that had some changes to the Staff rec for Item</p> <p>8 Number 6?</p> <p>9 MR. WU: The changes pertain to Page 3 of</p> <p>10 the Ordinance. If I can reference Item 4.C.</p> <p>11 What I --</p> <p>12 MR. BEHAR: Yeah. I'll make a motion to</p> <p>13 approve Item 6, under Attachment B, with the</p> <p>14 modification that the FAR, under 4.C goes from</p> <p>15 a 2.0 to 2.5, be changed to 2.0 to 2.75 FAR.</p> <p>16 MR. PEREZ: With Mediterranean Bonuses?</p> <p>17 MR. BEHAR: With Mediterranean Bonus,</p> <p>18 correct.</p> <p>19 MR. PEREZ: I'll second it.</p> <p>20 MS. MENENDEZ: I'm sorry, you're saying, on</p> <p>21 Attachment B, which are the proposed changes?</p> <p>22 MR. BEHAR: 4.C -- under 4.C, which is the</p> <p>23 FAR, currently it says in this --</p> <p>24 MS. MENENDEZ: You want to change it to</p> <p>25 2.75?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 72</p> <p>1 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.</p> <p>2 THE SECRETARY: Jeff Flanagan?</p> <p>3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No.</p> <p>4 All right. So that's 5 and 6.</p> <p>5 MS. MENENDEZ: What else?</p> <p>6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We have one more item</p> <p>7 on the agenda.</p> <p>8 MR. TRIAS: Thank you very much.</p> <p>9 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: You're welcome.</p> <p>10 Next item is Item Number 7. This is an</p> <p>11 Ordinance of the City of Commission of Coral</p> <p>12 Gables, Florida providing for a text amendment</p> <p>13 to the City of Coral Gables Official Zoning</p> <p>14 Code by amending Article 4, "Zoning Districts,"</p> <p>15 Section 4-206, "Business Improvement Overlay</p> <p>16 District" to include special provisions for all</p> <p>17 properties within the District such as</p> <p>18 pedestrian-oriented signage, hours of</p> <p>19 operation, and outdoor dining; providing for a</p> <p>20 repealer provision, providing for a</p> <p>21 severability clause, codification and providing</p> <p>22 for an effective date.</p> <p>23 (Thereupon, Mr. Perez left the Commission</p> <p>24 Chambers.)</p> <p>25 MR. TRIAS: May I have the PowerPoint,</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 73</p> <p>1 please?</p> <p>2 Mr. Chairman, this item was also heard by</p> <p>3 the Commission in an effort to expedite the</p> <p>4 regulations on Miracle Mile and Giralda. The</p> <p>5 items before you apply to the boundary of the</p> <p>6 BID. The boundary of the BID is shown on this</p> <p>7 map. The key idea behind this map is that it</p> <p>8 includes Miracle Mile and Giralda, all of the</p> <p>9 areas that are currently under construction</p> <p>10 with the very, very nice and extremely</p> <p>11 attractive streetscape design.</p> <p>12 So the idea was to deal with some of the</p> <p>13 concerns that businesses have expressed through</p> <p>14 the years about the operations. Today we're</p> <p>15 not going to deal with anything that deals with</p> <p>16 development, intensities or FAR or parking or</p> <p>17 setbacks. We're only dealing with the</p> <p>18 operational issues that are in the Zoning Code</p> <p>19 or may not be in the Zoning Code, some are new</p> <p>20 ideas.</p> <p>21 Some of the proposed changes are in this</p> <p>22 chart, and one of the things that we don't have</p> <p>23 in the Zoning Code is hours of operation, so</p> <p>24 we're including some hours of operation.</p> <p>25 They're regulated elsewhere, but it was just</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 75</p> <p>1 in this Overlay, is that we want to have</p> <p>2 multiple signs, multiple signs per business,</p> <p>3 and, therefore, contribute to the activity of</p> <p>4 Downtown.</p> <p>5 We have new regulations for pop-up retail,</p> <p>6 some Disclosure Forms for residents, and also a</p> <p>7 potential for a management agreement for areas</p> <p>8 such as Giralda, that may require that in the</p> <p>9 future.</p> <p>10 The review process, we've discussed this</p> <p>11 multiple times with you. We really value the</p> <p>12 ideas that you have provided. I think that</p> <p>13 this has been a very, very effective process.</p> <p>14 I want to thank the City Manager for providing</p> <p>15 some great leadership to be able to be here,</p> <p>16 and also I want to thank members of the BID who</p> <p>17 are here tonight, and may want to provide some</p> <p>18 ideas.</p> <p>19 As you can see, this has been discussed</p> <p>20 multiple times, and the key dates there, if you</p> <p>21 go to Number 4, on February 28, the Commission</p> <p>22 looked at this in First Reading, so this is</p> <p>23 coming to you after that, and hopefully the</p> <p>24 Commission will deal with this shortly</p> <p>25 thereafter for the Second Reading.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 74</p> <p>1 for clarity, to have those hours of operation.</p> <p>2 There was some real interest in making the</p> <p>3 whole Miracle Mile and Giralda area active at</p> <p>4 night, especially through the weekend. So</p> <p>5 those are the hours that are being proposed.</p> <p>6 We're also dealing with some issues that</p> <p>7 deal with noise, and, in particular, we're</p> <p>8 trying to propose a pre-approved outdoor dining</p> <p>9 strategy. And the idea is that right now we're</p> <p>10 going have this very wide sidewalks and the</p> <p>11 wide sidewalks need to be designed in a way</p> <p>12 that they encourage as much activity as</p> <p>13 possible. So there's a map that is being</p> <p>14 developed right now -- it's almost complete --</p> <p>15 and provides ample outdoor seating, in the</p> <p>16 right places, all throughout the Mile, and it</p> <p>17 allows for a pre-approved process, a very</p> <p>18 efficient pre-approved process, we hope, that</p> <p>19 will encourage development and activity.</p> <p>20 Then we also have some signage regulations</p> <p>21 that are new. We have, for example, the</p> <p>22 directory signs. We have kiosks. We have</p> <p>23 window decals. We have temporary signs. We</p> <p>24 have Downtown projection signs. Some of those</p> <p>25 signs are allowed right now. The idea, though,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 76</p> <p>1 That is my presentation. I believe that</p> <p>2 some of the members of the public may be</p> <p>3 interested in speaking, and I'll be able to</p> <p>4 answer questions later on. Thank you.</p> <p>5 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you, Ramon.</p> <p>6 Do any of the Members of the Board have any</p> <p>7 questions at this point?</p> <p>8 Okay. We'll open the public hearing up.</p> <p>9 Jill, if you could call our speakers, please.</p> <p>10 THE SECRETARY: Taciana Amador, and Barbara</p> <p>11 Tria.</p> <p>12 MS. AMADOR: Good afternoon. I'm Taciana</p> <p>13 Amador, the Director of the Business</p> <p>14 Improvement District. And, first of all, I'd</p> <p>15 like to say thank you for listening to this</p> <p>16 item, and I'd like to thank City Staff, the</p> <p>17 City Manager, Economic Development Director,</p> <p>18 and Planning and Zoning, for the work that</p> <p>19 they've done to put this item together as fast</p> <p>20 as they have. Our Board really appreciates the</p> <p>21 degree of importance that you all have placed</p> <p>22 on this, so we're very appreciative of that,</p> <p>23 and we want to speak in support of the item.</p> <p>24 One thing I would like to point out is that</p> <p>25 there's one section here, under Section 3-B,</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 77</p> <p>1 that we'd like to have the opportunity to  2 revisit, just to go back and look at what the  3 original intent of how it was written, but  4 other than that, we're very pleased with the  5 Overlay.  6 MS. TRIA: Hi. Barbara Tria, BID  7 Vice-President, and property owner, 2309-2315  8 Ponce. I just echo Taci's sentiments here.  9 We're very thankful for the collaboration that  10 it took to put this together and bring it  11 forward. It is, as the City Attorney said, the  12 operational component of the Overlay. So it  13 gives our retailers some more tools to help  14 drive business to their storefronts and their  15 restaurants, and so we hope that you are in  16 support of it, as well, and if you have any  17 questions, we'd be happy to answer them.  18 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.  19 THE SECRETARY: Albert Poza.  20 MR. POZA: Good evening. Albert Poza,  21 architect. I've been practicing here at the  22 City for more years than I want to remember.  23 I've been approached by two potential  24 clients. They're property owners in Miracle  25 Mile. And I haven't taken up any job yet or</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 79</p> <p>1 fixed, are they removable, can they be  2 relocated to help that owner better use that  3 area right in front of the restaurant.  4 If you own a restaurant, I'm sure you don't  5 want to be down the street, and be trying to  6 manage, you know, the logistics of serving down  7 the street. So that's one item.  8 The other item is actually more important.  9 As I read the Ordinance or the new proposed  10 Code, if somebody does not have enough space in  11 front of them, for whatever reason, small  12 frontage, trees, any other kind of obstacle,  13 they can go to the adjacent property owner,  14 fifty feet one way, fifty feet the other way,  15 and as long as that property owner gives them  16 the okay -- could be, again, the wedding shop,  17 they're never going to put a restaurant outside  18 the wedding shop on their own behalf -- but  19 it's okay for that restaurant owner to go ahead  20 and use that area in front of the wedding  21 shop -- and I use, the wedding shop, because  22 there are so many of them, not because of any  23 other reason -- they have to get approval of  24 the wedding shop in order to come to the City  25 and ask for tables and chairs outside of the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 78</p> <p>1 anything, because this basically was just kind  2 of exposed to the public, and I told them, "I  3 really don't know how to help you, 'cause I  4 don't know what the parameters are."  5 So, as I read a little bit about it, and  6 met with a little bit of Staff, as they  7 developed the thing, I've learned a couple of  8 things that -- it was brought up to me, by  9 these two individuals, and I think that  10 possibly this should be looked at, because it's  11 almost like a result -- an intended -- it was  12 all done in good faith, but it's a result that  13 one should consider. And here I'm speaking  14 almost as a resident of Coral Gables, and not  15 so much as an architect.  16 The situation is such that, as I understand  17 the -- you know, what's been written, there are  18 certain situations where somebody may own a  19 restaurant, and there may be a proposed bench  20 there. Yet, down the street, forty feet away,  21 there may not be a bench there. There may not  22 even be a tree there. And that might be a  23 place for wedding gowns, which they will never  24 be using the outdoor for seating.  25 So I was wondering if these benches are</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 80</p> <p>1 wedding shop, because they didn't have the  2 vehicle -- because of whatever obstacle in  3 front of them.  4 The problem is, the wedding shop may not  5 sign off. And the reason for that is, why,  6 because, you know, we're very ingenious, so  7 they'll say, "But you're not going to ever be  8 putting any restaurant out here in front of the  9 wedding shop," but the wedding shop owner says,  10 "I'll sign it, if you pay me "X" amount of  11 dollars under the table."  12 So I propose that rather -- instead of  13 leaving it in the hands of the person in front,  14 which this is basically right-of-way, it's not  15 really their area, to maybe Staff analyze the  16 situation, because I know of particularly one  17 individual, they have already approached their  18 neighbor, and the neighbor won't sign off  19 unless he gets paid off, and that is an  20 unintended consequence of the neighbor having  21 to sign off.  22 So it's a major obstacle for the intent of  23 that vitality. So that restaurant owner will  24 never be able to use his outdoor dining,  25 because his neighbor won't sign off, and he</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 81</p> <p>1 obviously, probably, will not be paying the  2 neighbor off.  3 Thank you.  4 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.  5 THE SECRETARY: No more speakers.  6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No more speakers?  7 All right. So we'll close the public  8 hearing.  9 Anybody have any comments?  10 MR. BELLIN: Yeah, I have a comment.  11 Generally speaking, I agree with what's here.  12 One question I have is, if we go to  13 applicability, Number One, it seems to me that  14 that ought to be delineated a little bit better  15 to be more specific with what's covered in --  16 MR. TRIAS: More specific than the numbers  17 of the BID?  18 MR. BELLIN: Well, it just says, you know,  19 "If the BID ceases to exist, the boundaries of  20 the other district shall remain the streets and  21 properties most recently comprising the BID  22 boundaries." I mean, shouldn't we define those  23 boundaries?  24 MR. TRIAS: We could. The only issue is  25 that they are a little bit irregular in the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 83</p> <p>1 think about a year ago, our Zoning Code  2 provisions related to signs, and we had a  3 number of changes to the Sign Code. We're  4 making sure that this complies with that, as  5 well. The City Manager, the Assistant City  6 Manager for Operations and Infrastructure, both  7 of them are working with us. They said that  8 they would incorporate our changes. So that's  9 all being done. So I will add that to what  10 we're looking at.  11 MR. BELLIN: Okay.  12 MR. TRIAS: One change suggested by the  13 City Attorney is to change the word "content"  14 and use the word "information". So there's  15 changes like that, that I think are coming up,  16 but there are no changes that affect the  17 content, I believe.  18 MR. LEEN: Yeah. The only change that we  19 are proposing, which simply gives the City a  20 little more discretion, is that when the City  21 applies the standards for outdoor dining or  22 outdoor seating, that there is a provision that  23 allows the City to also impose conditions or  24 accept proffering or establish programs to  25 regulate that, to ensure that those conditions</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 82</p> <p>1 way -- it's not easy to describe them --  2 MR. LEEN: You know, it's a good comment,  3 actually. We're doing a legal review of this,  4 as well. That's one thing that we'll address.  5 Because if the BID expands, you can't have this  6 automatically expand, you know.  7 MR. BELLIN: That's my point.  8 MR. LEEN: So we should probably put a  9 geographical boundary.  10 MR. TRIAS: But that -- yeah --  11 MR. LEEN: Or at least say that it wouldn't  12 expand if the BID expands.  13 MR. TRIAS: Certainly. And let me give you  14 a more useful answer, which is that the main  15 issue -- the main benefit of this idea, Giralda  16 and Miracle Mile, and the main collaborator in  17 the discussions has been the BID. So that is  18 the reason why we have this language here in  19 applicability, but certainly we could define it  20 better.  21 MR. LEEN: But, Mr. Chair, Mr. Bellin makes  22 a good point. We are doing a legal review,  23 just to make sure. As you all probably  24 remember, there's the Town of Gilbert case from  25 the Supreme Court, and we brought before you, I</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 84</p> <p>1 are met, and that there's not a harm to an  2 adjoining property owner or something like  3 that.  4 But that would be an administrative review.  5 It's not establishing, you know, a more  6 complicated Commission review or anything like  7 that.  8 One concern that's come up in the  9 Commission meetings is with smoking, for  10 example, and not that this will be a debate  11 about smoking today, but I just want to put  12 that on the record, that's one thing that --  13 for example, if you had a family restaurant,  14 and they were willing to proffer that they  15 didn't want to allow smoking, as the Commission  16 is sort of requesting, they could do that. Or  17 if there's two restaurants right next to each  18 other, and maybe the smoking could be in a  19 different area of the outdoor dining, and there  20 could be an area where there's no smoking. So  21 that would be an example.  22 But there could be other things, other than  23 smoking, as well. And other than that, the one  24 other thing is, there's a provision that allows  25 the City Manager to make adjustments, and so</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 85</p> <p>1 the one edit that we're making to that, because</p> <p>2 we want the City Manager to have that sort of</p> <p>3 flexibility, to make sure that this works, the</p> <p>4 City has invested a lot of money, obviously, in</p> <p>5 Giralda and Miracle Mile, and we want it to be</p> <p>6 -- we want it to work. We want it to be</p> <p>7 exciting. So that's very important to the City</p> <p>8 Manager.</p> <p>9 I agree with her. I think you need to have</p> <p>10 that flexibility in the Chief Executive, but</p> <p>11 we're putting the standards of the special</p> <p>12 events. Basically, whenever you do a special</p> <p>13 event, there's a lot of things that you can</p> <p>14 look at to allow an adjustment to applicable</p> <p>15 provisions. So it's just incorporating that.</p> <p>16 The City Manager already has that authority.</p> <p>17 So we're just referencing that, so that someone</p> <p>18 can't challenge that.</p> <p>19 So I think that was every edit, wasn't it,</p> <p>20 Ramon --</p> <p>21 MR. TRIAS: Yes.</p> <p>22 MR. LEEN: -- generally?</p> <p>23 Most of them are done for First Amendment</p> <p>24 purposes.</p> <p>25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. I have a hard</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 87</p> <p>1 on its side, that is a touch screen, that is on</p> <p>2 this larger kiosk, and when you go up, you</p> <p>3 know, you could find maps, information, retail</p> <p>4 directories, public safety information, et</p> <p>5 cetera, but when someone is not using it, it</p> <p>6 would run advertising.</p> <p>7 Now, the City and/or the BID, again, can</p> <p>8 control the content of that advertising, to</p> <p>9 ensure that, for instance, we don't have</p> <p>10 competing destination -- you know, we don't</p> <p>11 want to be advertising South Beach -- that</p> <p>12 there isn't obscene material on there. We</p> <p>13 could also prioritize local merchants with</p> <p>14 preferential placement and pricing. So all of</p> <p>15 that remains to be worked out. But this would</p> <p>16 allow us the ability, within the Zoning Code,</p> <p>17 to do that. But it's been a part of the</p> <p>18 streetscape project for a long time.</p> <p>19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. I have a hard --</p> <p>20 I'm sorry, my recollection, generally, is, the</p> <p>21 City doesn't like and doesn't have illuminated</p> <p>22 electronic signage, to the point where, when</p> <p>23 the high school put one in, I don't think the</p> <p>24 City was very happy about that. The school</p> <p>25 down on Madrugra, I forget the name of the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 86</p> <p>1 time with the digital kiosk concept.</p> <p>2 MR. TRIAS: I think Mr. Betancourt may want</p> <p>3 to explain that better.</p> <p>4 MR. BETANCOURT: Good evening. For the</p> <p>5 record, Javier Betancourt, Director of Economic</p> <p>6 Development.</p> <p>7 So as part of the streetscape project, it's</p> <p>8 always been intended that there would be kiosks</p> <p>9 -- digital kiosks on Miracle Mile and Giralda.</p> <p>10 So there are three planned for the Mile and one</p> <p>11 on Giralda. It's been part of the design from</p> <p>12 the beginning, and we're at the point now where</p> <p>13 we're looking at vendors to produce that.</p> <p>14 There are a couple of ways to produce or to</p> <p>15 build a digital kiosk. Number One, simply pay</p> <p>16 for it. You build it. The City, the BID,</p> <p>17 someone, maintains it, operates it, programs</p> <p>18 it.</p> <p>19 A second approach is a business model</p> <p>20 that's become very popular, which is, a private</p> <p>21 party does that on the City's behalf, and pays</p> <p>22 for it, and in exchange for that, they're able</p> <p>23 to provide some advertising on the panels. And</p> <p>24 so this would be digital advertising.</p> <p>25 Essentially a picture -- a monitor like that,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 88</p> <p>1 school, they put a big rotating electric sign,</p> <p>2 that was very, very bright at one point. I</p> <p>3 think they politely toned it down, at the</p> <p>4 City's request, at one point.</p> <p>5 So for the City to be doing it, I struggle</p> <p>6 with flashing colors and information, and</p> <p>7 assuming -- and it sounds like that train has</p> <p>8 left the station -- I think, advertising, and I</p> <p>9 understand clearly the concept of having a</p> <p>10 private party do it and get some advertising</p> <p>11 revenue from it, but I think that's totally</p> <p>12 inappropriate for the City.</p> <p>13 The City doesn't have bus benches with</p> <p>14 advertising. We don't have buildings with</p> <p>15 advertising under the guise of an art mural</p> <p>16 anywhere. And so for the City to open itself</p> <p>17 up to allow basically third-party advertising,</p> <p>18 I definitely cannot support that.</p> <p>19 Maria.</p> <p>20 MS. MENENDEZ: Is that for advertising,</p> <p>21 though? Your intent is for advertising?</p> <p>22 MR. BETANCOURT: The intent of the digital</p> <p>23 kiosk weren't necessarily to be advertising</p> <p>24 platforms. It was to provide information --</p> <p>25 MS. MENENDEZ: Like events?</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 89</p> <p>1 MR. BETANCOURT: -- particularly retail  2 directories, events, way finding was a key part  3 of it. The advertising comes in as a way to  4 pay for them, frankly, and so -- but, you know,  5 it also adds the -- I would say, the added  6 benefit of being able to promote our merchants,  7 particularly as they've suffered through the  8 streetscape construction.  9 MS. MENENDEZ: So you would be promoting  10 primarily merchants from the area?  11 MR. BETANCOURT: As I said, we would --  12 either we or the BID, whoever we chose, you  13 know, would be managing this program, would, of  14 course, have control over content, over what's  15 approved. So, again, we would be looking at  16 competing destinations not being allowed,  17 obscene kind of advertising. You know, I don't  18 want to get into what that might be. And we  19 could narrow it, so that it's only local  20 merchants and/or local merchants, you know, get  21 a preference somehow.  22 MS. MENENDEZ: I would think you're going  23 to have some agreement with the BID as to what  24 -- sorry, some agreements with the BID as to  25 what you would want -- or, you know, how to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 91</p> <p>1 wholeheartedly with the Chairman regarding  2 advertising, generally.  3 I feel it's -- I think it's totally not in  4 keeping with, you know, what Coral Gables is  5 all about. I'd feel differently if it was  6 limited to Coral Gables businesses, and it was  7 partly informational, and, you know, with an  8 advertising component to it. I would feel much  9 differently about that.  10 So, I mean, I'm not sure exactly what at  11 this point we can do about this, but I  12 wholeheartedly agree with the Chairman,  13 specifically with regard to having -- I think  14 it's kind of vulgar and crass to have, in our  15 City streets, especially these really nice  16 areas, have advertising of, I don't know,  17 whatever businesses that are outside of Coral  18 Gables -- you know, I --  19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Or beer.  20 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I just think it's totally,  21 again, not in keeping with what Coral Gables is  22 all about.  23 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, every sign  24 category, we're careful to say that the  25 content, which is going to be changed to</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 90</p> <p>1 control that.  2 MR. LEEN: I would like to add something,  3 because I've been involved in those  4 discussions, so has Peter Iglesias. The  5 purpose is information. The purpose is not  6 advertising. There's an advertising component  7 that helps fund it, that helps provide  8 advertising for the merchants, as mentioned,  9 but the purpose is information, and the City is  10 able to control it, because it's on City  11 property and we would be entering into an  12 agreement.  13 I think that's very important, that the  14 City be able to control it. Now, if there's an  15 agreement with the BID, the agreement would  16 have specifications for how -- where the City  17 would exercise its control through the  18 agreement and the terms of the agreement.  19 MR. RODRIGUEZ: If the purpose is  20 informational, which I think is -- I would  21 agree with, then you wouldn't have any  22 advertising that relates to vendors outside of  23 Coral Gables. Like I'm less troubled with the  24 digital kiosk concept, partly because I'm not  25 exactly sure what it is, but I agree</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 92</p> <p>1 information, that word is going to be changed,  2 it's going to be the tenant name, and the logo,  3 precisely for that idea, because we believe in  4 the branding of Miracle Mile very clearly, and  5 we basically had the same concern.  6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Ramon, that's different  7 than these kiosks.  8 MR. TRIAS: That's different than these  9 kiosks. The kiosk is different, yes.  10 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Go ahead, Robert.  11 MR. BEHAR: I think you made a great point,  12 and I think Frank made an excellent point, and  13 I will agree with them totally. If it's  14 something to benefit the local businesses, I'm  15 in support, but I don't want to see advertising  16 for, you know, an Infiniti car dealership or  17 something that has nothing to do with --  18 MR. BETANCOURT: Although Infiniti is a  19 local business now.  20 MS. MENENDEZ: That's true.  21 MR. BEHAR: Okay. I take it back. Do we  22 have a Porsche dealership? Oh, we do have  23 that, too.  24 But, no, I think they made a great -- and I  25 will agree with them a hundred percent.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 93</p> <p>1 MS. MENENDEZ: Have you identified the look 2 of the kiosk, as far as the height? 3 MR. BETANCOURT: The design of the kiosk 4 casing has been designed by a group of 5 Robertson -- 6 MS. MENENDEZ: How big is it? 7 MR. BETANCOURT: Oh, gosh. 8 MR. TRIAS: They're fairly tall. They went 9 through a design review process, and it's part 10 of the overall design of the aesthetics of 11 Miracle Mile. 12 MR. BETANCOURT: Yeah. That's the casing. 13 The actually monitor would be within a larger 14 casing, and probably takes up about a 15 quarter -- 16 MS. MENENDEZ: But how high? Overall 17 what's the height of the kiosk? 18 MR. BETANCOURT: I couldn't tell you. 19 MS. MENENDEZ: It's not in there. Don't 20 say that. 21 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, the retail 22 directory sign is a max of eight feet. 23 MR. BETANCOURT: It's taller than that. 24 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Taller than eight feet? 25 MR. BETANCOURT: The entire casing, again,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 95</p> <p>1 kiosk? 2 MR. BETANCOURT: That's what -- I don't 3 have the height. It's tall. 4 MR. BEHAR: I thought I was joking when I 5 said, "Twelve." 6 MR. TRIAS: I apologize for the confusion, 7 but the Assistant City Manager is looking for 8 the plans right now to verify it. That was 9 part of the recommendations from the design 10 team that worked Miracle Mile. I was not 11 involved with any of those decisions. I'm just 12 recollecting right now. 13 MS. MENENDEZ: How many kiosks are planned? 14 MR. BETANCOURT: Four. Three on the Mile, 15 one on Giralda. 16 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Isn't the height -- 17 wouldn't that be like a fairly relevant piece 18 of information that we should have in here? 19 Because it is -- I mean, if it is, it's hard to 20 believe that it would be, but if it's 25 feet, 21 I mean -- 22 MR. BETANCOURT: Well, we left it subject 23 to Public Works Department approval, because 24 they're the ones in charge of the streetscape 25 project.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 94</p> <p>1 which is almost like an artistic piece. The 2 monitor itself is going to be imbedded and 3 probably a quarter of that larger casing. 4 MR. TRIAS: Let me give you what I know. I 5 was invited to a couple of review sessions. 6 This is not my project. But I will tell you, 7 from my collection, they're basically 8 rectangular. I would say that they're about 25 9 feet or so tall. They're very tall. 10 MS. MENENDEZ: 25 feet? 11 Well, let me tell you something, you all 12 have to be careful with this billboard digital 13 stuff that's coming out. 14 MR. BEHAR: That's a two-story building. 15 MR. TRIAS: But, again, I'm just purely 16 speaking, just for your information, and the 17 issue is that -- 18 MR. BEHAR: No, it can't be 25 feet. I'm 19 sorry. 20 MR. BETANCOURT: Let me just be clear, 21 we're talking about -- 22 MR. BEHAR: That is taller than this space. 23 MR. BETANCOURT: The kiosk is tall. The 24 monitor, which would have -- 25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. How tall is the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 96</p> <p>1 MS. MENENDEZ: I can only tell you that the 2 whole digital billboard thing, you're getting 3 into that, if you're going so high up, and 4 that's not really -- 5 MR. BETANCOURT: Let me just clarify once 6 again. The advertising digital component that 7 we're talking about is a monitor probably about 8 taht size, standing on its side. The larger 9 casing that it's in, it's not going to be 10 advertising. It's going to be an artistic 11 design. 12 MS. MENENDEZ: But who is your audience? 13 Is it the vehicle traveling through the Mile or 14 is it the pedestrian? 15 MR. BETANCOURT: No, it's the pedestrian. 16 MS. MENENDEZ: Then I don't think it's 17 going to be 25 feet high. 18 MR. TRIAS: No, it's not -- I misspoke. 19 Please, let's forget that. The Assistant City 20 Manager is verifying the drawings. 21 MR. BEHAR: You know, if your audience is 22 the pedestrian, it's going to be at a 23 pedestrian eye level. 24 MR. TRIAS: There's no need to continue 25 this discussion, since we're going to check the</p>



<p style="text-align: right;">Page 97</p> <p>1 facts. We're going to check the facts and we 2 will give it to you. 3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Are they double-sided, 4 triangular? What's the -- 5 MR. BETANCOURT: Rectangular. 6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Rectangular. So front 7 and back or side, side? 8 MR. BEHAR: Two sides. 9 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Two sides. 10 MR. BETANCOURT: Two sides. I believe the 11 monitor is on both sides, but I'm not entirely 12 certain. 13 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: In other words, it's 14 not a three-sided or -- okay. 15 MR. BETANCOURT: No. They're rather thin 16 rectangles. 17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. 18 MR. LEEN: Mr. Iglesias is getting the 19 height information. 20 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Frank. 21 MR. RODRIGUEZ: While we're waiting for 22 this information, there's something else I'm 23 just curious about. On Page 7, there's a 24 section dealing with standards, criteria and 25 conditions that deal with outdoor dining. And,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 99</p> <p>1 by the Board of Architects. 2 Currently the Board of Architects reviews 3 furniture for aesthetics. 4 MR. BEHAR: Frank, if you look at Page 6, 5 4-A-2, on the bottom -- 6 MR. RODRIGUEZ: They're pre-approved. 7 MR. BEHAR: Pre-approved. 8 So, you know, what I am concerned, and I'm 9 going to address one of the comments that one 10 of the speakers said, is the ability to go -- 11 to move beyond the -- you know, the area in 12 front of each restaurant. I'm okay, to a 13 certain point, but I don't want to see Lincoln 14 Road, where you have a restaurant that goes on 15 for a hundred feet, and the dining express. 16 I will tell you, and I'm very pleasantly 17 surprised and pleased, how Miracle Mile and 18 Giralda is coming. My wife and I have come for 19 the last two Fridays to have dinner, and I love 20 the people movement that it's starting to take. 21 Instead of going somewhere else, we are coming 22 to Downtown Coral Gables, because it's going to 23 be fantastic. And I want to preserve -- you 24 know, make sure that it flourishes and it does 25 very well.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 98</p> <p>1 for example, there's a -- one of these 2 sections, let me see if I find it, deals with 3 the quality -- I think it's Roman Numeral IV. 4 It's on Page 7. It's A-4. "All sidewalk cafe 5 furniture shall be of high quality, design, 6 materials and workmanship so as to ensure the 7 safety and convenience of the public." 8 Who is going to determine -- 9 MR. BEHAR: There's a section that calls 10 for pre-approved furniture packages. 11 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay. So it goes to some 12 kind of equivalent of an architectural board or 13 something like that? 14 MR. BEHAR: I guess. And I thought I read 15 that, because I was concerned, and I read it 16 somewhere. 17 MR. TRIAS: What we have is a two-tier 18 process. 19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It's an expedited 20 process. 21 MR. TRIAS: What we would like to have is 22 some pre-approved furniture that is available, 23 and maybe two types of chairs and tables, and 24 if somebody wants to do something else, they 25 can follow the current process, which is review</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 100</p> <p>1 I would hate to see that the dining area, 2 you know, takes the life of Lincoln Road, that 3 expands. 4 MS. MENENDEZ: You can't really control it. 5 MR. BEHAR: Well, but you can. You can. 6 To address his comment, you know, you want to 7 set some limitations of how far you can go. 8 You don't want to go a hundred feet in each 9 direction. 10 MS. MENENDEZ: But I think it's going to 11 have to do with the use -- 12 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I thought it was 13 limited, how far you could go. 14 MR. BEHAR: Please, point it out to me. I 15 didn't see that, how far you could take in 16 front of other establishments. 17 MR. TRIAS: Well, the text right now says 18 50 feet, and that's -- also, Mr. Poza, in his 19 presentation, he was accurate in the fact that 20 it does require acceptance by the other 21 property owners, and that's something that my 22 recommendation was to make it as flexible as 23 possible, and, certainly, if you have some 24 better ideas, you could do that. And the 25 concern is real. The concern is real, in the</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 101</p> <p>1 sense that there are benches, there are trees,  2 there's all kinds of objects within the  3 streetscape that may not lend themselves to the  4 best outdoor seating right at that moment, at  5 that place, so some other location may be  6 better.  7 So the City owns the right-of-way and the  8 City would have a management process to deal  9 with that. So the City would have control,  10 based on the rules and your recommendation.  11 Before I forget, I was completely wrong.  12 It's actually fifteen feet, the size of the  13 kiosks.  14 MS. MENENDEZ: Fifteen feet.  15 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It's still pretty tall.  16 MR. BETANCOURT: I apologize. I should  17 have brought that --  18 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And how large --  19 MR. BETANCOURT: Just to give you a sense  20 of what this looks like.  21 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Ramon, while  22 that's going around, and back to the -- you  23 talked about the names, and the content.  24 MR. TRIAS: Yes.  25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Under the awning signs,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 103</p> <p>1 Those are nice.  2 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Two and a half feet  3 wide.  4 MS. MENENDEZ: It's for the eye level.  5 MR. BETANCOURT: We have pictures of them.  6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So from ground  7 to top of display screen is six feet.  8 MS. MENENDEZ: Yeah, it's eye level. Much  9 better than what we envisioned.  10 MR. BEHAR: Yes.  11 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes.  12 MR. BETANCOURT: Sorry for not describing it --  13 MS. MENENDEZ: We see it all flashing --  14 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Ramon, on Prohibited  15 Signs, it says -- this is Sub G -- or, sorry,  16 Paragraph K, on Page 5 --  17 MR. TRIAS: Yes.  18 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: -- "No food display  19 shall be permitted on the public right-of-way."  20 MR. TRIAS: Yes.  21 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I don't know if all of  22 those storefronts come up to the public  23 right-of-way or some have some privately owned  24 space between the building and right-of-way,  25 but I would just like to see that changed to,</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 102</p> <p>1 which is on Page 4 of 10, Sub Item G --  2 MR. TRIAS: Yes.  3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: -- it says, "The  4 content, tenant name or logo," but yet  5 everywhere else it's "Tenant name and logo."  6 MR. TRIAS: We have a couple of issues that  7 are basically typos. We need to make it the  8 same.  9 MS. MENENDEZ: It's here, but it's just the  10 structure. So it's at eye level. It's just  11 that the structure is --  12 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Javier kept saying,  13 "It's much smaller."  14 MR. TRIAS: There is a structure that is  15 designed for aesthetic purposes, that is larger  16 than the actual kiosk screen.  17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Then how wide? Javier,  18 you said these are pretty thin?  19 MR. BETANCOURT: I think, on the next page,  20 perhaps you see the thickness. Yes. You know,  21 it's wide enough to hold obviously the monitor.  22 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: 10 and half inches.  23 Less than a foot wide.  24 MR. BETANCOURT: Yeah.  25 MS. MENENDEZ: Yeah. That will look nice.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 104</p> <p>1 "No food displays outside of the  2 establishment."  3 Because you get a lot of that on Lincoln  4 Road, with a piece of plastic wrapped over some  5 food that's been sitting there for six hours,  6 and it's just -- it's like a hokey way to try  7 and sell a dish, and I think that's --  8 MR. BEHAR: Yeah, I think we've got to keep  9 us at a much higher standard.  10 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And then one other  11 comment.  12 MR. BEHAR: I like the hokey.  13 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It says, "Amplified  14 music is prohibited outdoors at all times,"  15 Page 6. And then, back to Page 7, Sub -- under  16 Paragraph A, it's 10, I think it's Paragraph --  17 it's Number 13, "Live entertainment or speakers  18 shall comply with noise regulations."  19 MR. TRIAS: I noticed that today, also, and  20 I think there's -- yeah, we need to clarify  21 that.  22 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.  23 And then there's Disclosure Form. Can you  24 go into that in more detail? Who is going to  25 enforce it? What's going to happen? I do my</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 105</p> <p>1 share of real estate closings.</p> <p>2 MR. TRIAS: I'm going to ask Mr. Betancourt</p> <p>3 again to explain the Disclosure Form and the</p> <p>4 idea behind it.</p> <p>5 MR. BETANCOURT: So the Disclosure Form --</p> <p>6 this is something that takes place in other</p> <p>7 parts of the country. I don't know that we've</p> <p>8 seen it here. But if you're near -- it started</p> <p>9 with airports. If you live near an airport,</p> <p>10 you're often required to fill out and complete</p> <p>11 a disclose form, acknowledging that you're</p> <p>12 purchasing property near an airport, and so</p> <p>13 you're not going to complain about the noise.</p> <p>14 They have taken that same concept and</p> <p>15 applied it to entertainment districts in</p> <p>16 different places. Like I saw an Ordinance in</p> <p>17 San Francisco. And that's meant to address an</p> <p>18 issue. What we have, and we're trying to</p> <p>19 promote greater residential occupancy in the</p> <p>20 Downtown, to support, you know, a vibrant</p> <p>21 Downtown. However, there is sometimes an</p> <p>22 inherent conflict between living in Downtown</p> <p>23 and a lot of the activity that a Downtown</p> <p>24 creates, particularly around noise, street</p> <p>25 closures, festivals, et cetera.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 107</p> <p>1 MR. BETANCOURT: And so we're going to have</p> <p>2 to obviously create administrative policies and</p> <p>3 procedures to implement that part of the Code,</p> <p>4 that will tackle those very issues. We're not</p> <p>5 there yet, truthfully.</p> <p>6 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, and keep in mind that</p> <p>7 this is the Zoning Code. It only deals with</p> <p>8 ideas and the authority to do things. It</p> <p>9 doesn't deal with all of the details. So let's</p> <p>10 not ask too much from the Zoning language.</p> <p>11 MR. BETANCOURT: But I share the same</p> <p>12 concern, and so we're going to have to figure</p> <p>13 out a very kind of rational process for getting</p> <p>14 that information to the brokers, to everyone</p> <p>15 involved in a closing, for instance, the</p> <p>16 property managers for apartments, and trying to</p> <p>17 find an easy way for them to file those with</p> <p>18 the City, maybe digitally, for instance.</p> <p>19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. It might just be</p> <p>20 something that maybe the brokers can hand out,</p> <p>21 rather than a formal disclosure, because we</p> <p>22 have enough paperwork to deal with at the</p> <p>23 closing table.</p> <p>24 MR. BETANCOURT: What's one more?</p> <p>25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah, exactly. Pile it</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 106</p> <p>1 So we want to make sure that when people</p> <p>2 buy or rent in Downtown, that they're aware</p> <p>3 that this is an active, vibrant Downtown.</p> <p>4 There's going to be noise. We're going to have</p> <p>5 events. There are going to be street closures,</p> <p>6 et cetera. It's just an acknowledgment. It</p> <p>7 doesn't take any of their rights away. It</p> <p>8 simply informs them and makes them acknowledge</p> <p>9 that they are aware of it, and that that would</p> <p>10 be filed with the City.</p> <p>11 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. I'll just put</p> <p>12 out there, the County has one. If you sell</p> <p>13 property in the Unincorporated Agricultural</p> <p>14 Area, there is a disclosure, but I will tell</p> <p>15 you, probably more often than not, that the</p> <p>16 disclosure doesn't get used or put out, because</p> <p>17 people are unaware of it. So I think you run</p> <p>18 into -- it's a good idea, in concept, but</p> <p>19 then --</p> <p>20 MR. BETANCOURT: How do you execute it?</p> <p>21 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Exactly. You've got</p> <p>22 the execution side. And, then, what happens if</p> <p>23 you don't disclose it? I mean, what's an</p> <p>24 enforcement measure? Is there anything or is</p> <p>25 it just completely hollow?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 108</p> <p>1 on.</p> <p>2 All right. Thank you, Javier.</p> <p>3 MR. BETANCOURT: My hand still hurts from</p> <p>4 signing my mortgage papers.</p> <p>5 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Any other comments on</p> <p>6 this?</p> <p>7 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.</p> <p>8 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Maria.</p> <p>9 MS. MENENDEZ: No. No. I don't have</p> <p>10 comments. I'm ready to vote. I'll make the</p> <p>11 motion.</p> <p>12 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.</p> <p>13 MR. LEEN: So does the motion --</p> <p>14 MR. TRIAS: Just be aware that there are</p> <p>15 some --</p> <p>16 MS. MENENDEZ: To accept it.</p> <p>17 MR. LEEN: Accept it with the comments made</p> <p>18 today or just as --</p> <p>19 MS. MENENDEZ: We didn't have any comments,</p> <p>20 that I know.</p> <p>21 MR. LEEN: I think, Prohibited Signs, you</p> <p>22 wanted it to be not just on the public</p> <p>23 right-of-way.</p> <p>24 MR. TRIAS: There were some minor comments,</p> <p>25 that I would describe as typos.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 109</p> <p>1 MS. MENENDEZ: Can we repeat the comments  2 that you all have for the motion? I have no  3 problems with --  4 MR. BELLIN: I would like for it be part of  5 the motion the requirement that any advertising  6 be limited to Coral Gables merchants.  7 MS. MENENDEZ: You mean, on the kiosk?  8 MR. BELLIN: Yes.  9 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. I'll accept that.  10 MR. LEEN: You know, that's --  11 MS. MENENDEZ: I'll accept that, but they  12 also want events, they want other activities.  13 Is that part of your --  14 MR. BELLIN: If the activity is in Coral  15 Gables, yes.  16 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.  17 MR. LEEN: You know, that's not really a  18 Zoning limitation.  19 MS. MENENDEZ: Yeah.  20 MR. LEEN: It's more of the proprietary  21 one, because the City is controlling the kiosk.  22 I would recommend that you make that more of a  23 recommendation to Staff, that they consider  24 that when they're doing any sort of RFP or any  25 sort of agreement, because this is actually</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 111</p> <p>1 to let people know about our -- you know, our  2 businesses, if we have events that are going to  3 be in the Gables, I think that's okay, but when  4 you start advertising things that are not  5 related to Coral Gables, and I think a lot of  6 the, you know, Members of the Board have  7 expressed, it feels like it's crass, it's not  8 something that we should be doing in Coral  9 Gables.  10 MS. SWANSON-RIVENBARK: And so, Mr. Chair,  11 just to -- regardless of the Attorney's  12 viewpoints, we have no intention of advertising  13 anything other than Coral Gables, and so we're  14 absolutely able to develop a protocol that  15 confirms that.  16 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.  17 MS. MENENDEZ: Thank you.  18 MR. LEEN: So they should do that, but as a  19 Zoning matter, we can't legally require that on  20 third parties.  21 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. So we won't add it to  22 the Ordinance, we just put it as a side note,  23 that that's what we're recommending.  24 MR. LEEN: I understand.  25 MS. MENENDEZ: But there's already a record</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 110</p> <p>1 that the City could just agree to do with the  2 third party, as well, because ultimately the  3 City is going to be controlling what's on the  4 kiosks.  5 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yeah. Well, Craig, it's  6 part of what we're voting on.  7 MS. MENENDEZ: It's a recommendation.  8 MR. RODRIGUEZ: So if we decide that in  9 order for us to favorably consider it, we want  10 some changes, why can't the Board -- I mean, at  11 the end of the day, the Commission is going to  12 make a decision, but why can't our  13 recommendation be predicated upon --  14 MR. LEEN: Well, I'll tell you the concern  15 I have. Because if it's done as a regulatory  16 matter, typically we don't look at the content  17 of the actual sign, in a regulation, because of  18 this Town of Gilbert case. It's something we  19 can do in our proprietary capacity, though, but  20 it's not typically a Zoning regulation that you  21 would limit only to Coral Gables.  22 MR. RODRIGUEZ: See, to me, that issue --  23 the issue is, as we discussed before, that when  24 you couch Coral Gables advertising, it's  25 informational. You know, you want to be able</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 112</p> <p>1 of the Manager saying that she --  2 MR. LEEN: Yeah, she stated that on the  3 record, so --  4 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. Anything -- any other  5 comments?  6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No food outside. No  7 food displays outside.  8 MS. MENENDEZ: Oh, no food displays  9 outside.  10 MR. TRIAS: There were a couple of typos.  11 There was no food outside, not even on private  12 property, and then there was an inconsistency  13 with speakers and no amplified noise. Those  14 are the comments that I heard.  15 MS. MENENDEZ: Anything else? Did he miss  16 any comments?  17 MR. BELLIN: More specific about the -- if  18 for some reason the boundary changes, the BID  19 expands --  20 MS. MENENDEZ: That's a good point, yeah.  21 The issue of the boundary, how did you want  22 to address that in the Ordinance? Or you're  23 just going to further define it in the  24 Ordinance?  25 MR. LEEN: Yes.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 113</p> <p>1 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.</p> <p>2 MR. LEEN: We'll make sure that that's</p> <p>3 legally compliant. We'll look to Staff as to</p> <p>4 what the content of that would be. I would</p> <p>5 think it would be the current boundaries of the</p> <p>6 BID, and maybe make some sort of procedure for</p> <p>7 amending that. It could just come through a</p> <p>8 typical amendment, like it does today, or maybe</p> <p>9 we could allow Staff to have some ability to</p> <p>10 amend that administratively, but it would need</p> <p>11 to be -- there would need to be a process.</p> <p>12 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.</p> <p>13 MR. LEEN: You shouldn't just amend with a</p> <p>14 private entity expanding their -- a</p> <p>15 quasi-private entity expanding or decreasing</p> <p>16 their size.</p> <p>17 MS. MENENDEZ: I would suggest that it</p> <p>18 would go through the process again, because if</p> <p>19 you go south or north, you might be affecting</p> <p>20 residential, and you're allowing for a lot in</p> <p>21 this area.</p> <p>22 Okay. Is that okay with everyone? I made</p> <p>23 the motion. There's a second that's needed.</p> <p>24 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Is there a second?</p> <p>25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Not yet.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 115</p> <p>1 MR. LEEN: Okay.</p> <p>2 MR. BEHAR: On private property, you should</p> <p>3 be able to do signage.</p> <p>4 MR. LEEN: Well, right now, for signs on</p> <p>5 private property, it would comply then with the</p> <p>6 general Zoning Code.</p> <p>7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I had no comment about</p> <p>8 the signs. My comment was strictly on food</p> <p>9 displays outside the building.</p> <p>10 MR. BEHAR: I agree.</p> <p>11 MS. MENENDEZ: He doesn't want food</p> <p>12 displays.</p> <p>13 MR. LEEN: Got it. So that will be outside</p> <p>14 the restaurant.</p> <p>15 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. We have a</p> <p>16 motion and a second. Do we have any further</p> <p>17 discussion?</p> <p>18 Hearing none, Jill, can you call the roll,</p> <p>19 please?</p> <p>20 THE SECRETARY: Frank Rodriguez?</p> <p>21 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.</p> <p>22 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?</p> <p>23 MR. BEHAR: Yes.</p> <p>24 THE SECRETARY: Marshall Bellin?</p> <p>25 MR. BELLIN: Yes.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 114</p> <p>1 MS. MENENDEZ: No. We need a second.</p> <p>2 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Second.</p> <p>3 MR. LEEN: Oh, and, Ms. Menendez, but with</p> <p>4 the Prohibited Signs, I'm asking specifically,</p> <p>5 because we're going to amend that, that's a</p> <p>6 little -- right now, it says, "The public</p> <p>7 right-of-way," but you're saying, "Outside,"</p> <p>8 which you can do. That can be a proper Zoning</p> <p>9 restriction. But you're saying, you want no</p> <p>10 food displays outside, even on private</p> <p>11 property.</p> <p>12 MS. MENENDEZ: We don't want it outside or</p> <p>13 private.</p> <p>14 MR. LEEN: And also no advertising signs or</p> <p>15 tenant signs, other than what's permitted in</p> <p>16 here, even on private property, as long as it's</p> <p>17 outside? Is that what you're saying?</p> <p>18 MS. MENENDEZ: Who put that comment in? I</p> <p>19 need some clarification on that.</p> <p>20 MR. LEEN: The Chair did. The Chair did.</p> <p>21 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No, I only talked about</p> <p>22 food displays.</p> <p>23 MS. MENENDEZ: He just talked about food.</p> <p>24 MR. LEEN: So it's just the food displays?</p> <p>25 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 116</p> <p>1 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell?</p> <p>2 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.</p> <p>3 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?</p> <p>4 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.</p> <p>5 THE SECRETARY: Jeff Flanagan?</p> <p>6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes.</p> <p>7 MR. TRIAS: Thank you very much.</p> <p>8 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. I think</p> <p>9 that's the last item on the agenda. Anything</p> <p>10 else?</p> <p>11 Thank you, everybody. Move to adjourn.</p> <p>12 Yeah, we're out of here.</p> <p>13 (Thereupon, the meeting was concluded at</p> <p>14 8:00 p.m.)</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF FLORIDA:

SS.

COUNTY OF MIAMI-DADE:

I, NIEVES SANCHEZ, Court Reporter, and a Notary  
Public for the State of Florida at Large, do hereby  
certify that I was authorized to and did  
stenographically report the foregoing proceedings and  
that the transcript is a true and complete record of my  
stenographic notes.

DATED this 21st day of March, 2016.

SIGNATURE ON FILE

\_\_\_\_\_  
NIEVES SANCHEZ