

Page 1 CITY OF CORAL GABLES LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY (LPA)/ PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT VIA ZOOM TELECONFERENCE WEDNESDAY, JULY 29, 2020, COMMENCING AT 4:05 P.M. Board Members Present: Eibi Aizenstat, Chairman Robert Behar Rhonda A. Anderson Venny Torre Wayne "Chip" Withers Rene Murai Maria Velez City Staff and Consultants: Ramon Trias, Planning Director Miriam Ramos, City Attorney Cristina Suarez, Deputy City Attorney Craig Collier, Special Attorney Jill Menendez, Administrative Assistant, Board Secretary Jennifer Garcia, City Planner Ana Restrepo, Principal Planner Arceli Redila, Principal Planner Devin Cejas, Deputy Development Services Director/Zoning Official Billy Y. Urquia, City Clerk Suramy Cabrera, Development Services Director Commissioner Pat Keon Elizabeth Plater-Zyberg, Consultant Judith Bell, Consultant	Page 2 1 ALSO PARTICIPATING: 2 Mario Garcia-Serra, Esq. 3 Jorge Navarro, Esq. 4 Kirk Menendez 5 Julio Webel 6 Maria Mas Blet 7 Maria Menendez 8 Richard Formoso 9 Waldo Toyos 10 Esperanza Yanis 11 Claudio Naranjo 12 Maria Beunza 13 Juan Castro Lopez 14 Alain Yanes 15 Maria Perera 16 Antonio Miyar 17 Jorge Arias 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25
Page 3 1 THEREUPON: 2 (The following proceedings were held.) 3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Let's go ahead and get 4 started. I'd like to first, before we get 5 started, just welcome everybody to this unusual 6 P&Z Board meeting. These are extraneous times, 7 and, unfortunately, this is the way we have to 8 do it, but at least we're able to move forward 9 and have some progress. 10 I'd like to call the meeting to order. 11 Good afternoon, everybody. This Board is 12 comprised of seven members. Four Members of 13 the Board shall constitute a quorum, and the 14 affirmative vote of four Members of the Board 15 present shall be necessary for the adoption of 16 any motion. A tie vote will result in the 17 automatic continuance of the matter until the 18 next meeting, which shall be continued until a 19 majority vote is achieved. If only four 20 Members of the Board are present, which is not 21 the case today, an applicant shall be entitled 22 to a postponement to the next regularly 23 scheduled Board meeting. 24 Lobbyist Registration and Disclosure, any 25 person who acts as a lobbyist pursuant to the	Page 4 1 City of Coral Gables Ordinance Number 2006-11 2 must register with the City Clerk prior to 3 engaging in lobbying activities or 4 presentations before City Staff, Boards, 5 Committees and/or Commission meeting. A copy 6 of the Ordinance is available in the Office of 7 the City Clerk. Failure to register and 8 provide proof of registration shall prohibit 9 your ability to present to the Board. 10 I now officially call the City of Coral 11 Gables Planning & Zoning Board Virtual Meeting 12 of July 29th, 2020 to order. Due to COVID-19 13 the Zoom platform is being used, along with a 14 dedicated phone line. The time is 4:05. 15 I will ask now Jill to call the roll, and 16 when your name is called, please make sure your 17 microphone is on and acknowledge your presence. 18 Jill. 19 THE SECRETARY: Rhonda Anderson? 20 MS. ANDERSON: Present. 21 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar? 22 MR. BEHAR: Present. 23 THE SECRETARY: Rene Murai? 24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Is Rene here? 25 THE SECRETARY: Yes, he is.

Page 5 1 MR. MURAI: I just unmuted. 2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you. 3 MR. MURAI: Can you hear me? 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I can hear you now. 5 THE SECRETARY: Yeah. 6 Venny Torre? 7 MR. TORRE: I'm here. 8 THE SECRETARY: Maria Velez? 9 MS. VELEZ: Here. 10 THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? 11 MR. WITHERS: I'm here. 12 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat? 13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Present. 14 Notice Regarding Ex Parte Communications. 15 Please be advised that Board is a 16 quasi-judicial Board and the Items 2 -- two of 17 the five items on the agenda are quasi-judicial 18 in nature -- those would be Items E-4 and 19 E-5 -- which require Board Members to disclose 20 all ex parte communication and site visit. An 21 ex parte communication is defined as any 22 contact, communication, conversation, 23 correspondence, memorandum or other written or 24 verbal communication that takes place outside a 25 public hearing between a member of the public	Page 6 1 and a member of the quasi-judicial Board 2 regarding matters to be heard by the Board. 3 If anyone made any contact with a Board 4 Member regarding an issue before the Board, the 5 Board Member must state on the record the 6 existence of an ex parte communication and the 7 party who originated the communication. Also, 8 if a Board Member conducted a site visit 9 specifically related to the case before the 10 Board, the Board Member must also disclose such 11 visit. In either case, the Board must state on 12 the record -- the Board Member must state on 13 the record whether the ex parte communication 14 and/or site visit will affect the Board 15 Member's ability to impartially consider the 16 evidence to be presented regarding the matter. 17 The Board Member should also state that his or 18 her decision will be based on substantial 19 competent evidence and testimony presented on 20 the record today. 21 Does any Board Member have such 22 communication or site visit to disclose at this 23 time? 24 MR. MURAI: Just for the record, I did 25 speak with Jorge Navarro of Greenberg Taurig,
Page 7 1 regarding the Zoning change. I don't think 2 that's a quasi-judicial matter, but if it is, I 3 just want to state for the record that I did 4 speak with him, but that I'm able to do all of 5 the things that the Chairman said. 6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you. 7 MR. COLLER: Could you just describe -- 8 this is for the Crafts Section items, Item 4 9 and 5. Could you just describe generally what 10 the conversation related to? 11 MR. MURAI: It related to the fact that 12 that matter was coming up before the Board. 13 That's it. 14 MS. ANDERSON: Rhonda Anderson. I also 15 received a call from Jorge Navarro, letting me 16 know that that matter was coming before the 17 Board. No substantial conversation occurred, 18 nor will the discussion or the call affect my 19 ability to be impartial about the issues being 20 presented. 21 MR. BEHAR: I did a site visit, just to be 22 more familiar with the area. No -- the 23 decision that I will make will not be hindered 24 on anything that I did on my site visit. 25 MR. TORRE: I received a call, also, from	Page 8 1 Jorge Navarro, and the same as the other Board 2 Members, I don't feel that I should have any 3 reason not to be impartial in this matter. 4 MS. VELEZ: I did not receive any phone 5 call and I did not make a site visit. 6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. I had a message 7 from Jorge, basically asking what the procedure 8 was going to be for witnesses and individuals 9 that wanted to testify, and I asked Jill to 10 please reach out to him and give him that 11 information. 12 Okay. Good. 13 Swearing In, the swearing in process will 14 be different than normal today. With the 15 exception of attorneys, when we take up a 16 quasi-judicial item, which would be 4 and 5, 17 each member of the public will be sworn in 18 before they speak. Also, I ask that each 19 speaker first state their full name and 20 address, for the record, prior to speaking. 21 We have two platforms that are being 22 conducted. One platform is a Zoom platform, 23 and we also have a phone line, a call-in line 24 forum. On the Zoom platform participants, I 25 will ask any person wishing to speak or testify

Page 9 1 on a specific agenda item to please open your 2 chat and send a direct message to Jill 3 Menendez, stating the agenda item you would 4 like to speak about, and include your full 5 name. Jill will call you, when it's your turn. 6 Depending on the number of speakers, I ask that 7 you limit your remarks to three minutes. 8 People that are on the phone platform, 9 after the Zoom platform participants are done, 10 I will ask phone participants to comment on the 11 agenda items. I also will ask you to please 12 limit your remarks to three minutes. 13 At this time, I'd like to ask the Clerk 14 about any e-comments or e-mails that have been 15 received. Jill? 16 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, you have received 17 two e-mails with several comments, received 18 today by Staff. 19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Correct. I 20 acknowledge that. Were any items received 21 after four o'clock? 22 MR. TRIAS: No, sir. 23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. Do we need to 24 read those into the record or we can just 25 attach those to the record? Craig?	Page 10 1 MR. COLLER: I think we've identified that 2 those comments were distributed to the Board 3 Members, and the Board Members have them. 4 However, I'm thinking that there may be 5 participants that will not have gotten them. 6 So we may need to read them into the record, 7 since we do have people that are on this, that 8 would not have gotten it. So maybe we can -- 9 one of them is a petition with a very short 10 sentence, that I think can be read, and the 11 other one is a little bit longer, but I guess 12 we need to read those. 13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Should we read those 14 at the time when we take up that agenda item, 15 as opposed to right now? 16 MR. COLLER: Yes. Yes. We should. 17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. 18 MR. COLLER: I think they all dealt with 19 Items 4 and 5, so we can read them at that 20 time. 21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. Perfect. 22 CITY CLERK: Mr. Coller, you should also 23 know that at the time the Board received their 24 e-mails, they were all uploaded and made 25 available to the public.
Page 11 1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Very good. 2 MR. COLLER: Okay. That's helpful. 3 MR. WITHERS: Can I ask a question? 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Go ahead, Chip. 5 MR. WITHERS: This is to the City Attorney. 6 How were neighbors notified in the Zoom? I'm 7 sorry, what? 8 MR. TRIAS: There was a mailed notice to 9 the neighbors and people within 1,500 feet and 10 the back of the notice had extensive and 11 detailed direction of how to use the Zoom 12 meeting. 13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Chip, does that answer 14 your question? 15 MR. TRIAS: I'm speaking of the second 16 item, the items -- the quasi-judicial items on 17 the agenda. 18 MR. WITHERS: Do they have access to the 19 link that we were given? 20 MR. TRIAS: Can you repeat the -- I 21 couldn't hear you. 22 MR. WITHERS: We were given a link to be 23 able to look into the file, the supporting 24 documentation. Were they provided that link, 25 as well?	Page 12 1 MR. TRIAS: I could check. I believe so. 2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I think, Ramon, what 3 Chip was asking is if the links that we were 4 provided is of public record? 5 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. The link you were 6 provided is the Legistar link that is always 7 available and is part of the public record. So 8 that's a typical way to access information. 9 MR. WITHERS: No, I understand that, but 10 were they especially provided, in their 11 notification, the ability to access those 12 files? That's my question. 13 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, I understand. 14 MR. WITHERS: Eibi, I want to make sure, if 15 they were supposed to get it, that they got it. 16 If it doesn't matter, then it doesn't matter. 17 I just want to make sure, for our attorney, as 18 well, if they should have been provided that 19 link. 20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Understood. 21 Ramon, you'll look into that and be able to 22 answer that as we go on? 23 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. I'm looking for the 24 actual notice. Maybe somebody from Staff has 25 it --

Page 13 1 MR. TORRE: It's on there. It's on the 2 back of the page. It gives the Zoom website 3 for connection to this and the meeting ID 4 number, as well. 5 MR. WITHERS: No. No. I'm speaking about 6 the Legistar link for all of the supporting 7 documents for the item. 8 MR. TRIAS: The link states CoralGables.com 9 as the place where you can find the items. 10 MR. WITHERS: So it doesn't? It says, 11 CoralGables.com? It doesn't give the specific 12 link? I don't know how hard the question is. 13 In the e-mail, we were provided a link -- 14 MR. TRIAS: Yes. Yes. 15 MR. WITHERS: -- for the supporting 16 documents. I just want to know if that link 17 was given to the residents who were going to 18 attend this meeting? That's all I'm asking. 19 MR. TRIAS: No, the link was not included 20 exactly as it was provided to you. 21 MR. WITHERS: So my question to the City 22 Attorney is, is it necessary that we provided 23 the link? The reason I ask is, I attended Zoom 24 meeting, and, you know, these types of virtual 25 meetings over the past month and a half like	Page 14 1 everybody has, and I have sat on a 2 quasi-judicial Board and I can tell you that 3 the same information that we have available to 4 us, in some states, should have been provided 5 to the other people, and I'm just asking if we 6 are required in Dade County to provide that 7 link to the residents that are attending this 8 meeting. 9 MR. COLLIER: Well, actually, this has sort 10 of remained unchanged being in the Zoom 11 platform versus the regular platform. 12 MR. WITHERS: Okay. 13 MR. COLLIER: When you advertise a title or 14 send an advertisement that places someone at 15 inquiry notice, that they're welcome to check 16 the record. I believe that the notice 17 indicates that it can be found at 18 CoralGables.com and when you go to the website, 19 you do see the agenda is published. So there 20 is a publication of the agenda and the items. 21 So I believe that the notice was adequate. 22 MR. WITHERS: Okay. Perfect. That's all I 23 wanted to make sure of. 24 Okay. Thank you very, very much. 25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.
Page 15 1 MS. ANDERSON: I do have a follow-up 2 question on that notice issue, as well. Are 3 Board Members, that live within the area of 4 notice, omitted from the mailing? 5 MR. TRIAS: No. 6 MS. ANDERSON: Because I didn't receive 7 one, and I'm within that 1,500 range. 8 MR. TRIAS: Are you certain you're within 9 the 1,500 feet depth? 10 MS. ANDERSON: I'm looking at what's on 11 Page 7 of your public notice section, and 1,500 12 feet reaches all of the way to the City Park in 13 front of City Hall, and it encompasses Hernando 14 Street, which I live on. 15 So, according to that radius, I am within 16 that circle. 17 MR. TRIAS: We could verify that. We get 18 the information from the IT Department, so 19 certainly we can verify whether your address 20 was omitted or not. 21 MS. ANDERSON: Okay. Thank you. 22 CITY CLERK: Mr. Chair, before you 23 continue, just something really quick. For 24 those on the phone, they cannot unmute 25 themselves. However, they can raise their hand	Page 16 1 by pressing *9 on their phone and that's how 2 they'll get acknowledged. 3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: That's perfect. I 4 hope everybody heard that. *9? 5 CITY CLERK: Yes, sir. 6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay, for those on the 7 phone. 8 MR. WITHERS: Is that preferred instead 9 with advising the Board Chair and asking -- 10 CITY CLERK: I'm sorry, what was the 11 question again? 12 MR. WITHERS: Is that better than advising 13 the Board Chair that you would like to make a 14 comment on the chat? 15 CITY CLERK: No. No. No. So those who 16 are on the Zoom platform, they can chat with 17 the Board Chair. It's just that if you're on 18 the phone, there is no way to chat. 19 MR. WITHERS: Okay. 20 CITY CLERK: So you can press *9 to get our 21 attention. 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: That would be at the 23 time when it's open for such an item via the 24 phone platform, correct? 25 Okay. Let's move on.

Page 17 1 Approval of the minutes. Did everybody get 2 a chance to take a look at the minutes that 3 were sent to us? 4 MR. MURAI: Yeah. I move for approval. 5 MS. ANDERSON: Yes. I second. 6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Rene moved the 7 approval. We have a second. Any questions or 8 comments? No? 9 Jill, call the roll please. 10 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar? 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Robert, you're on 12 mute. 13 MR. BEHAR: Sorry. Yes. 14 THE SECRETARY: Rene Murai? 15 MR. MURAI: Yes. 16 THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? 17 MR. TORRE: Yes. 18 THE SECRETARY: Maria Velez? 19 MS. VELEZ: Yes. 20 THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? 21 MR. WITHERS: Yes. 22 THE SECRETARY: Rhonda Anderson? 23 MS. ANDERSON: Yes. 24 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat? 25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.	Page 18 1 Before we start reading the items into the 2 agenda, I just want to give the procedure for 3 tonight that we will use, a brief overview, 4 quickly. 5 First, we will have the identification of 6 item by Mr. Coller. Then we'll have the 7 presentation by Staff. Then we'll have the 8 presentation by our outside consultant. And 9 then we'll have a brief question and discussion 10 by the Board. 11 Once that is done, I will open it to the 12 public comment. First, to the Zoom platform, 13 as I had described earlier; second, to the 14 phone line platform, as I had described 15 earlier. And we will also go ahead and read 16 any e-comments or e-mails into the record as 17 they pertain specifically to an item. 18 I'll then go ahead and close the public 19 comment. The Board will have a discussion, 20 and, then, if there's a motion, further 21 discussion, or a second to the motion, and then 22 a vote, if any, that's appropriate. 23 Any questions from the Board? No? 24 Mr. Coller, would you please read the first 25 item into the record?
Page 19 1 MR. COLLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2 Item E-1, an Ordinance relating to the 3 Zoning Code of the City of Coral Gables, 4 Florida, adopted as Ordinance Number 2007-01, 5 as amended, reorganizing the Zoning Code, 6 revising and renumbering Article and Section 7 numbers, transferring certain Divisions and 8 Sections from the Zoning Code to the Code of 9 the City of Coral Gables, known as the City 10 Code, updating certain department names, but 11 providing no substantive changes to the Zoning 12 Code, providing for a repealer provision, a 13 severability clause, codification, and 14 providing for an effective date. 15 Item E-1, public hearing, and the Chair has 16 previously asked me to identify, this is a 17 legislative, not a quasi-judicial item. 18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, Mr. Coller. 19 Mr. Trias. 20 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chair, I would request that 21 we take Items 1 and 2 at the same time, because 22 they're related. 23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: As long as the City 24 Attorney is good with that, I think we all are. 25 MR. COLLER: Sure.	Page 20 1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Please proceed. 2 MR. COLLER: Item E-2, an Ordinance of the 3 City Commission of Coral Gables, Florida 4 providing for text and map amendments to the 5 City of Coral Gables Official Zoning Code 6 pursuant to Zoning Code Article 14, 7 "Process" -- let me just stop here for one 8 minute, because I need to give an explanation. 9 Because E-1 is the re-organization of the 10 Zoning Code, the sections I'm going to read to 11 you pre-suppose that re-organization is 12 accomplished. So these section numbers that 13 I'm referring to in the title are indeed the 14 new section numbers, if the first Ordinance, 15 the re-organization is adopted. So I'll 16 continue -- Pursuant to Zoning Code Article 14, 17 "Process," Section 14-212, "Zoning Code Text 18 and Map Amendments," by amending the following 19 provisions: (1) Article 1, "General 20 Provisions," creating new zoning districts: 21 Multi-Family 3 (MF3), Multi-Family 4 (MF4), 22 Mixed-use 1 (MX1), Mixed-Use 2 (MF2), Mixed-Use 23 3 (MX3), and Design/Industrial District 24 Overlay; and deleting: Multi-Family Special 25 Area (MSFA), Commercial Limited (CL),

Page 21 1 Commercial (C), Industrial (I), and the north 2 and south Industrial Mixed-Use Overlay 3 Districts, and making the appropriate zoning 4 map amendments to effectuate these changes; (2) 5 Article 2 "Zoning Districts", creating new 6 zoning districts and associated provisions, and 7 deleting floor area ratio requirements in 8 certain districts; (3) Article 4 "Uses", 9 allowing certain uses in new zoning districts, 10 and updating Telecommunication provisions; (4) 11 Article 4 "Urban Design and Public Improvement 12 Standards", refining public realm requirements' 13 (5) Article 5 "Architecture", updating zoning 14 districts to be consistent with Article 2' (6) 15 Article 6 "Landscape" updating and increasing 16 certain open space requirements; (7) Article 10 17 "parking" updating certain parking 18 requirements' (8) Article 14 "Process"; 19 revising and clarifying processes for zoning 20 applications; and (9) Article 16, 21 "Definitions"; updating certain definitions; 22 providing for repealer provision, severability 23 clause, codification, and providing for an 24 effective date. 25 Item E-2, public hearing and also a	Page 22 1 legislative item. Since we're calling both, I 2 presume it's the desire of the Board to have 3 the public hearing on both items at the same 4 time. Is that the desire of the Board? 5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I think it is, unless 6 anybody objects. 7 MR. BEHAR: Can I ask a question? Item E-2 8 pertains to the documents that -- I printed it 9 out, because it was much easier for me to try 10 to compare. This, which is the -- encompassed 11 the proposed Zoning Code Attachment B, correct? 12 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. And what happens is that 13 Item E-1 is related to that text, because it's 14 re-arranged. So basically they're together. 15 MR. BEHAR: But this has a lot of -- I 16 mean, I don't have a problem with E-1, but I 17 have gone through a lot since, you know, not 18 Friday, because I was out and I started on 19 Monday morning, but I've gone through a lot of 20 this, I don't see how I could look at all of 21 this today and make a decision on this, unless 22 we could separate and say, the organization, 23 rename it, I have no issues with -- 24 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Behar, I think that those 25 are very valid points. Just for the purpose of
Page 23 1 the presentation, I want to have them together. 2 Certainly, there are two separate items, and 3 you can vote differently and separately later 4 on. Or if the Board believes that there's more 5 time needed, that could be discussed later on, 6 but at this point, I think we have a 7 presentation that explains the ideas and the 8 concepts, and we have our consultant, also, 9 that can provide some very valuable content. 10 So my thinking is, we can go ahead with the 11 presentation and then the discussion can lead 12 us to wherever it does lead. 13 MR. BEHAR: Okay. 14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Ramon, would you 15 continue, then, with the presentation? 16 MR. TRIAS: Yes. Thank you very much, 17 Mr. Chairman. If I could have the PowerPoint 18 on the screen. 19 I think that you all need to be commended 20 for the very good work that we've put together 21 into this project. 22 Next, please. 23 And as we have just discussed, we have two 24 items. 1 is the re-organization, which I think 25 we have discussed with you several times, and I	Page 24 1 don't think that there are any major issues or 2 controversies on that one. And then the next 3 one is the actual provisions -- yeah, thank you 4 -- the actual provisions and the Map Amendment, 5 which I think implement most of the things that 6 you have discussed for the past two years, more 7 or less. 8 Next. 9 Now, the process has been fairly lengthy, 10 and some of you have played multiple roles in 11 the process. Some of you participated in the 12 working group that we had. Some of you have 13 given comments at different Commission 14 Workshops. But what I want to remind you, 15 because we've had this very uncomfortable break 16 in the last few months, of the very, very hard 17 work that went into this, and all of the many 18 meetings that we've had already, and to 19 encourage you to see if we are able to make 20 some determinations and some progress to move 21 this together. 22 This is a team effort. I think -- I want 23 to thank all of you for the work you've done. 24 It is going to be a team effort to get it to 25 the end. So I really encourage you to help us

Page 25 1 with this process. 2 Next. 3 The re-organization is fairly 4 straight-forward. We changed some of the 5 Articles. We transferred some text that really 6 wasn't related to Zoning, per se, to the City 7 Code, and we also updated a few department 8 names and those kinds of housekeeping issues. 9 Next. 10 The Text Amendments are fairly ambitious. 11 Some ideas are very big ideas, some are very 12 small, but what I would like to express today 13 is that there's nothing new that you haven't 14 seen before. The content, the ideas, the 15 different recommendations that have been 16 discussed, have been fairly stable for, 17 perhaps, the last six months or even longer 18 than that. So nothing has changed in the 19 recent weeks, except making sure that the typos 20 and the coordination was correct. So that's 21 something that I think may make our discussion 22 a little bit easier. 23 And, then, the other issue is that the 24 Zoning Map was amended in such a way to be 25 consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. It may	Page 26 1 look like changes were made and they were, but 2 they were only made as long as they were 3 absolutely consistent with the Comprehensive 4 Plan. And our consultant will be able to 5 explain that in some detail. 6 Next. 7 Now, to make it a little bit easier, 8 perhaps, we had a couple of attachments that 9 tracked all of the different items that had 10 been modified or changed, and I counted about 11 94 in the Zoning Code update, plus a few more, 12 for the consistency with some of the City 13 Attorney interpretations. So those are 14 attachments that I think could be helpful and 15 may be able to guide some of the discussion now 16 and in the future next. Next. 17 And on the map, like I said, even though it 18 appears different, all of this is trying to 19 clarify through the new Zoning designations to 20 try to make it very clear that each Zoning 21 designation means what it says. Right now, 22 unfortunately, the Zoning is a little bit 23 vague. It's just Commercial. And as many of 24 you know, it depends on the underlying Land 25 Use, in terms of the actual development
Page 27 1 potential. So some of those issues, I think, 2 have been clarified and made easier to 3 understand through this process. 4 Next. 5 And as you can see, the changes in the map 6 are relatively small. They're really very 7 targeted, very clearly defined, in areas that 8 make the Code more user friendly. 9 Next. 10 We've had public notification at least nine 11 times in the website and we've had about six 12 newspaper advertisements, as many of those 13 meetings have taken place, whether it's 14 Planning & Zoning Workshops or Commission 15 Workshops, we've always followed the legal 16 notice. 17 Next. 18 For Request Number 1, Staff recommends 19 approval. I think we've discussed this in the 20 past. And if you have any questions, we'll be 21 happy to address them. Request Number 1 is the 22 re-organization. 23 Next. 24 And Request Number 2, which is the actual 25 change, the update of the provisions, Staff	Page 28 1 also recommends approval, because all of the 2 changes are consistent with the Comprehensive 3 Plan. 4 Now, in addition to what we all have done, 5 in terms of our contribution to this effort, 6 we've also had a world class consultant, 7 Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk, and Julie Bell, have 8 been very, very helpful, very much hands on, in 9 terms of making sure that everything was ready 10 for you, and Liz has a presentation that will 11 explain the content of the changes in the 12 provision, the actual -- I think, the issues 13 that most of you probably are interested in, 14 and then Staff and our consultant will be able 15 to answer any questions. 16 So we can go to the next presentation. 17 And, Liz, if you could proceed. 18 MS. PLATER-ZYBERG: Thank you. 19 Sorry for the hand signals. I was 20 requesting unmuting. 21 So I'm going to give you -- first of all, 22 my name is Elizabeth Plater-Zyberg. I'm with 23 DPZ Co-Design, and I live in the City of Coral 24 Gables, at the 6612 Le Jeune Road. 25 I'm going to give a little bit of

Page 29 1 elaboration with regard to both, the 2 re-organization and the content updating, in a 3 slightly longer presentation than the outline 4 that Ramon gave you. 5 Next, please. 6 So this, I think, is a slide that you've 7 seen before, but I thought it was worth just 8 looking at it one more time, so that we could 9 point out that, part of the clarification was 10 to try to make things much easier to find, to 11 aggregate like content, and if you look at the 12 current Table of Contents, a lot of what is -- 13 has its own sections in the proposed or new 14 Table of Contents work, was aggregated in 15 Article 5, Development Standards, in a way that 16 we found quite difficult to use. 17 The appendices grew, because some things, 18 like the University Campus District, which 19 remains unchanged, was embedded. I've already 20 forgotten, but I think in Article 5, and the 21 Business Improvement District, which is largely 22 about operations and not really Zoning issues, 23 likewise was given its own place. So, here 24 you see it. It may look more complex, because 25 it's longer, because it really clarifies, we	Page 30 1 believe, and will make this -- in addition, I 2 think it's important to point out that this 3 makes additions or changes to the Code over 4 time somewhat easier. We've already seen that 5 in process as we were moving through the 6 changes through our work, because it's easier 7 to find things and you don't have to put 8 something at the end of a series of numbers, 9 which is unrelated to the prior issue. Those 10 of you who use the Code regularly, I think, 11 might understand that this will help its 12 evolution over time. 13 Next, please. 14 So, just to go into some of those changes a 15 little bit, the general provisions are really 16 very much the same. The Zoning Districts has 17 already been explained briefly. Of course, the 18 Single-Family and the duplex have been 19 maintained exactly the way they have been, but 20 it was in the Multi-Family area that we did 21 primarily two things. One was a bit of work on 22 MF2, the FAR being removed and the density will 23 still hold -- the maximum densities will still 24 be in place, and as Ramon mentioned, MFSA 25 became MF3 and MF4. MF3 is the townhouses, and
Page 31 1 there are a few lots, I believe, left that 2 could become apartment buildings, as well, the 3 Low-Rise Residential, and then MF4 is a very 4 small High-Rise Residential area in the 5 Biltmore Way area. 6 In addition, in the MF2 area, we were 7 trying to address the small lots that are being 8 left in between re-development, in order to 9 enable small lot development and 10 re-development. And then the Commercial Zoning 11 became three new Mixed-Use Zonings. You know, 12 you had the old -- the existing Code has a 13 Mixed-Use section, and so much of that found 14 its way into each of these three categories, 15 and where the regulations were all over the 16 place, now they're in there in one place under 17 the MXs. 18 The Overlay Districts have remained, and 19 they're in one place in the Code. You'll see 20 that shortly. And, then, some of the standards 21 that we're applying in certain areas, like just 22 Mixed-Use for which you have to apply for, are 23 now being applied to all MX zone districts, in 24 order to make buildings street and pedestrian 25 friendly, as I think you've been trying to do	Page 32 1 for a long time. The uses have been updated. 2 There's a new table. 3 Next. 4 We will see that a little bit later. 5 The Urban Design Standards, which also were 6 in several different areas, have been collated 7 into one area. Small changes in the Street 8 Design Standards. The Architecture Section has 9 all been moved into one place. Landscape, 10 small changes. And, then, finally, I will 11 speak a little bit about some of the changes in 12 the Parking Article, which are listed here. I 13 won't talk about them right now. 14 Next, please. 15 And Ramon pointed out that there were small 16 changes in the process. The Article, and, of 17 course, as you might expect, definitions have 18 been cleaned up, and, in fact, there were some 19 descriptions in the definitions which were 20 really standards or more than just a 21 definition, and those were moved into the main 22 body of the Code. 23 I've already mentioned the appendices, so 24 we could move on to the next slide, please. 25 Ramon talked about the maps a little bit.

Page 33 1 In the right-hand one, you can see, in the key 2 to the right, how each Zoning category, 3 from which of the existing categories it has 4 emerged, and I would just point out that, at 5 the bottom, there is a blue line, which shows 6 the Design District. This brings together the 7 two Industrial Districts, which were also 8 attached to the Mixed-Use Section, and that's 9 one District which I will talk about when I go 10 through the Overlay Districts. 11 Next. 12 So here you can see that these MX1, 2 and 3 13 are largely the Central Business District, the 14 North Ponce corridor. The South Ponce corridor 15 is MX1. And, then, that the Multi-Family, the 16 dark brown, is MX4. That area was largely MFSA 17 and very complex in the existing Code. 18 I'm sorry, I'm already speaking as if it's 19 in the past tense. It's still your Code. 20 And what we tried to do is, just clarify, 21 according to -- really, largely, according to 22 the development which has already occurred, and 23 I think, upon closer examination, hopefully, 24 you will agree with that. 25 Next.	Page 34 1 Likewise, with the areas to the south, much 2 of this was largely a direct translation from 3 the prior designation to the proposed one. And 4 here you can see that the Industrial District 5 is much more unified, in terms of the Zoning 6 category. 7 Next. 8 So, to speak to all of these Zoning 9 Districts, I think the easiest way is to talk 10 to you a little bit about how it's organized, 11 and so the Residential Districts have their own 12 section, running from Single-Family all of the 13 way to MF4. Should there ever be a distinct 14 place in the City, somehow, in some way, 15 different, it could be added to this area. 16 The Mixed-Use District, the MXs, except for 17 certain capacity, which is evident and I will 18 show you how it's made evident in the proposed 19 text; however, had so many similarities that 20 most of the text is in Section 201, in which 21 they're dealt with in a unified fashion, with 22 certain district differences called out. 23 The Special Use and Preservation Districts, 24 these are exactly the way they were, and then 25 the District Overlays. These had many
Page 35 1 different names, Overlay District, District 2 Overlay, and we've suggested that they all just 3 be called District Overlay, and they are all 4 here, much in the order they were, but 5 scattered around the existing Code, and you'll 6 see that the Design District Overlay really is 7 the one that's added. And Planned Area 8 Development stays as it was or as it is. 9 Next, please. 10 This article has two tables, which show the 11 differences between -- or aggregate the 12 Residential uses, the MFs on one table, and the 13 MXs on another table, and they're very similar 14 in structure now, which -- and I should say 15 that "structure" is coming out of the existing 16 Code, and then there's certain other notes on 17 the bottom, the Mediterranean Bonus is included 18 in these, and so it's -- we hope it's a much 19 simpler affair of where you go to look for the 20 essential issues attached to any Zoning 21 category. 22 Next. 23 So, for both of those tables, this is the 24 structure, A, B, C, D, E. The Performance 25 Standards are the greater part of it, and in	Page 36 1 each one of those -- in each one of the 2 districts, it follows in this order. It's an 3 order that was embedded in the Code, but not 4 always used in categories which have been added 5 or modified in recent years. So we tried to 6 bring it back into order in this fashion. 7 Next. 8 And so that largely corresponds, also, in 9 order to the tables. So here, in Multi-Family, 10 you will -- and in the Residential table, you 11 will see that Single-Family has its own column 12 and MF1 has its own column, and then you will 13 notice that there are two different lot sizes 14 in MF2 and 3. This is also part of your 15 existing Code structure, the idea that 16 something like height and density, for 17 instance, sometimes relates differently to what 18 the building height is. 19 So, in this case, it's primarily height of 20 which differs, according to the size of site 21 that you have, and so that's maintained in this 22 manner by calling out the different site areas 23 and site widths. And then you'll see, MF3, in 24 the text, speaks to the townhouse and the small 25 apartment building separately, and then MF4 is

Page 37 1 the taller apartments that are on the west side 2 of Le Jeune Road. 3 Next. 4 We did a lot of studies in all of the 5 categories, and I'm just giving you an example 6 of one here. It's not intended to show you a 7 specific building, but just some of the 8 maximums that are possible, and I should say 9 that these are somewhat unlikely, because, for 10 instance, if you're not filling the pedestal 11 with parking, you probably would have narrower 12 buildings in order to receive light and air, 13 especially in a Residential building. They 14 rarely exceed 60 or 65 feet in width. But we 15 just wanted to show that the maximum and the 16 most abstract version of the envelope, and you 17 can look at these or perhaps you looked at 18 these more thoroughly as you went through, but 19 we were -- I think these tests satisfied us 20 that we were treating these areas fairly, that 21 some of the changes we were making, like 22 removing FAR, was not undermining in any way 23 the capacity of these sites, and, in fact, 24 possibly the opposite. And so it's really 25 about clarifying it and making it easier to	Page 38 1 use. 2 Next. 3 And, then, with regard to the MXs, 4 similarly each of the column relates in 5 height -- relates height to width and size of 6 site. Here, we were -- I think, probably one 7 change is allowing the smaller sites that are 8 beginning to languish in between the larger 9 sites that have been re-developing near 10 Commercial areas, to both, allow and encourage 11 building on the smaller sites. And so, in this 12 case, FAR is maintained, because it's a 13 different situation with the Commercial 14 buildings, but many -- most of the other 15 restrictions or regulations, in terms of 16 setback and so on, are the same as you're 17 familiar with now. 18 Next. 19 And, likewise, there were many studies 20 made. One change that we've suggested is that 21 the open space that's required should have a 22 certain proportion. It should never be -- or 23 we should no longer be streaming it out along 24 the edge of the site with the little hedges 25 that get caught up under awnings and so on, but
Page 39 1 they really should be useful space of a certain 2 proportion. I believe we said one to three. 3 And what you are seeing is something that 4 was embedded in many of your Overlays, is this 5 idea that there's a 45-foot height -- 6 three-story, 45-foot height, which relates to 7 the smaller sites, and for the larger sites, 8 would then require a step back, in order to use 9 that as a kind of unifying data in between 10 small and large or small and tall, let's say. 11 Next. 12 We looked, as well, at Miracle Mile, to 13 understand how the -- whether some of the small 14 single-story buildings might not be able to 15 redevelop to that 45-foot height at least. 16 It's difficult, if you only have a 25-foot 17 frontage, but once you get it to 50 and more, 18 you could do a bit more, and so that might 19 encourage some re-development, and we would 20 hope maybe even some Residential -- additional 21 Residential uses along the Mile. 22 Next. 23 So, hopefully, that gives you some 24 background for MF and MX, and, of course, those 25 are the underlying Zoning for these various	Page 40 1 Overlays. I will take you through each one of 2 these very quickly, but individually, to show 3 you what they look like, speaking to some 4 changes -- potential changes along the way. 5 Next, please. 6 So the Central Business District, which is 7 very short, really speaks to identifying the 8 location of the District, and it plays a role, 9 because of, for instance, parking exemptions, 10 which I will get to next, in particular, for 11 the smaller lots in this District. 12 Next. 13 The Miracle Mile District, of course, 14 follows completely the original intentions. 15 You know, you're seeing text that both, shows 16 crossouts for removals and underlinings for 17 additions, and I'm not going to go into each 18 one of those, but I should point out that much 19 of the under -- much of the crossing out went 20 somewhere else. It wasn't really big changes, 21 and much of the underlining, what looks new, 22 came from somewhere else or was a reaffirmation 23 of something that was intended. 24 So, one of the new ones, no parking shall 25 be -- the garage shall be allowed within 60

Page 41 1 feet of Miracle Mile, I think it has always 2 been one of the intentions that there should be 3 no parking garages facing forward on Miracle 4 Mile, but that was -- may have been in the MX 5 area, for instance, pertaining to Miracle Mile. 6 Next, please. 7 The Giralda Plaza District Overlay, of 8 course, that's something that was produced not 9 so long ago, and very much the same. This will 10 be -- this will come up again when we get to 11 the parking, for parking exemptions, but very 12 much reinforcing what's there and what's 13 intended to be there now. 14 Next, please. 15 The North Ponce Neighborhood Conservation 16 District Overlay, this is a longer one, and 17 it's very much the same. Home office is moved, 18 I believe, to Definitions or to Uses -- 19 probably to Uses. So that's one reason it's 20 not here, because it's a Conditional Use in 21 other places, as well. 22 Next. 23 This is more of the same Overlay, and so 24 the Garden Apartment Conservation Benefits 25 Program remains. Everything remains, and those	Page 42 1 cross-outs are just somewhere else. 2 Next. 3 The RIR, Residential Infill Regulations 4 Overlay, likewise staying largely the same and 5 just pointing out that the density, in the 6 lower left-hand corner, the maximum density is 7 according MF2, which is, of course, related to 8 the Comprehensive Plan, but that there were, I 9 should say, many references to the 10 Comprehensive Plan or there are many references 11 to the Comprehensive Plan, that whenever 12 possible, we are making references to another 13 part of the Code that relates to the 14 Comprehensive Plan, so you don't always have to 15 be looking to another document outside. This 16 should be automatically tied to it, anyway. 17 Next. 18 The Design District Overlay, which is, in 19 fact, a new district, but gathers all of the -- 20 all of the descriptive and restricting 21 components that were in the North and South 22 Industrial and MX areas of the Code before, and 23 so, you know, someone with interest in this 24 area might want to take a closer look at it, 25 but we're hoping that that also makes it easier
Page 43 1 to work with. In fact, we're very much aware 2 that, in many of these areas, there are a few 3 sites left for re-development at the scale of 4 the Overlay, but nonetheless trying to -- 5 trying to make it a place of coordination, and 6 a kind of unified urban intent. 7 Next. 8 The North Ponce Mixed-Use District, very 9 much exactly what was there or what is there 10 now. 11 Next. 12 And so, the uses, likewise, were looked at 13 very carefully, in terms of some uses which 14 were described in other parts of the Code, are 15 brought here and everything organized according 16 to principal accessory, special restrictions, 17 following on that, but, likewise, it's similar. 18 Similarly, it's pretty easy to add new ones 19 here, if you wish, along the way, and, then, 20 the first thing, like docks and 21 telecommunications, are always their own kind 22 of animal. 23 We did add one thing, which is, there's 24 always been permitted and conditional use. 25 This is a type of table that already was in the	Page 44 1 Code, and I think you can see, the new tables 2 that we're adding, are trying to conform with 3 things that were already working in the 4 existing Code, but we added AR, Additional 5 Regulations, as a kind of note, to enable 6 people to understand that later in the text 7 there's going to be something else said about 8 that use. And, for instance, AR, here, for 9 Home Office, will have in the text some of what 10 was moved out of the Overlay District that I 11 just pointed out to you. 12 We're getting close to the end. Next. 13 So, parking, of course, that's always a big 14 deal in every Code. I should point out very 15 interesting discussions about how parking is 16 being used currently, and there was, I think, 17 we've said this in prior meetings, a lot of 18 input, also, from the City's Parking 19 Department, but the two pages that I'm showing 20 you here, a lot of the dimensional and 21 descriptive issues of parking spaces are 22 largely the same, but two things that are new 23 are the payment in lieu and remote off-street 24 parking, which the City discussed and decided 25 to include in the Code, I think, within the

Page 45 1 past year. It was pretty recent. So I just 2 wanted to point out that it's here. 3 And, then, in terms of the amount of 4 required parking, most -- I'll talk about 5 specific amounts a little bit later, but we 6 spent a good amount of time on the exemptions, 7 and so here you can see the Central Business 8 District Overlay comes into play, because 9 it's -- we're suggesting that the ground 10 floors, which, in effect, are already existing, 11 if it's a small building, without its own 12 parking, that that could continue without 13 applying any stress to the City, and -- as 14 well, that the narrow -- the small lots should 15 not be required to provide off-street parking, 16 to encourage their re-development over time. 17 Similarly, MX -- excuse me, Giralda Plaza 18 and Miracle Mile, that there be some reductions 19 for certain uses, retail, restaurant, in the 20 upper floors, and that the shared and remote 21 parking that's on the prior page can play a 22 role here. And, then, in the Design District, 23 some of the exemptions that were, in fact, 24 playing a role in the Industrial District are 25 included here. So, the operations is not that	Page 46 1 different. 2 So, you know, this is trying to, again, 3 once again, assist with the small lots that 4 remain among the big. And, then, the next 5 several pages, but let's go to the next one, we 6 did do some modifications. We did suggest some 7 modifications in the parking requirements. 8 You'll notice that Single-Family is crossed 9 out. That's because there was a detached 10 Single-Family. There doesn't seem to be a 11 distinction that plays a role in the Code. So 12 this is just part of cleaning up. 13 But we generally went from the 250 square 14 feet of floor area per space, up to 300, and, 15 in a few cases, like Overnight Accommodation, 16 which is on the right-hand side, made some 17 changes to make that less onerous after a good 18 deal of research with other cities, and, 19 generally speaking, the industry, in general, 20 how parking is being used in urban hotels these 21 days. 22 Next. 23 And, finally, just some changes which are 24 required, for instance, with the religious 25 institution, and that -- next -- concludes my
Page 47 1 presentation. 2 The next slide will show us that overview 3 of what's being proposed, and I'd be happy to 4 answer questions. 5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, Liz. 6 At that time, Board Members, do you have -- 7 let me just get myself situated here. I'd like 8 to see if Board Members have any questions. 9 Chip, would you like to start? 10 MR. WITHERS: I do, yeah. I mean, I have a 11 bunch of questions, but obviously I'm not going 12 to ask them all. I'm going to read a little 13 bit more about this. Is the plan -- what is 14 the overall plan on this, to just pass it with 15 confirmation that everything in here is what we 16 agree with, or are we going to send it to 17 Commission with, we kind of understand it, but 18 still have some open questions? I mean, what's 19 -- how do we pass this up to the next level? 20 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, if I could help a 21 little bit. 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes. 23 MR. TRIAS: What's going on right now is 24 that the Commission has scheduled a Workshop on 25 September 1st.	Page 48 1 MR. WITHERS: Okay. 2 MR. TRIAS: This is the only other time 3 that this is going to be reviewed. 4 MR. WITHERS: Okay. 5 MR. TRIAS: So, basically, you have time 6 today to provide input. My hope is that we get 7 some good discussion about the big ideas and 8 the concepts, and we have time to refine the 9 text prior to Commission. So that's the 10 schedule that is existing at this point. 11 MR. WITHERS: Okay. So, Ramon, then maybe 12 the question I have for you, what is the plan 13 for the US-1 corridor? That study is on, it's 14 off, it's on, it's off. This encompasses some 15 of it. But I thought there was going to be an 16 entire study and a review and Master Plan for 17 the US-1 corridor. How does that fall under 18 this? 19 MR. TRIAS: Well, that's a separate 20 project. I don't think -- I don't think there 21 are any changes in this proposed text that 22 would make it any different than it is now, 23 except for a requirement for a ten-foot 24 mandatory setback at the sidewalk. Except for 25 a few things like that, I don't believe that

Page 49 1 there's anything that you could say is a Master 2 Plan for US-1. That was a separate project, 3 and, certainly, that could continue, if the 4 Commission decides to do that. 5 MR. WITHERS: So you don't think there's 6 going to be any discussion about the US-1 7 corridor in this Re-Write? 8 MR. TRIAS: Like I said, I know one 9 specific proposal, which is a mandatory 10 setback -- maybe Liz can remember some other 11 issues -- but nothing general that I would 12 describe as a Master Plan. 13 MR. WITHERS: Okay. Liz, is there 14 something, other than that? You're on mute. 15 Can you hear her? 16 MS. PLATER-ZYBERG: Yes, now. I'm sorry, I 17 didn't have control of the button. 18 MR. WITHERS: That's okay. 19 MS. PLATER-ZYBERG: I'll just stay on. 20 Yes. What shows now is largely a translation 21 from the Commercial Zoning that exists there. 22 So it's not addressing any kind of new design 23 or overall unified perspective on Route 1. 24 It's essentially going from the Cs to the MXs. 25 MR. WITHERS: Okay. In regards to the	Page 50 1 remote parking or a payment in lieu of, the 2 distance now from the effective property is, 3 what, a thousand feet, I believe, in the 4 current Code? Is that what it is? 5 MR. TRIAS: Yes. Yes. 6 MR. WITHERS: It's a thousand feet? 7 MR. TRIAS: Yes. 8 MR. WITHERS: And is that going to be a 9 discussion item or are we now going to -- I 10 know we, as a Board, had talked about reducing 11 that. 12 MR. TRIAS: Yes. Certainly, it's included 13 in the Re-Write. It's a significant part of 14 the department chapter. 15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Can you tell us what 16 it is? 17 MR. WITHERS: Is it 500 feet or where did 18 we go to? 19 MS. PLATER-ZYBERG: It's still a thousand. 20 MR. WITHERS: It was, what, I'm sorry? 21 MS. PLATER-ZYBERG: I'm looking at it. 22 It's still a thousand. 23 MR. WITHERS: Right. I thought, as a 24 Board, we had talked about reducing it. I 25 don't remember if the rest of the Board wants
Page 51 1 to chime in on this, but we thought a thousand 2 feet was a little too much. 3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: This is Eibi. 4 We had discussed reducing that, Chip. 5 MR. WITHERS: Yes. So I don't know how the 6 Board feels. Maybe as people speak on it -- 7 you know, I would like to see it reduced to 8 probably 500 feet. 9 MS. ANDERSON: Rhonda Anderson. I agree 10 that it needs to be reduced and we need a clear 11 definition as to where you measure the 500 feet 12 from. If the entrance to the parking is beyond 13 500 feet, I think that would lead to results 14 that we're not happy with. 15 MR. WITHERS: Right. And the entrance to 16 the building is being affected instead -- 17 MS. ANDERSON: Right. 18 MR. WITHERS: Go ahead. 19 MR. COLLIER: Jill, would you please unmute 20 Miriam Ramos, City Attorney? She's on this, 21 and she can give more information, but there's 22 a slight difference in exactly what that 23 September 1st meeting is. 24 It is a Special Commission meeting. 25 Miriam, maybe you want to just elaborate on	Page 52 1 that. 2 MS. RAMOS: Hi, everybody. Thanks, Jill. 3 Yes, only that Ramon mentioned that it was 4 a Workshop. It's not a Workshop. It's an 5 actual Special Commission Meeting, where it's 6 expected to go on First Reading at the moment. 7 So if that doesn't change, that's the first 8 time that Commission will be able to take 9 action. 10 MR. WITHERS: Okay. It's a Commission 11 Meeting and not a Workshop. 12 MS. RAMOS: Yes. 13 MR. WITHERS: And this -- 14 MS. RAMOS: The difference is whether the 15 Commission can or cannot take action. 16 MR. WITHERS: Okay. So that's my 17 discussion on remote. 18 Now, as far as the payment in lieu of, how 19 is that calculated? Is that calculated from 20 what the Developer is saying is costing him or 21 is the City going to come up with a formula 22 or -- 23 MR. TRIAS: The City is going to come up 24 with a formula, and it's going to be in the 25 City Code, the actual amount.

Page 53 1 MR. WITHERS: Okay. And is that money then 2 going to be used to go into a parking fund or 3 what's going to be done with that money when 4 they assess that? Is it going to Parking? 5 Where does that money go? 6 MR. TRIAS: Typically, it goes to our 7 Parking Fund, yes. 8 MR. WITHERS: Okay. And to be used to 9 build a parking garage or -- I'm trying to 10 figure out, I mean, if we're taking away -- or 11 we're not requiring parking and we're asking 12 someone to give money for parking, is it our 13 intent that we want this money directed to that 14 parking? 15 MR. TRIAS: Well, I think that the best way 16 to articulate these things is to make 17 recommendations. If you believe that's the way 18 it should be, let's recommend that, and we'll 19 take notes on that and bring it forward. 20 MR. WITHERS: Okay. I mean, I just feel 21 that we should allocate it towards construction 22 of new parking. I don't know how the rest of 23 the Board feels, but that would be my own. I 24 just don't want it to end up somewhere that -- 25 other than what it was intended for.	Page 54 1 And then I guess the last question is, on 2 the area that is east of Ponce, south of 3 probably Almeria, north of Coconut Grove Drive 4 there, what is the long-term -- Elizabeth, 5 maybe you can help me -- what's the long-term 6 intended goal of that area? 7 So it's behind Coral Gables Hospital, up to 8 Almeria, west over to Ponce, behind -- 9 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. We're not making any 10 changes in that area as of this proposal. Now, 11 the area towards the west, a different area, 12 but in the general vicinity, that's the second 13 item on this -- 14 MR. WITHERS: No, I understand that. 15 And the reason I ask that is because, you 16 know, the two are somewhat joined at the hip, I 17 think. I mean, it seems that, you know, the 18 move is to maybe square off the southern border 19 of our Central Business District, and we're 20 doing it on the east side, but there's not -- 21 we're not addressing much of the west side, and 22 if we do have a plan on doing something with 23 that other side, you know, maybe we should 24 start to look at something in our Code that 25 will help us move in that direction.
Page 55 1 So did you look at that area at all, 2 Elizabeth? Do you have any ideas on that area? 3 MS. PLATER-ZYBERG: We haven't looked at it 4 in terms of an overall plan or urban design, 5 but, you know, as an advisor, I would say that 6 looking at those areas in plan, not just a 7 rewriting -- not just changing the category, to 8 understand what the impact would be, and, also, 9 when you make Zoning changes, what benefits the 10 City could derive from that along the way, 11 would be a good idea. 12 MR. WITHERS: Look, I remember when you and 13 I -- I don't want to say squared off, because 14 that has negative in them, but you were -- when 15 we did the Villages of Merrick Park, you came 16 up with a proposal of kind of a town concept, 17 with Low-Rise tree streets, more of a village 18 concept, with some Mixed-Use, and looking back, 19 you know, as I get older, it probably was 20 vision -- very visionary, I mean, today. I 21 mean, so maybe those are the areas that should 22 adopt that kind of feel, as well. 23 Okay. Thank you. That's all I have, 24 Ramon. Thank you very much. 25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.	Page 56 1 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. And just to clarify, the 2 changes -- if any changes are proposed, they're 3 separate. They're not part of the overall 4 Code. We tried to keep the overall Code as 5 what the Comp Plan says right now, but it is 6 designed to accommodate future change very 7 effectively, if the policy is decided. 8 MR. WITHERS: Well, I understand that, and 9 I don't know how much visioning has actually 10 been done on either of the areas. I really -- 11 I mean, you're asking us -- you know, this 12 isn't a hit on you, but you're asking us to 13 make changes to our Zoning Code and our Land 14 Use Code without really understanding what the 15 vision is for those areas. I have no idea 16 what -- once we change the Code, what's 17 happening there. And once we change it, you 18 know -- what's pushing this? 19 I mean, do we want eight-story buildings to 20 fill out that area? It's just -- we're 21 changing Code without really -- to me, a real 22 visioning of what we want to do in those areas. 23 So it's a little concerning. 24 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. To make it easier to go 25 through this discussion, the Code is really not

Page 57 1 changing the vision, if by the vision we mean 2 the Comp Plan and the discussions that we had 3 in the past. The changes that are being 4 proposed by our consultant are really ways to 5 streamline and enhance the Code and implement 6 the existing vision. 7 Now, certainly, it will be a great idea to 8 do additional visioning and we've done some 9 with the neighborhood that we're proposing some 10 changes today. We met with the neighbors 11 multiple times and so on. More of that could 12 be done in other places. And, certainly, the 13 way I see it is that, this is not the end of 14 the process. This is allowing us to proceed 15 with a much more detailed Zoning Code and 16 Master Plan. 17 MR. WITHERS: Okay. Got it. Thank you. 18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Before we continue, 19 I'd like to welcome Commissioner Pat Keon, who 20 has joined us at the meeting. Welcome, 21 Commissioner. 22 COMMISSIONER KEON: Thank you. 23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Rene, go ahead, 24 please. You're on mute. 25 MR. MURAI: The host would like you to	Page 58 1 unmute. 2 Again, I go back to the original 3 question -- I think Chip raised it or somebody 4 raised it -- what are we supposed to do today 5 with this presentation? 6 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, if I could. 7 Again, my hope is that you are able to review 8 this and provide ideas based on your expertise 9 and experience and make a recommendation to the 10 Commission. It doesn't have to be done at this 11 moment necessarily, but certainly a lot of work 12 has been done. 13 We've had many meetings. There's a point 14 in which we need to feel comfortable with the 15 product, so we can make a recommendation to the 16 Commission. So that's what I would like to do, 17 help you get to a point in which you're ready 18 to make a recommendation to the Commission. 19 MR. MURAI: But you're not looking for that 20 today? 21 MR. TRIAS: I would like it today, if 22 you're comfortable. If you're not, we can do 23 it two weeks from now. I mean, we do have some 24 time to think about these things, but, 25 certainly, you need to be comfortable and you
Page 59 1 need to be able to make that recommendation as 2 a Board. 3 MR. MURAI: You know what would help me, 4 Ramon? It would be from you, from Liz, like an 5 executive summary of the significant changes 6 that are being introduced. I'm not concerned 7 with the re-organization of where we are 8 putting different things. That's great. But 9 to the extent that we're actually changing -- 10 to the extent that we're making substantive 11 changes, I would like an executive summary, if 12 possible. 13 MR. TRIAS: So Attachment C is the summary, 14 and it may be a little bit too long. We did a 15 one page description, and then we listed 94 16 items, but that was the beginning of what 17 you're requesting, and, again, it's something 18 that, I think, lists all of the things. It may 19 not explain the big picture, but we do have Liz 20 here to explain that big picture, if we need 21 to. 22 MS. PLATER-ZYBERG: So, you know, I took 23 Ramon's 94 items off of his report. The City 24 tracked them all. And the three slides that 25 are near the beginning of my presentation,	Page 60 1 which I think you can look at if you want to 2 put on the screen, as well, attempted to 3 describe or to list what the big items were, 4 and so that was -- for instance, going from 5 Commercial to the MX, aggregating and applying 6 into those three categories some of the quality 7 standards that might apply to Mixed-Use, which 8 is another thing that you asked for, and so on, 9 taking FAR out of the Residential areas, and 10 then allowing the small lots (unintelligible) 11 for re-development. 12 So I think there are a couple of items like 13 that, that probably are the most important, but 14 they don't in any way really revise, in a big 15 way, any part of the City or any of the 16 categories, anything that's now -- any of the 17 denser categories in the way that Commissioner 18 Withers spoke of, you know, how is this area 19 going to change. It's really still the old -- 20 the existing City standards codified in a more 21 clear way. 22 MR. TRIAS: And, Mr. Chairman, if Mr. Murai 23 would allow me, I can give my opinion of what 24 the big picture and the big changes, maybe that 25 will helpful.

Page 61 1 MR. MURAI: Yeah. 2 MR. TRIAS: Basically, I see two big 3 changes. One has to do with the Downtown area, 4 which is the Commercial. The Commercial area 5 right now is one Zoning designation, 6 Commercial. Now, that is not really very 7 helpful, because depending on the Land Use that 8 you have in each parcel, you can do different 9 types of buildings. 10 So one thing that has happened is that, 11 that has become MX1, Mixed-Use 1, Mixed-Use 2 12 and Mixed-Use 3. Now, that is very, very 13 significant. Commercial has become Mixed-Use. 14 Right now, in Commercial, you're not allowed to 15 do Residential, within Mixed-Use, unless you 16 have a big project. Right now, with the 17 changes, you could. 18 The other big change that is happening in 19 that Commercial area is that, in the chart, if 20 you look at the chart, now there is a 10,000 21 square foot column. In the existing Code, 22 either you have a small parcel or you assemble 23 20,000 square feet. So now it's possible to do 24 some of the middle range buildings that are not 25 possible in the current Code. So I think	Page 62 1 that's a big change. 2 The other big change is that, the things 3 that Chip was mentioning about remote parking, 4 et cetera. We have really allowed the 5 possibility of doing high quality buildings, 6 particularly, let's say, on Miracle Mile, and 7 then have parking somewhere else or pay to a 8 fund. That way, we don't have parking. We 9 don't have the uses that are not high quality 10 pedestrian oriented uses. 11 So, to me, that's a big idea, and it 12 matters, and I think it implements the overall 13 vision of the City as a Mixed-Use pedestrian 14 high quality Commercial area in the Downtown. 15 The second big idea, which is not as big, 16 but I think it makes a difference is, in the 17 large Residential buildings, the large 18 Residential buildings, the Zoning has been 19 clarified. Right now, like Liz explained, 20 there's the MFSA Zoning that goes from row 21 houses to thirteen-story buildings in the same 22 designation, and it's not very clear. 23 What Liz is proposing is MF2, MF3, MF4, to 24 be able to have a much more clear set of 25 buildings, and one big change, one big change,
Page 63 1 which is removing FAR from the Residential. 2 Now, in theory, in planning theory, FAR is 3 very good for Commercial buildings. 4 Residential buildings tend to be regulated 5 through density. So that's what Liz is 6 proposing, and I think that allows, again, for 7 that middle ground, the 10,000 or so parcel, to 8 be developed, which right now is not happening. 9 That's the big picture that I see. 10 In addition, we have 94 other little things 11 that deal with making the Code more user 12 friendly, having the charts that explain 13 things. For example, now we know exactly what 14 Med Bonus means, in terms of each of the 15 designations and so on, and a lot of cleanup 16 that could have been done by itself, but I want 17 to stress that the bones of the Code, the basic 18 ideas of the Code, were put together in 2007 by 19 some of you, actually. So many of you worked 20 really hard. That's about 90 percent of the 21 Code, 80 percent, at least. What we're doing 22 today is only the last 10 percent, trying to 23 clean up and enhance a few things. 24 And like I'm saying, the big change, I 25 think, is the change towards allowing the	Page 64 1 10,000 square foot parcel and encouraging 2 Mixed-Use. 3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Rene, you're muted. 4 MR. MURAI: You're the one who controls 5 that, right? 6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: No. No. 7 MR. MURAI: Who controls it? How do I 8 unmute myself? 9 MR. TRIAS: You're fine. You're fine. Go 10 ahead. 11 MR. WITHERS: You're unmuted now. 12 MR. MURAI: Yeah. I mean, I think that's 13 very helpful. So, I mean, I think I have an 14 idea of the significant changes that you're 15 making, besides the re-organizations and 16 whatnot. 17 In terms of parking, I'm just thinking 18 aloud, yeah, I mean, to the extent that you can 19 do off-site parking, because there's a parking 20 garage nearby, makes -- you know, you find 21 parking, but to the extent that we're putting 22 it into a parking fund and we don't know if 23 it's going to be built in 10 years from now, 24 what impact is that going to have in people's 25 ability to park in the Central Business?

Page 65 1 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. Those are the issues 2 that I think it would be helpful to make some 3 proposals, in terms of what you would prefer. 4 I think it's impossible to predict the future, 5 obviously, but it is possible to make 6 recommendations about the way that we implement 7 all of this. 8 Parking is a little more subtle than that. 9 Liz explained it. Liz changed some of the 10 parking requirements, and also exempted some 11 areas Downtown. So I think that the parking 12 situation is going to encourage that infill 13 building that cannot be done today, and is not 14 really going to affect that much the function 15 of the place, because, as you know, basically 16 the whole area, the Commercial area, is mostly 17 built out, and it functions very well, from 18 many points of view, but if you have some 19 specific requests, some specific 20 recommendations, I think this is the venue to 21 do that, if you want to make a proposal that 22 parking -- a parking fund should be used to 23 build parking garages within "X" amount of 24 years, whatever. I think this is a good 25 opportunity for you to do that.	Page 66 1 MR. MURAI: Yeah. It's not an easy 2 subject. I mean, to try to regulate when 3 you're going to build a parking garage, et 4 cetera -- I mean, we've known what's happened, 5 for example, with the County's, what is it, 6 penny tax for transportation, and how that has 7 not been used. 8 You know, I don't really have an answer. 9 I'm more just thinking about it. 10 MR. TRIAS: And I'm taking notes. I mean, 11 everything you're saying, that we will forward, 12 and is very valuable, and I don't think we need 13 to have all of the answers today. 14 MR. MURAI: I don't think I have said 15 anything that makes any sense so far, but -- 16 MS. PLATER-ZYBERG: May I speak to parking 17 briefly, Ramon? 18 There was a lot of conversation about this, 19 and our understanding is, there is excess 20 capacity Downtown now, and most cities, as we 21 took a look at a couple of areas, are 22 undertaking reductions to parking restrictions, 23 especially to ground floor uses, like 24 restaurant, on the Central Business Districts, 25 where, you know, there's certain kinds of uses
Page 67 1 or re-development that you'd like to see. 2 So I think this is a -- this is not -- it 3 may seem like a big change, but it's not 4 extreme, by, let's say, current standards. 5 MR. MURAI: If there is excess capacity, 6 then that answers part of the question as to, 7 you know, okay, you put money into a fund, but 8 that's okay, we have excess capacity now. If 9 you didn't have excess capacity, I'm just 10 wondering -- I mean, Ramon says that most of 11 the Central Business District is already 12 developed, but is being re-developed, and, you 13 know, stories are being added, and, you know, 14 we saw that in a project that we approved 15 recently for Miracle Mile, and we permitted 16 off-site parking for that project. 17 And, you know, I guess the other question 18 is whether a thousand feet -- what is that, 19 three blocks, more or less? 20 MS. PLATER-ZYBERG: Two blocks. Our blocks 21 are 600 feet long. 22 MR. MURAI: Our blocks are 600 feet long? 23 Well, those are long blocks. I mean, a regular 24 block is a hundred. 25 MR. TRIAS: The long side of the block is	Page 68 1 600, yes. That's typical. 2 MR. MURAI: What's typical? 3 MR. TRIAS: The long side of the block, the 4 long side, when they're rectangular. 5 MR. MURAI: Are you talking about New York, 6 where, you know, there's some blocks that are 7 huge and then there are some -- 8 MS. PLATER-ZYBERG: Your blocks are 600 9 feet. 10 MR. MURAI: Our blocks are 600 feet? 11 MS. PLATER-ZYBERG: Yes. 12 MR. MURAI: Okay. So that's a block and a 13 half, more or less? 14 MS. PLATER-ZYBERG: It's diagonally across 15 from you, the long side and the short side. 16 MR. MURAI: I thought a block on both sides 17 is the same length? No? 18 MS. PLATER-ZYBERG: No. 19 MS. VELEZ: Could I jump in here a minute? 20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes. 21 MS. VELEZ: Could someone tell us, like on 22 Giralda -- say, at Ponce and Giralda, where we 23 have all of the restaurants and we have no 24 parking, but we have that parking garage on 25 Galiano, can someone tell me, from the corner

Page 69 1 of Ponce and Giralda, how far would it be to 2 that parking garage on Galiano, so that we have 3 an idea of what we're talking about distance 4 wise? 5 MS. PLATER-ZYBERG: That's close to -- if 6 you're on Ponce and Giralda, and you want to 7 get to the parking garage, that will be over 8 600 feet. 9 MS. VELEZ: Okay. So that gives us an idea 10 of what we're talking about. 11 MR. TRIAS: I think it's about 1,200 feet. 12 It's a little bit over a thousand feet. 13 MS. VELEZ: All right. So right now we 14 have that parking garage basically serving all 15 of those restaurants that are there. So when 16 we're talking about a thousand feet, we're 17 talking about that distance. 18 MS. PLATER-ZYBERG: That's right. 19 MS. VELEZ: Okay. Thank you. 20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Rene -- 21 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, I would ask you 22 to get the public input at some point. 23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Oh, we will. I'd like 24 to get a little bit of comments from the rest 25 of the Board Members. I'd like to ask, just	Page 70 1 keep it brief, and then we're going to open it 2 up to the public. 3 MS. VELEZ: I have another comment. On the 4 MF1 -- MF1, I noticed that on the Zoning 5 District Table, it says that the setback at the 6 rear, if there is an alley, is five feet, but 7 the text doesn't say the same thing. 8 The text, on MF1, says ten feet on the rear 9 setback. It doesn't say anything about alley. 10 Could I get some clarification on that, please? 11 MR. WITHERS: Where was that, again, I'm 12 sorry? 13 MS. VELEZ: On the MF1, if you look at the 14 Zoning District chart that we have, it says 15 that the setback at the rear of the alley on 16 all the residential is five feet, at the rear 17 of an alley, which makes sense, because it's 18 five feet, as opposed to more, because you do 19 have the space of the alley, but in the text of 20 the Code, it doesn't -- it says, ten feet. 21 That's just a comment. 22 MR. TRIAS: I think that's probably because 23 the text on MF1, which is duplex -- 24 MS. VELEZ: Yes. 25 MR. TRIAS: -- was not updated and that's
Page 71 1 probably what happened. 2 MS. VELEZ: Okay. So if that could be 3 clarified, that would be great. 4 MR. TRIAS: And the reason is that simply 5 MF1 didn't change. So that's not something 6 that Liz worked on. 7 MS. VELEZ: Okay. So it would be five feet 8 at the alley? 9 MR. TRIAS: That's the recommendation. 10 MS. VELEZ: Thank you. 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Jill, how many 12 people -- how many speakers do we have for 13 Agenda Item 1 and 2? 14 THE SECRETARY: For E-1 and E-2, we have 15 one speaker, Mario Garcia. 16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have one speaker? 17 Okay. 18 THE SECRETARY: Correct. 19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I was hoping to go 20 around the Board and get some brief comments, 21 but if everybody -- 22 MR. BEHAR: You know, Mr. Chair, I will 23 have comment -- 24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Correct. I think 25 we'll all have comments, but maybe we'll let	Page 72 1 the speaker go, and then we'll comment 2 accordingly? 3 MR. BEHAR: Sure. Okay. 4 MR. MURAI: Will do. 5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Jill, would you allow 6 Mario then -- so he's the only one from Zoom 7 participation, and then I guess you have -- do 8 you have anybody from phone? 9 THE SECRETARY: As of right now, no, only 10 Mario Garcia-Serra. 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. Could you put 12 him on, please? 13 THE SECRETARY: One second. 14 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Good afternoon, 15 Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board. Can you 16 hear me? 17 MS. VELEZ: Yes. 18 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Excellent. 19 I hope everyone's well in these unique 20 times. Mario Garcia-Serra, 600 Brickell 21 Avenue, not here representing any particular 22 client, per se, but, of course, an interested 23 party in the Zoning Code Re-Write. I was also 24 a member of the working group which met 25 previously to sort of review and provide input

Page 73 1 and initial ideas on the Zoning Code Re-Write. 2 There's a lot to like about the Zoning Code 3 Re-Write. You know, the mix of uses, the 4 improvements on parking, the improvements in 5 particular in the Multi-Family 2 Zoning 6 designation, the existing one and how it's 7 being improved by the new districts, is all to 8 be commended and you could tell the 9 considerable work that went into it. 10 What I believe, based on my review, we need 11 to drill down a little bit more is on the 12 details of the building envelope that is being 13 created by these new Code regulations. In 14 other words, there is new limitations on ground 15 area coverage, new requirements for things such 16 as liners, step backs, all things ultimately 17 affecting the ultimate building envelope that 18 one could build, and I think that we should try 19 to apply those criteria to a theoretical 20 typical set of properties in Coral Gables and 21 see what you actually come up with, because it 22 would be very frustrating, if after all of this 23 effort, we develop a Code that really cannot -- 24 has difficulty in being implemented, and, in 25 particular, difficulty because, in Coral	Page 74 1 Gables, unlike in other municipalities, the 2 depths of the lots is quite often an issue. 3 In other words, there's a 100 foot depths 4 on average in most Coral Gables properties, 5 which is always sort of a challenge, from a 6 design perspective, and now I think that 7 challenge could potentially even be bigger with 8 these other requirements. These other 9 requirements might make sense, but let's make 10 sure that they're going to work when the time 11 comes and actually brings about the product 12 that we want. 13 You know, I think it's more sort of a 14 design and architectural exercise. The working 15 group, in particular, that previously met, has 16 a good number of architects on it, so I think 17 that's maybe a venue or maybe a group that 18 should meet as part of this process again as we 19 move forward, to try to provide that input, 20 and, you know, have a certain level of comfort 21 and confidence that these regulations and 22 implementations are actually going to work. 23 Thank you. 24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, Mario. 25 Liz (sic), you said we don't have anybody
Page 75 1 else on the Zoom platform and we don't have 2 nobody on the phone line platform; is that 3 correct? 4 THE SECRETARY: Correct. 5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Do we have any 6 e-comments or e-mails that need to be read into 7 the record for this item? No? 8 THE SECRETARY: No comments. 9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. For these two 10 items, I'm going to go ahead and close the 11 floor for public comment. 12 I'd like to ask, Venny -- 13 MR. TORRE: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I 14 have several questions, and some hopefully big 15 ideas, discussions, to happen here, and I 16 reserve to ask some specific questions later 17 regarding the Code specifically. 18 But on the big idea situation, I have two 19 or three main things to ask. I have a feeling 20 that one of the main goals should be try to 21 have incentive for the large scale buildings to 22 happen, and, in some cases, that's not 23 happening currently, and the idea is to try to 24 bring these smaller buildings into play, and I 25 think that's part of the goals that Liz brought	Page 76 1 forth here. 2 Specifically in MX1, for example, when you 3 have a 10,000 square foot lot, and you have a 4 20-foot setback, how is that possible to really 5 get any parking to happen in something like 6 that, when you don't have an alley, for 7 example? How are we to really incentivize 8 those buildings to happen and not create, 9 again, more emphasis for the assemblage to 10 happen? 11 The second question for me is, Miracle 12 Mile, specifically, what does -- I'm going to 13 ask this to Liz specifically. What is the 14 perfect solution for Miracle Mile? How would 15 you incentivize that perfect solution to 16 happen, and how does that 60-foot item come 17 into play here, because I'm not sure I'm clear 18 on the 60-foot setback for garages? 19 MS. PLATER-ZYBERG: Yeah. So, you know, 20 speaking to Miracle Mile first, we're aware 21 that there's a lot of -- there are quite a 22 number of small ownership properties. It 23 doesn't mean that they won't be aggregated in 24 the future. But I think one of the concerns 25 that we were hearing in the various Committees

Page 77 1 is that there is this so-called missing middle, 2 the Low-Rise buildings, that might be built on 3 smaller lots, and so that's where the remote 4 parking and the parking in lieu came into play, 5 as well as the Miracle Mile parking exemption, 6 in order to encourage building the buildings in 7 Miracle Mile. 8 So that parking, 60 feet, is about not 9 filling the ground floor with parking, for 10 instance, on a building that might be three, 11 even six stories tall, and interrupting the 12 pedestrian character of Miracle Mile. 13 MR. TORRE: That means you cannot have it 14 on the ground floor, but it could be up on the 15 second floor, closer to the street, it just 16 cannot be 60 feet from the Miracle Mile 17 sidewalk? 18 MS. PLATER-ZYBERG: Yeah. It just seems -- 19 you know, the emphasis -- the intention of the 20 Miracle Mile District has always been to make 21 that as fully occupied by the various Downtown 22 uses, and so to devote some of that space to 23 cars seems contradictory to that intent. 24 MR. TORRE: I think this is what I'm 25 hearing from you. So, for example, the CBD has	Page 78 1 a parking reduction offered. That's great. 2 The Multi-Family, on the north side of Ponce, 3 all of that has parking reduction offered. 4 That's great. There's a block in the middle, 5 between Majorca and Alhambra, that is not in 6 the CBD or in the area of the North Ponce. 7 When you go south of Almeria, you get into 8 another district that is the edges of Downtown, 9 that's still the Crafts Section, that does not 10 have a parking reduction. 11 Are you proposing, to really incentivize 12 the smaller buildings, that they take that 13 remote parking as their key to that incentive? 14 Is that the main incentive for those smaller 15 buildings? 16 MS. PLATER-ZYBERG: That, and also the 17 ground floor not requiring parking. So, you 18 know, there's a series of different components 19 like that that are working together. 20 If you're talking about an area that would 21 be re-zoned or where the Zoning category would 22 change, I think that would be worth discussing, 23 certainly, how that would be adding to this 24 picture, but given the existing conditions, 25 that was what was our suggestion.
Page 79 1 MR. TORRE: Yeah. You did a -- I guess, an 2 analysis from form based designs that you were 3 showing us earlier, that showed a 10,000 square 4 foot lot, and it shaped out perfectly. When 5 you put 20 feet of setback, and then you have 6 to park, and then you have a liner, there's not 7 a lot of parking that can happen in that 8 building. So I just wondered how you can make 9 that building be successful as a small 10 building. 11 MS. PLATER-ZYBERG: So there's a lot of 12 fine print on that slide. Certainly, the 13 parking is always (unintelligible) but there 14 are the opportunities to reduce the amount of 15 parking, and so it's a trade-off, I would say, 16 and it seemed to be that -- it seemed to us 17 that we were offering other kinds of capacity 18 or other benefits for those areas, for the 19 various Zoning areas, the MF2 and so on, such 20 that how you -- but at the same time, the 21 (Unintelligible). 22 If you incentivize rebuilding on those 23 hundred foot lots, and you say, okay, no liner, 24 we would end up -- what we fear is that you 25 would end up with a lot of exposed parking	Page 80 1 garages, that you would prefer not to have in 2 those areas, which would be a reduction in 3 quality and value. 4 MR. TORRE: I understand. The liners are 5 great, and the use of retail on the ground 6 floor is fantastic. It's just that, on a 7 smaller site, I don't know how you park anybody 8 or you build that parking deck -- I don't know 9 how any small site can have it. 10 MS. PLATER-ZYBERG: Well, if you're in the 11 CBD, that's greatly ameliorated. So I suppose 12 that's where the inclusion in the CBD 13 discussion would come in. 14 MR. TORRE: Yeah. I'm bringing this up, 15 because MF1 is going to come in later and I 16 just wanted to bring that up for discussion at 17 this point. 18 A couple of other specific questions. I'm 19 going to focus on, specifically, MF3 for a 20 second. MF3 Townhouse, you changed the front 21 setback to ten, and currently it's five. I 22 wonder if there's a way to allow for -- again, 23 back to the Board of Architects, how it was 24 worded before, to allow for that to be reduced 25 in certain cases to allow for some articulation

Page 81 1 of the site, and also reduces the square 2 footage of that first floor and it becomes a 3 little difficult, from my experience, to do 10 4 feet. It's great more for green space, but I 5 would suggest that maybe bringing five back is 6 not a bad thing. 7 The second point to that MF3, there's, I 8 believe, discussions about not allowing the 9 drive-throughs to happen in the front. I'm not 10 sure if that means on an individual basis or if 11 you have a project that requires you to park in 12 the back, that you have one way to get the cars 13 to the back. I'm not clear if that's the 14 intent. 15 MS. PLATER-ZYBERG: The intent is to not 16 have a porte cochere in the front, which is 17 allowed in MF4, for instance. 18 MR. TORRE: But if you have a site that's 19 not tied to a corner, to an alley, you need to 20 get to the back to park the cars no matter 21 what. You would need to -- 22 MS. PLATER-ZYBERG: Right. So, on the 23 side, a side driveway, is permissible. 24 MR. TORRE: Okay. And, then, on that 25 point, you've made Multi-Family on MF3 be	Page 82 1 allowed with 10,000 square feet. 10,000 square 2 feet on that density is only twenty units per 3 acre. You're allowing four units on 10,000. 4 So, if for some reason, somebody wants to do 5 Multi-Family, MF3, the most he'll get is four 6 units. That's a big site to allow only four 7 units. 8 MS. PLATER-ZYBERG: So I believe that's the 9 Comprehensive Plan density that's in MFSA right 10 now, but I think I should check that with 11 Ramon. In other words, we were just bringing 12 that forward. So maybe they had some -- 13 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, the density -- the 14 Residential density is controlled by the Comp 15 Plan, and that's something that could be 16 reviewed by the Commission, if you believe that 17 in some cases it should be changed, but at this 18 point, we were not proposing any 19 inconsistencies. 20 MR. TORRE: Okay. I believe I had one more 21 specific question on the parking. If you can 22 explain, I'm not sure I'm clear, the Commercial 23 Limited allowed for some re-development to 24 happen without parking being affected -- and 25 I'm not sure I'm clear on that 1964 -- how
Page 83 1 that's playing out. If you could explain that. 2 MR. TRIAS: You mean, the parking 3 requirements? 4 MR. TORRE: Yeah. The Commercial Limited, 5 apparently you could re-develop before and 6 parking was waived. At this point, it's gone, 7 right? That condition is no longer applicable? 8 MR. TRIAS: Yes. I think what you're 9 thinking is that very specific provision on -- 10 yeah, that's gone, because right now there's 11 not going to be Commercial Limited. However, 12 there are other ways that that parking can be 13 waived, but that specific provision is no 14 longer valid. 15 MR. TORRE: Okay. One last question, when 16 you provide, for example, in the Parking 17 Section, buildings exceeding 45 feet will have 18 a 50 percent reduction in parking for retail, 19 restaurants and office use, how does that get 20 applied? So, in other words, if you have three 21 floors, the first three floors are waived and 22 whatever you put on the fourth floor is 23 required to have parking? Can you explain 24 that? When you get past the three floors that 25 are waived, what happens to the additional	Page 84 1 floors? 2 MR. TRIAS: Well, you have to provide 3 parking. 4 MR. TORRE: But is it a specific -- for 5 example, my fourth floor offices, and I get up 6 to three floors. Because I have fourth floor 7 offices, I'm using the parking Code for offices 8 What happens if I have Residential on the 9 fourth floor? I'm going to be using the 10 Residential Code on the fourth floor? Is it 11 like that? 12 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, something like that would 13 happen. 14 Can I correct one point? There's a liner 15 required for Miracle Mile. So it's beyond the 16 first story that parking is not allowed. It's 17 in all of the stories in the 60 feet. That's 18 what the Code says right now, as proposed. 19 And, secondly, Mr. Torre, you spoke about a 20 20-foot setback in the front for MX1 -- 21 MR. TORRE: I'm sorry, that's a zero. 22 MR. TRIAS: It's a zero, yes. 23 MR. TORRE: Yes. I want to bring back up 24 something, because of Chip's comment earlier 25 about the thousand foot. If, in fact, from

Page 85 1 Giralda and Ponce to that parking structure is 2 only (unintelligible) feet, that's not a long 3 distance to have your parking away from the 4 site you're trying to waive parking at. A 5 hundred feet would be half of Giralda? Is that 6 what you guys said earlier, in terms of 7 distance? 8 MR. TRIAS: Right. And that's a policy 9 choice. Clearly, you can go one way or the 10 other, depending on what you want to encourage. 11 If you want to encourage re-development, then 12 you have a much longer distance that allows all 13 of those things. 14 MR. TORRE: Those are all of my comments. 15 Thank you, Mr. Chair. 16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Before we continue 17 with other Board Members, Jorge Navarro had his 18 hands up to speak on the -- as the public 19 comment, and unfortunately we did not recognize 20 him, and I would like to do that at this time. 21 So, Liz (sic), would you get Jorge, because 22 it would be a shame? 23 MR. NAVARRO: Thank you very much. Mr. 24 Chair, can you hear me? 25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes, thank you.	Page 86 1 MR. NAVARRO: Great. Thank you very much. 2 I apologize. I raised my hand. I'm getting 3 the hang of these virtual meetings, but I just 4 wanted to quickly commend the City and Liz for 5 all of their hard work. This has been a Code 6 that's been a long time in the making. I've 7 had the privilege of sitting in the Steering 8 Committee. We've had some very good 9 discussions about this. I know we've had 10 multiple public meetings on this, and I think 11 this is the result of a lot of collaboration by 12 many different parties. 13 Overall, the Code implements many good 14 policies. I think, you know, you're pushing 15 for urbanism in a way that's forward thinking, 16 focusing on improving landscaping, public 17 benefits, enhanced walkability, really focusing 18 on the ground level pedestrian space, which is 19 important, and something that I can tell you, 20 in working with Staff for many years, they've 21 been pushing all of these policies that are 22 being codified. 23 I just wanted to quickly echo some of the 24 comments that have been made with regards 25 particularly to parking and setbacks, and I
Page 87 1 want to just reiterate those. You know, 2 particularly in MF4 District and some of the 3 other ones, where we're increasing landscape 4 requirements and modifying some of the 5 setbacks, I think it's been mentioned that the 6 Gables does have and these are old plats. They 7 were all platted back in the 1920s and '30s. 8 You have very small lots. And when you start 9 manipulating those factors, I think it's 10 important -- you know, I think someone had 11 suggested maybe studying a couple of sites to 12 see how the increased open space, with some of 13 the enhanced setbacks, affects the ability to 14 provide usable on-site parking that is safe for 15 residents and visitors that use those parking 16 facilities, also considering the ability to 17 have the option of providing, provided that 18 it's approved by your Board of Architects, 19 having liner spaces replaced by architectural 20 treatments. There may be some sites where that 21 might drastically impact your ability to 22 accommodate ramps and additional parking within 23 the building footprint. So that would be 24 something that I think could provide some 25 additional flexibility.	Page 88 1 And, lastly, currently, in your MXD, the 2 building height within a hundred feet of MF1 3 and SFR is limited to 45 feet, and we've been 4 able to accommodate four stories within that 45 5 feet, and I would ask the Board to consider 6 leaving that policy in place. I think, in 7 certain areas that lend itself to having 8 Commercial at the ground level, where you have 9 a very high floor to ceiling height, you do get 10 the three-story building envelope, where you 11 have a ground floor of retail, but there are 12 certain neighborhoods and certain areas where, 13 especially in today's market, retail may not be 14 the best use there. It may be a live-work 15 component or a Residential component, and I 16 think, in those instances, you want to have the 17 flexibility to keep the same 45-foot building 18 envelope, but to allow that to be filled in 19 with four stories, where it's Residential or 20 some other live-work. 21 So, with that, those are my comments, and 22 thank you, everybody, for all of your hard work 23 on this. 24 MS. PLATER-ZYBERG: Mr. Ramon, may I -- or, 25 Chairman, may I just speak to the capacity

Page 89 1 questions with regard to liners? 2 The studies that we did showed that 3 actually other -- there are other limits to the 4 density in these buildings, largely the Comp 5 Plan density, in terms of numbers of units. 6 And so when we did those buildings studies, 7 which I described as being abstract, but 8 nonetheless, there is much more area, 9 non-parking buildable area, in those buildings 10 currently or proposed, and the main restriction 11 is, in fact, not the restriction on parking 12 that the liner might give, but the 13 Comprehensive Plan density. 14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you. 15 Liz -- I mean, sorry, Jill, is there 16 anybody else that we missed while I have it 17 open, before I close it? 18 THE SECRETARY: Not on this item, no. 19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Not on this time, 20 okay. 21 I would like to remind everybody from the 22 public, please, if you are going to speak on 23 any items, to please chat over to Jill 24 Menendez, so that she can put you down. And if 25 not, Ramon, was it *9 from the phone?	Page 90 1 MR. TRIAS: Yes. 2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: *9, so you will be 3 recognized, also, to speak. 4 Rhonda, I'd like to ask you for comments, 5 please. 6 MS. ANDERSON: Well, I have to commend Liz 7 on the excellent job she's done re-organizing 8 this very complex Code that we've been dealing 9 with every time. So it was a great job -- 10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: It's a little hard to 11 hear you, Rhonda. 12 MS. ANDERSON: Okay. Let me see if I can 13 go to the headset, then. 14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. 15 MS. ANDERSON: I had it on earlier and I 16 took it off. 17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: All right. Everybody 18 please bear with us as this is our first 19 virtual meeting that we have done and I don't 20 think it will be the last one. 21 MS. ANDERSON: Can you hear me now? 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes. 23 MS. ANDERSON: Can you hear me clear? 24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes. 25 MS. ANDERSON: Okay. Well, Liz, I just
Page 91 1 want to commend you on the excellent job you've 2 done re-organizing the Code. 3 I do echo Mr. Behar's sentiments that we 4 could use a little more time in the review of 5 this, as well as some ideas on how some of 6 these things are going to be applied. 7 I'm going to go back to the parking 8 briefly, because in one of the proposals that 9 we've had, that came to us before, it had a 10 thousand feet limit. We don't have a 11 definition as to how that is calculated. It 12 could be the rear corner of the building, and 13 the actual entrance and exit of the parking is 14 1,500 feet or 2,000 feet. So the intent of the 15 Code is defeated, if we don't have a definition 16 as to where that entrance needs to be. 17 And as far as a parking fund, I'd also 18 suggest that as we have plenty of capacity for 19 parking, we also open it up for -- to assist 20 remote parking, that we can have funding for 21 things such as the freebie, to facilitate those 22 people parking to get to the restaurants. 23 One of the complaints that I hear typically 24 is, people are not willing to walk a distance. 25 So if we're going to really embrace remote	Page 92 1 parking in any location, we have to make it 2 much easier for people to get to and from those 3 buildings, other than through valet service, 4 which would require more of a robust drop off 5 area than we have available in some of the 6 areas along Miracle Mile and Ponce de Leon 7 right now. 8 So I don't know how the other Board Members 9 feel about having a little more time to totally 10 review the changes that are proposed, but I 11 would be in favor of that, and we can meet back 12 in a couple of weeks. 13 MR. WITHERS: I'll support that. 14 MR. BEHAR: Can I jump in now, Mr. Chair? 15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes. Are you done, 16 Rhonda? 17 MS. ANDERSON: Yes. 18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. Thank you. 19 Robert. 20 MR. BEHAR: Thank you. 21 I want to, you know, agree. I want to 22 commend Liz and Staff for work that's been 23 going on for about at least a year and a half, 24 to my knowledge, because I know we were -- I 25 was involved, also, in the Steering Committee.

Page 93 1 And I want to commend them for a lot of work 2 that they have put together. 3 Unfortunately, I received this package 4 early -- you know, mid day Friday afternoon, 5 and I started really digging in this past 6 Monday morning, and for the last two and a half 7 days, I really have gone through it, and you 8 can see, when I put my Zoom, that I've gone 9 through, taking a lot of time, to try to go 10 through and look at the implications of what 11 we're doing here. 12 And my first comment that I'd made earlier, 13 that I had no problem in moving E-1, which is 14 the organization. I still stand behind it. 15 I've gone through, and I have a lot of 16 concerns, you know, which, by the way, Mario 17 Garcia-Serra and Jorge Navarro made some very 18 good points, and I happen to agree with a lot 19 of those comments that they made. 20 When I see some of the report -- or the 21 summary of changes that there's very little or 22 no changes, with all due respect, and, 23 respectfully, I disagree, because when you look 24 at Subsection -- for example, MXD, that 25 we currently have, allowed a height of 120 feet	Page 94 1 and 10 stories, and what we're doing is, 2 reducing it to eight stories and 97 feet, with 3 a provision that the Commission could change 4 it, but with no increase to the floor area, I 5 find that to be that there are changes -- 6 significant changes being made. 7 Mario and Jorge alluded to the 60 percent 8 lot coverage. The properties in Coral Gables, 9 the majority of the platted properties, are 10 hundred foot in depth. It is very difficult, 11 without doing a proper analysis and show me -- 12 if I'm wrong, I will be the first one to stand 13 corrected, but we are making changes that are 14 going to have significant implications. 15 In a lot of the areas, I could, you know -- 16 the setbacks -- like everybody stated, the 17 setbacks, the lot coverages, the height, we're 18 implementing 190 feet you were allowed to go. 19 I don't recall having a specific height of 20 floor limitation. We're putting floor 21 limitations. 22 So, in my opinion, yes -- another example, 23 and Mr. Trias, you could -- we had 24 conversations on many, many multiple times, 25 occasions, that, for example, in Section 227 --
Page 95 1 Page 227, the uses of having percentage of uses 2 in building, like in the North Ponce corridor, 3 where you're going to have Commercial and 4 Residential, there was a conversation, there 5 were suggestions to eliminate those 6 percentages. Well, those are still here. 7 I'll give you another example, which I 8 happen to make already a study analysis, we're 9 trying to raise the minimum height for retail 10 to 17 feet. By doing that -- and, Liz, you 11 very well will know -- in some of the 12 properties that we're looking at, in order to 13 get my parking up to above 17 feet, the 14 percentages of the slope for those ramps are 15 not going to be feasible, they're not going to 16 be doable. You're going to be in excess of 18 17 or 20 percent slopes, which we know we cannot 18 do, and I don't think -- I'm making those very 19 quick points, because I don't think those 20 analyses have been done in order to determine 21 if it's doable, and, yet, you know, three days 22 ago, we were given this and we were asked that 23 today we have hoped to have comments to send 24 with recommendations to Commission. 25 I cannot do this today. I think we're	Page 96 1 going in the right direction, you know, without 2 a doubt, but I think that this is going to 3 require a greater effort from everybody, in 4 order to be able to really set forward 5 something that we could look at and say, "This 6 is good and is going to be for the best -- 7 betterment of Coral Gables." 8 At this point, I don't think we've done 9 that. You know, for -- and little things, as 10 I'm going through, the parking, we're not 11 reducing the required parking. Not that we may 12 want to do it, but we still have the two 13 bedrooms at 1.75, the three bedrooms 2.25. If 14 we're going to try to reduce parking, well, I 15 mean, I think it would have to be the whole 16 composition put together, not bits and pieces. 17 I think this is going in the right 18 direction. I think this probably -- and for 19 the benefit of some of my other colleagues, 20 Board Members, that are here, that may not 21 specifically know the implications that this is 22 doing, perhaps we need to go through the 23 process of, this is what you had, this is what 24 we're proposing, and this is maybe a scenario 25 of how that will be affected. I don't think

Page 97 1 we're doing that, and I looked at it. I have 2 spent a lot of time, a lot of time of my time 3 that I needed, you know, to do for work, but, 4 to me, this is extremely important, and I think 5 we need to do it the right way, and I don't 6 see -- right now, I don't feel like we're doing 7 that. 8 MR. TRIAS: But Mr. Chairman, if I could 9 maybe help the discussion. I think we're 10 extremely lucky that we have somebody with the 11 experience of Robert Behar, who I believe no 12 one has more experience with Mixed-Use 13 buildings in this area than he does, and also a 14 world class consultant, in the case of Liz, 15 helping us through this process. 16 What I would suggest is that, perhaps -- I 17 would enjoy having a meeting with Mr. Behar to 18 go over the details that he has pointed out, 19 because I think some of the things, he's 20 absolutely right. Some other things, I was not 21 very clear on exactly what the issue was, but 22 it would be very beneficial if we had that 23 discussion and get some of the benefits of his 24 expertise. 25 Furthermore, what I would suggest is that,	Page 98 1 if you're not ready to take action today, we 2 could schedule another meeting, perhaps August 3 19th, and allow for some more discussion and 4 some more thinking about this issue. That's 5 another option that you have, and that is 6 within the schedule that is proposed by the 7 Commission for First Reading September 1st. 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: If I may, I echo the 9 same sentiments that Robert just stated. I 10 think Robert and I were on the Planning & 11 Zoning Board back in 2007, when Charlie Siemon 12 did the Zoning Code Re-Write, and I recall we 13 spent countless, countless hours going through 14 each section. But what I recall the most is, 15 the entire Board got to take a look at the 16 comparison, comparison of what it is now to a 17 comparison of what will change, and not all of 18 us are architects. And I think, as a layman, I 19 think that's very helpful. 20 Basically, from what I recall, the Zoning 21 Board last met with the Zoning Re-Write in 22 October of 2019, if I'm not mistaken, some time 23 around then, and, I think, as a working group, 24 I don't know if it's been met since August of 25 2018. There are areas that Robert had already
Page 99 1 mentioned, one of them being the 60 percent on 2 the Multi-Family, on the MF2 and the MF4. 3 There's a concern there. 4 There's a concern from me, what will happen 5 to the Mediterranean Bonuses and how that will 6 be handled. There is a concern about the MF2 7 and MF4 being increased from 25 to 30 percent, 8 what impact that would have on a standard Coral 9 Gables building site, regulation of height of 10 stories, as opposed to just using liner feet. 11 I mean, I can go on and on. 12 And, Ramon, I understand that you would 13 like to meet with Robert, but I think we have 14 to meet as a Board as a whole, so that the 15 Board as a whole gets a grip and understands 16 it. If you're seeking the input from the 17 Board, then I think it should be done as a 18 whole. Unfortunately, with today's times, it's 19 very hard to meet, because of what's going on, 20 and I understand that you want to do another 21 meeting, but should we do another meeting or 22 should we do a Workshop, so we understand 23 better, with comparisons? 24 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, if we had a 25 normal situation, we probably would have had at	Page 100 1 least four meetings already on this topic, and, 2 unfortunately, we have what we have. 3 Now, my opinion is that if what you would 4 like is to see a before and after, what was in 5 the Code and what's being changed, explained 6 more clearly, we can do that, and we can 7 certainly provide that in another meeting, and 8 that maybe -- 9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: That's why the 10 presentation. 11 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, that may help the 12 discussion, and maybe that will make you 13 comfortable. Some of the things that I hear 14 from different people, I don't think are 15 accurate, and I think that would be a good 16 opportunity to clarify those things, because 17 the changes that are being proposed don't 18 change height, they don't change densities, 19 they don't change any of the development 20 standards that you would think, and the fact 21 that there's some confusion about that, we 22 could probably clarify that more for you in 23 another meeting. 24 Now, it's up to you. I mean, I think, at 25 the end of the day, you need to feel

Page 101 1 comfortable that you can make a recommendation 2 to the Commission. That is your role. And 3 whatever I can do and whatever our consultant 4 can do to help you, we're here to do it. 5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Craig, if I can ask 6 you a question, please. In E-1, the 7 documentation that we were given had a lot of 8 pages at the beginning, but really only dealt 9 from Page 7 down, which were the changes that 10 were being made. 11 MR. COLLIER: Those attachments -- the 12 Department put the attachments that were 13 comparable to both items in both agenda items, 14 but, actually, E-1 is a very -- is a much 15 narrower item. 16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Correct. 17 MR. COLLIER: It really only relates to that 18 one exhibit, which is the -- basically the 19 Table of Contents, where it's rearranged with 20 instructions to Staff to take the substantive 21 pieces and rearrange them in accordance with 22 the Table of Contents, and making the necessary 23 cross-references. 24 There are also some minor changes in the 25 name -- I call it, the names on the door, which	Page 102 1 are the department name changes that have been 2 updated, but there are no substantive changes 3 in E-1. So you may want to consider going 4 forward with that item, with the thought of, 5 that's really just a re-arrangement of the 6 Code, and then stick with maybe the concept of 7 another meeting to go further into the E-2. 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Would you be kind 9 enough to share a screen with us, looking at 10 E-1, when we talk about what the substantive 11 changes would be -- or non-substantive changes, 12 I apologize. 13 MR. COLLIER: Arceli, can you bring up that 14 item and then it shows the -- 15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I think it was from 16 Page 7 on, were the items that were being 17 changed, if I recall. 18 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, maybe Page 4 of 19 the PowerPoint that Liz provided -- 20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: But we have it exactly 21 on the exhibit. It was on the exhibit that we 22 received. 23 MR. TRIAS: And what I would say to this is 24 that, one option is certainly to go and adopt 25 one of the two. However, I don't think that
Page 103 1 really accomplishes that much. The reason we 2 separated it was just for clarity. And at some 3 point, was there a recommendation that just 4 arranging the Code would be a sufficient action 5 that would make any different? 6 So I would encourage you to look at them 7 together. 8 MR. COLLIER: That's certainly -- it's up to 9 the Board, and if Staff feels that would be the 10 best way to handle it, that's certainly fine. 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Are we able to find 12 that document or -- 13 MR. COLLIER: Well, if I knew how to share 14 my screen, I would -- 15 CITY CLERK: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair, I can 16 find it really quick. Do you mean it's the 17 first attachment for agenda Item E-1? 18 MR. COLLIER: It's actually Exhibit -- I 19 think it's identified as Exhibit A. It's not 20 the first one, which I think is the report of 21 the Board. 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: It's the 31 pages 23 of -- I think it's a Draft Ordinance. It's 24 titled 072920 Attachment A Draft Ordinance 25 Zoning Code. Is that correct?	Page 104 1 MR. COLLIER: Yes. I think it's the second 2 item to E-1. 3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Correct. If you look 4 at the agenda, it's the second item that's on 5 the agenda. 6 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, that would be Attachment 7 A. 8 MR. COLLIER: Correct. 9 MR. TRIAS: Attachment A is the Ordinance, 10 and then the Ordinance has a Table of Contents 11 afterwards. 12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Is there a way to 13 share that? That's the one right there. Can 14 we open that up? 15 MR. COLLIER: Well -- 16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Well, it doesn't seem 17 to be able to be opened up right now. 18 MR. COLLIER: Let me just -- I think, if the 19 Board Members, as you're dealing with the 20 screen, if you can click on it, you'll be able 21 to see it, and just to walk you through that 22 Ordinance, on Page 4 of the Ordinance, Section 23 5 deals with the -- 24 MR. BEHAR: Here you go. It's on. It's 25 up.

Page 105 1 MR. COLLIER: Okay. So if you could just go 2 up above that, to the actual Ordinance itself, 3 I just want to point out a few items there. 4 So -- stop. Stop. Move down to Section 5, 5 I think. So Section 5 is the action of moving 6 certain things into the City, which is known as 7 the City Code, which is on Municode, actually. 8 So that's, all of the things that are being 9 transferred out, are contained in Section 5. 10 Then, if you move down to Section 6, it's 11 just -- there's been certain name changes in 12 departments that is being updated. Again, 13 nothing substantive in that -- with regard to 14 Section 6. 15 And, then, if you moved down to starting on 16 Exhibit A, which is below this, then what you 17 see is, as you scroll down, you'll see the 18 strike-throughs and the changes to what the new 19 sections are, and what the Ordinance provides 20 is that Staff is to use this Table of Contents 21 as a guide and to basically cut and paste, in 22 the order that we're now setting the -- using 23 the Table of Contents for. So we didn't want 24 to waste the paper and trees just repeating the 25 whole thing, when it's going to be done	Page 106 1 basically taking these pieces out. 2 Now, this Ordinance doesn't introduce any 3 of the new Mixed-Use sections and MF3, MF4. 4 That is done in the second Ordinance. But 5 basically this gives you a good guide, and if 6 you remember where one section is, and you want 7 to know where it went, this is helpful to be 8 able to do that. 9 Did I miss anything, Ramon, on that one? 10 MR. TRIAS: No. I think you're very right, 11 and I think that if we only did this, we would 12 have done something good, but certainly we are 13 not fulfilling the scope of the project. I 14 just think that perhaps there's more of a need 15 to explain how things are changing, and I 16 believe we have plenty of time to do that, I 17 think, for the benefit of the Board. 18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yeah. I'd like to ask 19 the Board Members how they feel. Would anybody 20 like to make a recommendation or a motion based 21 on what we have discussed so far? 22 MR. WITHERS: Can I say something, Eibi? I 23 mean, look, I'm a little surprised that the 24 changes aren't more radical than they are. I 25 mean, I think there's still a fairly
Page 107 1 conservative approach, which I'm supportive of, 2 but I still harp on the fact that the 3 difficulty I'm having in this whole thing is -- 4 and like Robert said, under every page, there's 5 something else -- I really don't know what the 6 intention of -- I understand the cleanup of the 7 Zoning Code, but I really don't understand what 8 the modifications and changes of the Zoning 9 Code are, and to bore everybody with a bit of 10 history, early on in the Commission, our goal 11 was 20,000 residents -- more residents in 12 Downtown Coral Gables. That was a written goal 13 we had. 14 And the way we did that was, the Mixed-Use 15 Ordinance, we looked at areas and said, you 16 know what, we're allowed to have on-street 17 parking, we're allowed to put parking in front 18 of apartment houses in the North and not keep 19 it all in the back. We tweaked this, the 20 Mediterranean Ordinance, et cetera, and our 21 vision was to increase density and population 22 in Downtown Coral Gables. 23 Right now, it seems, and Elizabeth is 24 probably one of the best visionaries I've known 25 on something like this, is that we have a City	Page 108 1 that's fairly built out. We don't have a 2 lot -- you know, unless we really go through a 3 whole full re-development, we're doing a lot of 4 infill, we're looking at smaller lots, either 5 trying to accommodate them for re-development 6 or allow them to combine with other lots and 7 decreasing it from 20,000 to 10,000 square 8 feet, but is it the Commission's vision and is 9 it our vision that we are looking at our City 10 as a built-out City and we're just now trying 11 to clean up and tweak the differences or are we 12 trying to do a wholesale re-development in 13 areas? 14 I mean, I don't know. I don't know what 15 our vision is on it. So, you know, to me, 16 everything I've seen so far, there's no major 17 changes in my mind. I certainly understand 18 what Venny is saying about the parking and some 19 of the setbacks and I certainly understand what 20 Robert is saying about heights and parking 21 grids, because we don't have 125-foot deep 22 lots, we only have 100-foot lots, and you can't 23 have good circulation in parking garages -- I 24 understand all of that -- but where are we 25 trying to end up, as far as visioning our City

Page 109 1 in the future? 2 And maybe I'm thinking way too much into 3 this, but the way it stands right now, I'm 4 supportive of practically everything I've seen 5 on this. 6 MR. TRIAS: If I could make just one brief 7 comment. We did have three Workshops with the 8 Commission to set up some policy direction, in 9 addition to the working group, and in addition 10 to the four meetings that we discussed with the 11 Planning & Zoning. 12 So that has been the nature of the 13 discussion, and the goal here is not overly 14 ambitious, it's just to clean up what we have, 15 make it better, because you did a great job 16 last time, except for a few things, basically. 17 That has been the direction that we've had. 18 MR. WITHERS: So that's why I'm saying, 19 it's really no real -- look, if the Commission 20 wants to go above and beyond what the Code 21 says, they certainly have the prerogative to do 22 that, through Overlays or variances or 23 whatever, but there doesn't seem to be a whole 24 lot of wholesale changes. 25 MR. BEHAR: Chip, with all due respect, I	Page 110 1 don't think you have gone deep into there, to 2 really look at the changes, and I think Eibi 3 made a very good point, perhaps the best way to 4 do this is for Liz to come back and give us 5 like -- the same format as Charlie Siemon did, 6 the before -- what we had before, and what 7 we're proposing now, so you could understand 8 clearly -- clearly understand the implications 9 of the changes that are taking place. 10 You know, I have gone into it. I dove into 11 it the last two and a half days, and I see -- I 12 also will say, on the positive, there could be 13 a lot of great things that are being proposed 14 here, but I think that we really need to go and 15 take a look at it, you know, in indepth, 16 otherwise we could be making significant 17 changes, that, in my opinion, professionally, 18 we could start creating problems -- legal 19 problems to the City, because, in a very simple 20 way, we could be taking away development 21 rights. 22 And we may disagree, and Mr. Trias and Liz 23 may disagree with me, but when you're going -- 24 and, clearly -- Mr. Trias, you say, no, but 25 clearly on Page 248, when the height permitted
Page 111 1 on the MX2, which is the Design District, 2 you're going to maximum eight stories, 97 feet, 3 and today you have 10 stories and 120, you're 4 taking development rights away from those 5 property owners. I am very concerned, and I 6 wish we had more input from the community, to 7 be able to tell us, you know, how they feel. 8 I would -- you know, again, I'm in favor of 9 a lot stuff that's being proposed, but I think 10 that we need to look at it, Chip, in a much 11 deeper way, to analyze this. 12 MR. WITHERS: We're saying the exact same 13 thing, but why are we -- I don't know that I 14 agree that we're downzoning those areas, but 15 why are we going -- what is the rationale, what 16 is visioning behind moving it from 105 feet 17 down to -- why are we doing that? 18 MR. TRIAS: We are not doing that. I would 19 like to understand better what the concern is. 20 That is not the intent. 21 MR. WITHERS: Okay. So what I'm saying is, 22 Robert, when we get to those flash points, to 23 those changes, and if they are radical changes, 24 I'm just curious to know what was the 25 motivation behind changing them. You know, I	Page 112 1 understand that they don't want parking 2 garages, you know, on the face of Miracle Mile. 3 I mean, we understand that. 4 MR. BEHAR: I 100 percent agree with that, 5 should never happen. 6 MR. WITHERS: So, you know, we all 7 understand, aesthetically, circulation, 8 whatever, but on the other ones, I don't know 9 what's driving some of these things, but, 10 again, I did not go into it nearly as much as 11 you did. I breezed through it, because, yes, 12 it's a lot to go through. And you probably saw 13 a whole more wholesale changes, with a trained 14 eye, because you deal with this every single 15 day of your life, and I would like to know, 16 from you, what those changes are, and, then, 17 from Staff, why they made those changes. 18 MR. TRIAS: No. No. We did not, and I 19 think that if the issue is -- 20 MR. MURAI: Ramon -- 21 MR. TRIAS: Yes. 22 MR. MURAI: But before we answer or go into 23 the discussion that Chip is suggesting, I think 24 we need to understand, what are the changes, 25 because you mentioned before that maybe we're

Page 113 1 not -- some of the things that we were saying 2 were not really accurate. I think the best 3 thing is, like Eibi suggested, if we could have 4 before and after, and, then, with that, we 5 could see -- you know, then we can engage in a 6 discussion as to what's -- 7 MR. TRIAS: But let me give you an example. 8 The Code says, Design District, maximum height 9 with City Commission approval, to a maximum of 10 120 feet. It's exactly the same thing that it 11 says now. And I think that's the confusion. 12 The confusion may be that we haven't done the 13 type of presentation that explains all of that 14 in more detail. 15 I'm listening carefully. I understand the 16 concern. I think it's our challenge to explain 17 that we're not making any of those changes, but 18 we're making some changes, like you're saying. 19 Some changes are being made. 20 MR. MURAI: If we have what the Code 21 permits or requires now, and what it does under 22 these changes, I think we'll have a meeting 23 that will be very useful. 24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: One second, please. 25 We have with us Commissioner Keon. I think	Page 114 1 she'd like to make some remarks. Can you 2 please put her on? 3 COMMISSIONER KEON: Hello. Can you hear 4 me? 5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Hi, Commissioner. 6 COMMISSIONER KEON: Good evening. I wanted 7 to listen to you, because it was about three 8 years ago that I asked that we would do this, 9 and the reason -- and the items, in particular, 10 that we listed, that we asked them to look at, 11 were things that continue to come before the 12 Commission and they also came before the 13 Planning & Zoning Board, problematic. We 14 didn't have Mixed-Use designation. So what 15 happened, it was Commercial. 16 And so what happened, every time somebody 17 came with a Mixed-Use and wanted to develop a 18 Mixed-Use, they wanted to develop Mixed-Use, we 19 had to change it to Commercial. When you went 20 to Commercial, for a Residential building, it 21 removed all density, because that's the way 22 Commercial was, and then we would work on, no, 23 no, no, but you need a density requirement. 24 And so we didn't have a mechanism in the Code 25 as it existed before to develop Mixed-Use
Page 115 1 developments which is a current trend in 2 developing. 3 So that was the reason why the Commercial 4 was eliminated, and the Mixed-Use came in as 5 the designation. So I would say, much to what 6 Chip has said, I don't think that there is 7 anything significant here. What we wanted to 8 clean up were issues that kept coming before 9 us, and that was really one of the big issues. 10 The other is, we were frequently asked by 11 the smaller parcels that they didn't -- you 12 know, they would like to re-develop their 13 parcel, but were not able to really, under the 14 current Code, and to maintain that feeling, 15 particularly in the CBD, of some small 16 buildings, large buildings, different sizes of 17 buildings, we wanted to be able to provide the 18 mechanism for that small scale development, so 19 everything didn't become assembled into very 20 large parcels for development. 21 So that's pretty much, you know, what it 22 came to, and it was actually, because there 23 were a lot of conflicts in different pieces in 24 the Code, and it would say, you know, well, 25 this is the Zoning for one thing, but then you	Page 116 1 had to go find the Site Specifics someplace 2 else, and it changed it. 3 So, really, we organized it to make it much 4 more usable, much clearer, and to solve some of 5 the issues and the problems that you, as the 6 Planning & Zoning Board, and we, in the 7 Commission, were dealing on a regular basis, so 8 we wouldn't have go through all of those things 9 all over again. So, basically, I think, you 10 know, a lot has not changed. There are some 11 changes, but not a lot has changed, and it was 12 never -- the intent wasn't -- was not really 13 with regard to the visioning of a particular 14 corridor, but it was to create a Code where you 15 had all of the elements that you could talk 16 about when you do vision. So that stuff would 17 come later. 18 That's all. I just wanted to explain why we 19 asked for this. Maybe it would help you 20 understand that -- you know, why -- why we're 21 here today. 22 MR. TORRE: Could I say something? 23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Sure. 24 MR. TORRE: I think, what I'm hearing, 25 there's two things that are being asked

Page 117 1 specifically. One is, is there a set of goals 2 that are -- trying to be met by this process, 3 and I think Commissioner Keon just tried to 4 answer some of that. So that's, I think, one 5 of the questions. 6 The second thing that I've heard from 7 Mr. Behar, specifically, is that there's a 8 series of things that we haven't been able to 9 understand. We want to have the moment or the 10 time to be able to discuss this back and forth. 11 To be effective, though, I think we need to 12 find a way to define those two things being 13 answered, so we don't spin our wheels for the 14 next 30 days and come back, because I think 15 there's a role of trying to get to the 16 Commission by September here, and, in the next, 17 what, four to five weeks, we need to figure out 18 how to answer those particular questions. 19 So I would ask, how do we best do that, so 20 that we're effective coming back to the next 21 meeting? 22 COMMISSIONER KEON: Well, I think what they 23 asked of you, in the first Ordinance, is really 24 to approve the re-organization and the moving 25 out of those things that don't belong in a	Page 118 1 Zoning Code and really belong in the City Code, 2 this allows you -- the other part is, really -- 3 the second Ordinance is where, you know, 4 there's -- actually, it may be in the first 5 part, also, you're creating an MX, the 6 Mixed-Use development site, that was not in the 7 Code before. I mean, the details of that are 8 in the body of the document. 9 What you're doing is -- I only wanted you 10 to understand why Mixed-Use was now there and 11 Commercial was dropped. So, really, you can 12 just -- you know, as long as you agree that the 13 Mixed-Use is important, you're solving that 14 issue, because, you know, on the Board, it came 15 to you so often where things could go -- you 16 know, they'd have to go to Commercial, when 17 they started wanting to do Mixed-Use, that we 18 needed a designation for Mixed-Use and some of 19 the requirements regarding Mixed-Use. 20 So if you just accept the fact that, yes, 21 Mixed-Use is important and necessary, and, 22 then, in the Table of Contents, they can begin 23 on this. Now, the details of it, the second 24 Ordinance -- you know, I think that you should 25 work on it, until you're comfortable. You
Page 119 1 absolutely should take the time until, you 2 know, you're fully comfortable and you 3 understand -- I mean, you may never be fully 4 comfortable, but that you understand, you know, 5 what it actually says, and that you're 6 comfortable that it's not changing numbers or, 7 you know, requiring liners isn't really 8 creating -- you know, is affecting your ability 9 to develop or whatever, but those are the 10 questions that Ramon and Liz and your Board can 11 deal with. 12 I just wanted you to understand why it was 13 reordered. It was reordered, really, for ease 14 of use and it was to put in these -- the 15 different -- the MX Districts and the MF, that 16 it was just needed, because it's the way the 17 City has evolved and development has evolved 18 over time and they just didn't exist in our 19 Code before. So we were always trying to 20 manipulate the old Code to make them happen. 21 So rather than continue to manipulate, we'll 22 just put them in. It was really for clarity 23 and ease of use, and it's for anyone who comes 24 in and wants to develop, also. 25 So that's all.	Page 120 1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, 2 Commissioner. 3 COMMISSIONER KEON: Mr. Chair of the 4 Meeting, I'm done. I'm sorry. 5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Ramon, would it be 6 helpful, if possibly, as the Commissioner has 7 stated, maybe we could see some actual sites 8 and see the difference as to how they would 9 work between them? 10 MR. TRIAS: You know, that's a very good 11 idea. I think that, perhaps, the -- a graphic 12 illustration of the changes may be easier to 13 understand and explain. 14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Correct. 15 MR. TRIAS: We can work on that. 16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I think that would be 17 very helpful for the Board. 18 MR. BEHAR: Yeah. And, then, before we get 19 to a site, maybe perhaps we could have a 20 meeting where it's Ramon, myself, and other 21 members of -- you know, maybe Mario 22 Garcia-Serra, Jorge Navarro, maybe another 23 architect, you know, Hamed Rodriguez, that we 24 could share and look at specifically those 25 sites, so when it comes back to you,

Page 121 1 Mr. Chairman, it's a lot clearer, you know. I 2 would offer my time to be able to do that, 3 because I think this is going to be very 4 important, and I'm willing to do it. 5 MR. TRIAS: It's a team effort. It's 6 always been a team effort. I don't see it any 7 other way. So, thank you. Robert, whenever 8 you want, and whoever you want to invite, we 9 could certainly do that. 10 MR. COLLIER: Is there -- 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes, go ahead, Craig. 12 MR. COLLIER: Yeah. We just have to make 13 sure that whoever he invites is not somebody 14 else sitting on the Board. 15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Understood. 16 MR. BEHAR: No. No. That's why I 17 mentioned other architects, and attorneys that 18 are familiar with the Code, no Board Members. 19 MR. COLLIER: Exactly. I did that for 20 anybody who is listening, for their benefit, as 21 well. 22 MR. BEHAR: Let me throw an idea and see if 23 it's something that we could potentially 24 consider. For this meeting that we could have 25 on the 19th, would it be possible and I am the	Page 122 1 first believer that if I step outside my closed 2 office, I will wear my protocol protection, 3 face mask, whatever it needs to be, would it be 4 possible that maybe we could do it in a venue 5 that we could sit separated from each other, 6 not six feet, but maybe ten feet apart, fifteen 7 feet apart, but that we're all in one place 8 together? Would that be something that we 9 could even consider doing? 10 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, we can look into it. 11 Certainly that would be my preference. 12 MR. BEHAR: Because if we go -- a few 13 months ago there was a meeting in that media 14 room underneath the garage across from The 15 Palace, and I remember that space being a 16 significantly large space, that perhaps we 17 could sit and have this meeting, you know, 18 through Zoom and all, but separated from one 19 another. 20 I would be willing to do that. I'd like to 21 hear from the other Board Members. 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Craig, let me ask you 23 a question. Are you allowed to go ahead and 24 have a meeting in a building like that, without 25 the public, and have the public in the Zoom?
Page 123 1 MR. COLLIER: I think -- well, I'm glad that 2 the City Attorney is here. So I would like her 3 to speak to this issue, if she would, but she 4 is muted. 5 MS. RAMOS: Hi, everybody, again. So, a 6 couple of things about that. At the moment, 7 the only reason we're able to have these fully 8 virtual meetings without a quorum in the room, 9 is because there's a Governor's order that's 10 allowing us to do that and suspending the in 11 quorum meeting requirement. That order is set 12 to expire August 1st. We have not received an 13 order extending it. So we don't know what's 14 going to happen. 15 So it's possible that after this coming 16 Monday, virtual meetings of any Board or 17 Commission are not going to be permitted. What 18 we can do is have a hybrid meeting, where we 19 can have a quorum in the room, physically 20 distant, and other members appearing by Zoom, 21 and, then, of course, a public appearing by 22 Zoom. 23 The location won't matter, in the sense 24 that the public will be appearing by Zoom 25 anyway. So it would be a hybrid meeting, but	Page 124 1 we would have to have a quorum in the room. So 2 this setup would not work, unless there's an 3 extension to that order. 4 MR. TRIAS: But I think that Robert was 5 also thinking of having some work group type of 6 meeting, not necessarily the Planning & Zoning 7 meeting like that. Is that -- 8 MR. BEHAR: Ramon, you're right. I mean, 9 we could have a meeting that is Staff, Liz, and 10 a couple of the design professionals and Land 11 Use attorneys, just to be able to express some 12 of these concerns and observations, so when you 13 do your studies, you know a little bit more, 14 and, you know, because -- and, then, on the 15 next meeting that the Board will have, yes, I'm 16 thinking, if it's possible, that we do have, 17 you know, a meeting in a venue where it could 18 be separated from one another, but we're 19 physically there. I think it would be a 20 much -- 21 MS. RAMOS: Yes. So, Mr. Behar, for the 22 meeting that is not a meeting of this Board, 23 that is simply end users or community members, 24 professionals coming and giving thoughts, 25 that's fine. That can be done via Zoom at any

Page 125 1 time. But if when the next Planning & Zoning 2 Board Meeting is scheduled, we don't have an 3 extension of that Governor's order, we're going 4 to have to come up with some sort of hybrid 5 format, and even if we do have an extension of 6 the Order, but this Board chooses to meet 7 primarily in person, that would be fine, but we 8 would still recommend that the public appear 9 virtually, because otherwise the social 10 distancing is going to be almost impossible. 11 MR. BEHAR: No. And you're absolutely 12 correct. I'm 100 percent in support of that, 13 just like that. 14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. Is there a 15 motion or anybody who would like to say 16 anything to move this further, so we can move 17 on? 18 MR. BEHAR: No. I'm going to ask the City 19 Attorney, and that's one of the first 20 questions, can we separate E-1 and E-2, so we 21 could make a motion to approve E-1, which is 22 the re-organization of the Zoning Code, at this 23 point, and then we deal with E-2 separately? 24 MS. RAMOS: Can you? Yes, you can. 25 MR. BEHAR: Okay. Then, Mr. Chair, I will	Page 126 1 consider -- or I will make a motion to approve 2 Item E-1, at this point. 3 MS. ANDERSON: I'll second it. 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Rhonda seconds. 5 Any discussion? No? Having heard none, 6 call the roll, please, Jill. 7 THE SECRETARY: Rene Murai? 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: He's muted. 9 MR. MURAI: Yes. 10 THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? 11 MR. TORRE: Yes. 12 THE SECRETARY: Maria Velez? 13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: She's muted. 14 MS. VELEZ: Yes. 15 THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? 16 MR. WITHERS: Yes. 17 THE SECRETARY: Rhonda Anderson? 18 MS. ANDERSON: Yes. 19 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar? 20 MR. BEHAR: Yes. 21 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat? 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes. 23 On Item E-2, is there a motion either to 24 move forward or defer or any comments? 25 MR. MURAI: I move to defer it.
Page 127 1 MS. VELEZ: I'll second. 2 MS. ANDERSON: I'll second. 3 MR. COLLER: Just a question on that, and, 4 Miriam, maybe you can chime in, ordinarily we 5 would continue it to a certain date. There 6 wouldn't be re-advertising, but in light of the 7 uncertainty as to how this is going to be 8 conducted, it seems like we'll probably wind up 9 having to re-advertise this, because we don't 10 know the format that it's going to be. What do 11 you think? 12 MS. RAMOS: Yeah. So one thing that City 13 Attorneys are doing is, Craig, to grapple with 14 that, is to advertise in the alternative, but I 15 don't even know that we're convinced as to the 16 date. Ramon had mentioned the 19th, but we 17 haven't asked if people are available, so maybe 18 it's best to just defer it and then we'll 19 re-advertise. 20 MR. TRIAS: We have a meeting August 12th, 21 so that is not available, but we could 22 certainly, if we poll the Members after that, 23 at some point -- so sometime before September 24 1st. 25 MR. MURAI: But can we ask members if	Page 128 1 they're available on the 19th? 2 MR. TRIAS: Right now? 3 MR. MURAI: Right now. 4 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, certainly. 5 MS. ANDERSON: Rhonda Anderson, I'm 6 available. 7 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar, are you 8 available on the 19th? 9 MR. BEHAR: I am available. 10 THE SECRETARY: Rene Murai? 11 MR. MURAI: Yes. 12 THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? 13 MR. TORRE: Yes, I'm available. 14 THE SECRETARY: Maria Velez? 15 MS. VELEZ: Yes. 16 THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? 17 MR. WITHERS: I'm available. 18 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat? 19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes. 20 MR. TRIAS: So I would recommend a four 21 o'clock starting time also, like we're doing 22 today. 23 MS. RAMOS: Then we can -- then the motion 24 is preferable for it to be, instead of to defer 25 it, to defer it to the date certain of August

Page 129 1 19, that Wednesday, at 4:00 p.m. 2 MR. MURAI: Miriam, do you want us to just 3 continue the meeting to that date, instead of 4 deferring? 5 MS. RAMOS: I think there are other items 6 on this agenda, so I think you're just 7 deferring this one item. 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: That is correct. 9 MR. MURAI: I move to defer, to August 10 19th, this item. 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: E-2. 12 MS. VELEZ: Second. 13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: And we have Maria 14 second. Any discussion? 15 MR. WITHERS: Do we need to find out if 16 Elizabeth is going to join us at that meeting? 17 We've asked everybody but Elizabeth. 18 MR. MURAI: She's not important. She's 19 only the consultant. 20 MS. PLATER-ZYBERG: I'm muted. Yes, I can 21 be there. Thank you for asking. 22 MR. TORRE: Mr. Chair, I have a question. 23 Does it make sense for us to start providing 24 questions with regard to -- think about what 25 those questions would be, so there's a thought	Page 130 1 process to be had by Ms. Plater-Zyberg and 2 Staff, so that we're having a more effective 3 meeting and we can all maybe a week before -- 4 and maybe suggestions, as well, so that, again, 5 we can have a more productive meeting. 6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Craig, are we allowed, 7 or Miriam, are we allowed to do that, as long 8 as it's not circulated, I would assume, between 9 everybody, for Sunshine Laws? 10 MS. RAMOS: Yeah. As long as you don't do 11 it among each other, you're fine. You should 12 just send it to maybe Ramon or whoever the 13 Planning person is going to be. 14 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. The best thing you can 15 do is to give me your questions before the 16 meeting. That is by far the best approach. So 17 anything you need to do, you can always talk to 18 Staff and you can talk to me or any of my 19 Staff. 20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. So, at that 21 point, we would ask everybody to send it 22 individually, don't CC or so forth, to any 23 other Board Members. 24 MR. MURAI: Okay. But once you receive 25 them, can you circulate them, Miriam?
Page 131 1 MS. RAMOS: No, because that's where you 2 get into -- I mean, it's technically a one way 3 communication, I suppose. 4 MR. MURAI: Okay. Communication from Ramon 5 to me. 6 MR. TRIAS: I mean, I can go back and forth 7 with you, but I cannot have -- I cannot tell 8 other people. 9 MS. RAMOS: Yeah, there may be space -- 10 Rene, there may be space for us to -- if you 11 don't know who they're coming from, so if Ramon 12 compiles a list of questions, there may be 13 space for us to be able to put them together 14 and send them to all of you, but let me look at 15 that a little bit more closely to make sure. 16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: In other words, 17 without the author. 18 MS. RAMOS: Yeah. 19 MR. TORRE: I think that would be helpful 20 for us to understand what everybody else is 21 thinking, and, again, that will be a more 22 productive meeting. 23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. So we have a 24 first. We have a second. Any other comments? 25 No?	Page 132 1 Call the roll, please, Jill. 2 THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? 3 MR. TORRE: Yes. 4 THE SECRETARY: Maria Velez? 5 MS. VELEZ: Yes. 6 THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? 7 MR. WITHERS: Yes. 8 THE SECRETARY: Rhonda Anderson? 9 MS. ANDERSON: Yes. 10 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar? 11 MR. BEHAR: Yes. 12 THE SECRETARY: Rene Murai? 13 MR. MURAI: Yes. 14 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat? 15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes. 16 The next Item is E-3. Craig, would you 17 like to read that into the record, please? 18 MR. COLLIER: Yes. And just a preliminary 19 comment, again, the citation here is to 20 reorganized Code. 21 E-3, an Ordinance of the City Commission of 22 Coral Gables, Florida amending the Future Land 23 Use Map of the City of Coral Gables 24 Comprehensive Plan pursuant to Zoning Code 25 Article 14, "Process," Section 14-213, and

Page 133 1 Comprehensive Plan amendment procedures (163 2 and 3187), Florida Statutes, changing the land 3 use designation for certain properties located 4 in Lots 25-39, Block 27, all of Block 28 and 5 all of Block 36, Crafts Section, Coral Gables, 6 Florida from either Single-Family High Density 7 or Multi-Family Duplex Density to Commercial 8 Low-Rise intensity; providing for a repealer 9 provision, severability clause, and providing 10 for an effective date. 11 This item is for public hearing. It is a 12 legislative item. There are, however, two 13 Zoning items, I think, that are related. Are 14 they not, Ramon? 15 MR. TRIAS: Yes, sir. I would recommend 16 the three items be read into the record 17 together. 18 MR. COLLER: Okay. So when we do that, 19 then it's no longer just a purely legislative 20 meeting and it's quasi-judicial -- 21 MR. TRIAS: Can I say something? It's 22 really a conceptual meeting, because we have 23 not adopted the MX1. So we're discussing 24 things generally at this point. 25 MR. COLLER: Right, but we're still going	Page 134 1 to conduct it in a quasi-judicial manner. The 2 reason that Ramon is saying that is, the 3 rezoning to this MX1 District, the MX1 District 4 doesn't exist yet, so this is really kind of a 5 theoretical, you are the recommending body, so 6 you're giving the input, but I think we still 7 need to conduct it in a quasi-judicial 8 procedure. 9 So my recommendation is, I'll read the two 10 titles in. We'll have the normal 11 presentations, but then we're going to have to 12 swear in any witnesses that are going to speak 13 tonight. 14 Miriam, do you have any additional thoughts 15 you want to mention on this? 16 MS. RAMOS: No, Craig. You covered it. 17 MR. COLLER: Okay. So Item E-4, an 18 Ordinance of the City Commission of Coral 19 Gables, Florida making zoning district boundary 20 changes for certain properties located in Lots 21 25-39, Block 27, all of Block 28, and all of 22 Block 36, Crafts Section, Coral Gables, Florida 23 from either Single-Family Residential or 24 Multi-Family 1 Duplex to Mixed Use 1 District; 25 and making the appropriate zoning map
Page 135 1 amendments to effectuate these changes, 2 pursuant to Zoning Code Article 14, "Process", 3 Section 14-212 'Zoning Code Text and Map 4 Amendments"; providing for a repealer 5 provision, severability clause and providing 6 for an effective date. 7 Item E-5, an Ordinance of the City 8 Commission of Coral Gables, Florida providing 9 for a text amendment to the City of Coral 10 Gables Official Zoning Code by amending 11 Appendix A, "Site Specific Zoning Regulations", 12 Section A-36, "Crafts Section," by deleting 13 provisions for height restriction for certain 14 properties legally described as lots 16 and 17, 15 lots 24 through 30, inclusive, and the west 16 one-half of lot 23, all in Block 36, Coral 17 Gables, Florida, providing for a repealer 18 provision, severability clause, and providing 19 for an effective date. 20 Items E-4, E-5 and E-3, public hearing. 21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Before we do the 22 presentation, I know there's a laptop that's at 23 City Hall outside for any individuals that 24 would like to be there. Do we know if we have 25 individuals out there?	Page 136 1 Okay. So we have none. 2 MR. BEHAR: It's an empty laptop. 3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. Let's go ahead 4 and do the presentation by Staff first, Ramon. 5 MR. TRIAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Could 6 I have the PowerPoint, please? 7 Just as I told you that the prior item 8 didn't change anything, this item changes 9 something very, very specifically. 10 Next, please. 11 And it tries to implement some of the new 12 ideas that are being proposed, Mixed-Use ideas 13 that Commissioner Keon talked about, and some 14 of the ideas that have been discussed with the 15 neighbors for, perhaps, a couple of years, 16 quite some time, and it's a very specific area 17 between Le Jeune, Salzedo and Santander -- 18 Next. Next -- that through the years has 19 developed with mostly Single-Family, mostly Mid 20 Century, some older buildings. 21 Next. 22 But that originally, when Merrick was 23 coming up with the vision, and it was a very 24 good vision for the City, it was meant to be 25 more of a live-work and more of a Mixed-Use

Page 137	Page 138
1 area, the Crafts Section. That's why it was 2 called the Crafts Section. So, from that point 3 of view, we have an idea of the original 4 intent. 5 Next. 6 So what happens today is that, there's 7 mostly one story Single-Family houses, a few 8 buildings from the '20s, but very wide streets, 9 mostly paved. So what happens is that they 10 don't look like the typical neighborhoods of 11 Coral Gables, which have much more trees and 12 landscape, and so on. 13 Next. 14 And we've had many discussions with 15 neighbors. 16 Next. 17 We tried to come up with -- next -- with 18 some ways of enhancing landscaping, et cetera, 19 and I think that the best approach -- next -- 20 is to go back to the original and try to use 21 the MX1, which is very similar, I think, to the 22 original idea that Merrick had. MX1 is the 23 lowest Mixed-Use being proposed, and try to 24 change the Land Use and Zoning for that 25 District.	1 Next. 2 And this is not unusual. I'm going to go 3 fairly fast through the slides. 4 Next. 5 Our Zoning has changed. If you look at the 6 aerial from 1938, you can see that the great 7 vision of the City didn't quite materialize as 8 fast as Merrick would have liked, and, then, 9 through the years, things have changed. 10 Next. 11 And at some point, in the first Zoning 12 Code, there was a very simple look at the Uses, 13 the Commercial, which we're still dealing with 14 in this Re-Write, by the way. 15 Next. 16 And, then, through the '40s, you can see 17 more of an interest in trying to develop the 18 Special Zoning for the corridors, trying to 19 have more of an urban design approach to 20 things -- next -- which is also shown in the 21 '50s. And, again, I'm just trying to expand 22 the discussion and show that changes to the 23 Code have been actually quite common. 24 Next. 25 And by the '60s, you can see that area that
Page 139	Page 140
1 is kind of like popping up in yellow, into the 2 Downtown, and that is the area that we're 3 talking about. So it's always been a little 4 bit undefined, in terms of this grandeur 5 vision. 6 Next. 7 In fact, if you look at the existing Future 8 Land Use Map, you will see that the color that 9 is not yellow, is an ochre color. It's very 10 unusual, because that's the only place where 11 that extra density -- of higher density 12 Single-Family is in the Comp Plan, and then the 13 Zoning is simply Single-Family and Duplex 14 around the perimeter. 15 Next. 16 So the request is three things. One is to 17 have a Comp Plan amendment to allow the 18 Mixed-Use. The other one is to Zone the area 19 to MX1, which doesn't exist yet, but at the 20 point that -- if the Commission were to approve 21 it, that, in my view, would be the best 22 designation. And, then, some cleanup language 23 and some Site Specific lots in the perimeter 24 that don't really accomplish many of the goals 25 that we have.	1 Next. 2 So Request Number One is to change the Land 3 Use to Low-Rise intensity, and you will see, 4 it's pink, and right next to it, to the east, 5 is also pink. So it's not something that would 6 be unusual. It's consistent with the general 7 development of the area. 8 Next. 9 Request Number 2 would be to Zone to MX1, 10 which is also being proposed for some areas 11 around this District. 12 Next. 13 And, then, finally, in yellow, there are 14 some lots that have some Site Specifics that 15 deal with the bungalow type duplex being one 16 story in height, which, really, don't become -- 17 they're not very useful, in terms of a 18 regulation, given the way the area has 19 developed. 20 Next. 21 And just, in a very simple diagram, that's 22 the existing condition. In red is the area 23 that we're dealing with. 24 Next. 25 This is some of the type of -- the low end

Page 141 1 of the infill of MX1, if it were to be 2 developed with small incremental projects. 3 And Next. 4 That will give you a sense of some slightly 5 denser opportunities. But you can see, the San 6 Sebastian Apartment is right to the south of 7 that, and Downtown, you can see, the massing of 8 the buildings to the north. So it fits fairly 9 consistently with existing development. 10 Next. 11 Some of the drawings that I hope to bring 12 next time we talk about the Code, some of the 13 more detailed drawings that show the type of 14 development are here, and this shows you that, 15 in the smaller increment, that there's three 16 stories. In the big increment, there could be 17 a potential six, with Med Bonus Level 2, but 18 generally speaking the emphasis is in the 19 smaller increment, which right now is just not 20 possible with the existing regulations, like 21 Commissioner Keon mentioned. 22 Next. 23 Perhaps, not surprisingly, we've had a lot 24 of support from the neighborhood. There's a 25 petition, there's several e-mails. All of the	Page 142 1 communications I received today were in support 2 of the request. 3 Next. 4 We've had public notification. We've had 5 the legal ad, the mailings, 1,500 feet, we 6 mailed the -- we noticed all of the properties, 7 also, and this has been posted on City Hall and 8 the web page, and also we posted the Staff 9 Report. 10 And -- next. 11 This is the map, which we will verify that 12 everybody got the proper notice. 13 Next. 14 And the Staff recommendation for Request 15 Number 1, which is the Comprehensive Plan 16 Amendment, is approval, because it is 17 consistent with the Comprehensive Plan 18 standards. Request Number 2 is also approval, 19 which is the Zoning Code Map Amendment, should 20 the Zoning Code be adopted as proposed, and, 21 finally, we're also recommending approval for 22 the Text Amendment to remove some of the Site 23 Specifics. 24 Next. 25 That's the end of the presentation. I
Page 143 1 believe there may be some neighbors, and I'll 2 be happy to answer any questions. 3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Is there a 4 presentation being done by anybody else or 5 you're the only presentation? 6 MR. TRIAS: I think that's it. I think 7 that's it. I do know that there was some 8 interest and there may be some public input 9 that you may want to include. 10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. 11 MR. COLLIER: Mr. Chairman, we're going to 12 need to read in those messages that were sent 13 in -- 14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Correct. 15 MR. COLLIER: -- at the appropriate time. 16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Can we go ahead and 17 read in those messages that were sent first, 18 Jill? 19 THE SECRETARY: Yes. I will look for 20 them. 21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. 22 While Jill is looking for this, I would 23 like to remind everybody, if everybody, that's 24 on the Zoom platform, that would like to speak, 25 if you could please send a chat directly to	Page 144 1 Jill Menendez. You can do that individually. 2 It's a pop down menu. 3 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman -- 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes. 5 MR. TRIAS: -- my Staff checked and Rhonda 6 Anderson was mailed a letter. She's within the 7 1,500 feet. So I don't know what the issue was 8 there. 9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. And everybody 10 that is on the phone line, we'll take you up 11 next. That is *9, to be recognized, and each 12 individual person will be sworn in prior to 13 speaking or testifying. 14 Jill, you're muted. Could we unmute Jill? 15 Thank you. 16 THE SECRETARY: First speaker is Kirk 17 Menendez. 18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Well, before we ask 19 for the speakers, you were going to read in the 20 e-mails that were sent to you, so we could 21 enter them for the record. 22 THE SECRETARY: First comment was from 23 Dennis Fundora. Hello, my name is Dennis 24 Fundora, the authorized agent of 317 Holding, 25 LLC, which is legal owner of 317 Malaga Avenue,

Page 145 1 Coral Gables, Florida 33134. I'm submitting 2 the attached e-comment, in the absence, to be 3 read at the PZ Meeting on July 29th, 2020. I'm 4 hereby confirming the entity support of the 5 Crafts Section rezoning. As Members of the 6 Planning and Zoning Board are aware, this area 7 is no longer compatible with Single-Family 8 residential use, as there is no buffer to the 9 surrounding Commercial development, which 10 results in increased amounts of traffic, 11 privacy issues, safety concerns and parking 12 overflow issues due to the neighboring police 13 station, car dealerships, office buildings and 14 retail establishment. 15 Secondly, these homes are surrounded by 16 existing and proposed Commercial development, 17 all of which tower above these Low-Rise 18 residences, further eroding privacy and the 19 quality of life that Coral Gables is known for. 20 Being surrounded by Commercial development, 21 where speeding cars are a daily concern, 22 decreases property values and makes it 23 difficult to find renters. 24 Finally, the Crafts Section was promised 25 streetscape improvements and buffer to improve	Page 146 1 the street and those were never delivered. 2 Property owners have been promised a rezoning 3 for more than ten years. Accordingly, I 4 respectfully request that the Planning & Zoning 5 Board votes to approve the proposed rezoning 6 immediately, as this cannot wait any longer. 7 Very truly yours, 317 Holdings, LLC, Denise 8 Fundora. 9 John Martini. To the Officials and Staff 10 Members of the Planning & Zoning Board, my name 11 is John Martini and I own my home at 310 12 Catalonia Avenue, which I purchased in 1992. 13 We lived in Madison, New Jersey before coming 14 here, and spent six months researching which 15 area we should move to, and chose Coral Gables, 16 as we were impressed by the quality of life 17 which Coral Gables offered with the title of 18 the City Beautiful. 19 At first, we were very happy with the 20 change and found Catalonia to be an ideal place 21 to live. However, as the years passed, we 22 discovered that Catalonia does not provide the 23 same quality of life as other areas of the 24 Gables. We began to have problems with the 25 parking, and over the years, called the Parking
Page 147 1 Department several times to ticket cars which 2 were parked blocking our driveway. 3 We complained about a car dealer, who was 4 using our streets to allow their clients to 5 test drive cars at high speeds, to no avail. 6 We began to feel that Catalonia, with its 7 office buildings, Commercial retail 8 establishments and increased vehicular traffic 9 on our treeless street was not the City 10 Beautiful we once enjoyed. 11 In 2005, after spending several years of 12 hoping for a chance -- I think they meant 13 change -- we gave up and moved to Surfside and 14 now use our home as a rental. With each year 15 that passes, we find that our home is harder to 16 rent, as few people want to raise a family in a 17 Commercial like environment. Also, this is 18 evident as property values on the west side of 19 Le Jeune Avenue, with its tree lined streets, 20 are 20 to 25 percent higher. I, therefore, 21 support the City initiative to rezone this area 22 for Commercial use. Thank you. 23 Maria B. (sic) Lopez. My name is Maria L. 24 Lopez. I own 355 Malaga. I strongly support 25 the proposed rezoning for Commercial use. As	Page 148 1 an 84-year-old widow, I depend on renting this 2 property to single families for income. When I 3 purchased the property over a decade ago, the 4 area was quiet and attractive, family friendly, 5 and it was a pleasure working with single 6 families to occupy the property. Not so 7 anymore. This block is surrounded by 8 Commercial and retail areas now, and single 9 families are no longer attracted to this area. 10 Traffic has dramatically increased. Malaga 11 Avenue is often used by speeding cars to cut to 12 and from Le Jeune, and illegal street side 13 parking by Commercial visitors prevent 14 residents from parking in front of their own 15 homes. 16 Finally, the nearby Commercial and retail 17 stores have removed all privacy from the area, 18 and safety issues, not just from speeding cars, 19 but also from increased foot traffic, are 20 concerning. This neighborhood is simply no 21 longer a Single-Family area. It is sandwiched 22 and isolated among retail stores and offices. 23 Again, given the realities of the area, I 24 strongly support the re-zoning proposal and 25 urge this Board to favorably recommend the

Page 149 1 proposed changes to the City Commission. 2 My name is Stefan Seuss, and I live at 340 3 Catalonia Avenue, Coral Gables, Florida 33134. 4 I've live between the Gables and Coconut Grove 5 for the last 20 years, and at the above stated 6 address, my third summer. I live here 7 sometimes with my two teenage sons, who I share 8 with my ex-wife. I support the proposed 9 rezoning of the above stated section by the 10 City of Coral Gables for the following reasons: 11 Since I've known this area of the Gables, 12 Catalonia was used as a through street during 13 rush hours on many mornings and in the evening. 14 However, since I've lived here, I've seen that 15 my street is used extensively by vehicles to 16 avoid traffic on Le Jeune and the traffic 17 increased monthly. Unfortunately, sometimes 18 the street even turns into a race course and 19 I'm reluctant to let my kids use their 20 skateboard in front of the house. Now, with 21 even more increased heavy truck traffic 22 catering to The Plaza Coral Gables, the street 23 is no longer a residential neighborhood street. 24 I understand that the construction traffic 25 will subside when The Plaza is finished, but	Page 150 1 then there will be another increased traffic 2 situation in connection with the occupants and 3 visitors of the Center. I'm actually for the 4 Plaza development, but I understand that my 5 neighborhood cannot be seen as a Single-Family 6 zoned area anymore. Additionally, all areas 7 towards the north, with now two car 8 dealerships, and to the east with Commercial, 9 to me, this area is well suited by following 10 your proposal and convert it into a Mixed-Use 11 area, but still with low impact. 12 Since I've lived in Miami, your City, with 13 some exceptions, in the Alhambra area, has done 14 a great job to improve the appeal of Coral 15 Gables for businesses and residents alike, and 16 I trust that you will make the right decision 17 to lead the City into the future. 18 Thank you very much for your time. I wish 19 you a successful hearing. Best regards. 20 And that is it. 21 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, there's one 22 additional -- 23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Is there one 24 additional one? 25 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
Page 151 1 THE SECRETARY: There's one more. 2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Would you read it, 3 please? 4 MS. REDILLA: Which I can read. Okay. 5 My name is Marissa Tenazas and we own 352 6 Catalonia Avenue. I know that there is a 7 proposal to refine our area. We support such 8 proposal on our street, to help expand our 9 Commercial area in Coral Gables. I'm currently 10 attending the Zoom meeting, but I cannot stay 11 through the whole meeting, but wanted to 12 express my views. Thanks. Best regards, Louis 13 Tenazas and Marissa Tenazas. 14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you. 15 I think there's also the petition that was 16 handed in. If we could read the body of the 17 petition and then you can tell us how many 18 signatures are on there for that Petition? 19 Would that suffice, Craig? 20 MR. COLLIER: That would be fine. 21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you. 22 Jill. 23 THE SECRETARY: The petition was submitted 24 by Jorge Navarro. Consent to the City 25 initiated proposed change of Land Use and	Page 152 1 Zoning. We, the undersigned owners of property 2 within the area in the City of Coral Gables, 3 founded by the following right of way, West Le 4 Jeune Road, Southwest 42nd Avenue, north, 5 east/west Alley bisecting Block 27 of the Coral 6 Gables Crafts Section, east of Salzedo Street, 7 south Santander Avenue, do hereby consent to a 8 City of Coral Gables initiated change of the 9 areas Land Use and Zoning designations as to 10 incorporate this area into the City Central 11 Business District and to permit Multi-Family 12 and Mixed Residential/Commercial Uses. 13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: And how many 14 signatures? 15 THE SECRETARY: They're not numbered. One 16 second. I believe, over -- about 20. 17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I've got 18, plus 17, 18 plus one, two, three -- plus, twelve. 18, 17, 19 12. And then we have an additional -- 20 MR. BEHAR: 47 -- 48. 21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: 48. Thank you, 22 Robert. I knew we needed an architect on the 23 Board. 24 Jill, how many speakers do we have? 25 THE SECRETARY: We have fifteen.

Page 153 1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: And are they Zoom or 2 are they phone line or -- 3 THE SECRETARY: I believe most of them are 4 Zoom. 5 MR. BEHAR: Are we going to give a time 6 limit for the speakers, since we have 15 -- 7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes. So there's a 8 three-minute time limit, which I had stated at 9 the beginning. 10 THE SECRETARY: Sorry, we also have a 11 telephone number that's also wanting to 12 comment. 13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. And who will be 14 doing the swearing in? 15 THE SECRETARY: The court reporter. 16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: If the court reporter, 17 please, when Jill call the name of the person 18 and they are unmuted and acknowledge, if you 19 would please swear them in. 20 Jill, go ahead and please call the first 21 witness. 22 THE SECRETARY: Kirk Menendez. 23 (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.) 24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you. If you 25 could please start by stating your full name	Page 154 1 and your address. 2 MR. MENENDEZ: Sure. 3 My name is Kirk Menendez. I reside at 325 4 Malaga Avenue, and I support the rezoning. 5 I've been a resident of Coral Gables and of its 6 Crafts Section since 1962, when JFK was 7 president, and I've resided on the 300 Block of 8 Malaga since 1977. I've been deeply involved 9 in the community, including the Youth Center, 10 where I've coached for over 25 years, and where 11 today I'm the longest serving President of the 12 75-year-old Coral Gables War Memorial Youth 13 Center Association. 14 For more than half a century, my life has 15 been closely intertwined with the City, with 16 the Crafts Section, and most importantly, with 17 the area being considered for re-zoning today. 18 And this proposed area has an extensive 19 history, too. In 1942, George Merrick died 20 without seeing his vision for the Crafts 21 Section completed. When World War II ended in 22 1945, GIs flocked to South Florida to study at 23 UM and starts their families. Suddenly, there 24 was a great demand for smaller, more affordable 25 homes. That is when construction of
Page 155 1 Single-Family homes began on the 300 Blocks of 2 Malaga and Catalonia, in the late 1940s. It 3 was a detour of opportunity from the original 4 plan for the area. 5 Fast-forward to 2002, and discussions about 6 rezoning this area to Commercial began. In 7 early 2000s, I recall a couple of Planning & 8 Zoning Board Members at a P&Z meeting openly 9 question why Single-Family homes were located 10 in what was fundamentally a Commercial area, 11 and they were right to question. When you look 12 at our streets, they're the same width and 13 makeup as most every street criss-crossing the 14 Downtown area of the City. We even have the 15 same type of street lights you'd find 16 throughout the City's urban core, and we are on 17 the same electrical grid as parts of the 18 commercially zoned areas of the Crafts Section. 19 In fact, the San Sebastian building at the 20 corner of University Drive and Le Jeune was 21 actually a full fledged hotel in the early days 22 of the City, during the peak of George 23 Merrick's vision for Coral Gables. 24 So, just like I have a history with the 25 City, this area has a history, too, and it's	Page 156 1 the same history as the Commercial areas that 2 immediately surround it. They're one and the 3 same. It's finally time to codify what 4 everyone has known for decades, that the area 5 between Catalonia and Santander and Le Jeune 6 and Salzedo is meant to be Commercial. It 7 always has. 8 So, on behalf of my family, I strongly 9 request that you please support this item and 10 approve the rezoning. Thank you. 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, sir. 12 THE SECRETARY: Sophia Larraz. 13 MR. MURAI: Eibi, can we swear all 14 witnesses at once? 15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Craig wanted to do 16 them individually. 17 MR. COLLIER: You can't really do it all at 18 once. It's just a limitation of the 19 technology. So, unfortunately, we're going to 20 have to swear them one at a time. 21 THE SECRETARY: We have Julio Webel. 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Could you please state 23 your full name for the record and your address? 24 MR. WEBEL: My name is Julio Webel, 309 25 Malaga Avenue.

Page 157 1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Go ahead, please. 2 (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.) 3 MR. WEBEL: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair and 4 Members of the Board. Thank you for the time. 5 My name is Julio Webel. I reside at 309 6 Malaga, and I support the rezoning of this 7 area. Coral Gables is very proud of the 8 streets. I don't think -- that if we re-zone 9 these streets, we can be proud of this area, 10 also. 11 It's very simple. The area does not have a 12 street infrastructure and elements of the 13 streetscape that allow for comfortable 14 Single-Family houses in this street, and that's 15 why it's very difficult to live in the area, 16 for traffic and many other issues that my 17 neighbors have mentioned. Fifty-foot right of 18 way, the scale is not of a comfortable street, 19 the lighting, the signage, nothing goes with a 20 Single-Family house. 21 And to finish -- I'm not going to talk too 22 much, but to finish, I'm going to leave you 23 with a picture that really contrasts what 24 really Coral Gables Single-Family housing is 25 versus our area.	Page 158 1 So thank you very much, and I'll leave with 2 a picture. 3 THE SECRETARY: Maria Mas. 4 (Thereupon, the participant was sworn in.) 5 MS. MAS BLET: Thank you. My name is 6 actually Maria Mas Blet, and I am here 7 representing MBP Malaga Holdings, LLC, who is 8 the owner of 323 Malaga Avenue, Coral Gables, 9 Florida 33134. 10 I want you to know, I grew up in Coral 11 Gables since 1976, and I've own this 12 property -- we've owned this property since 13 2014. I fully support the City's proposed 14 rezoning, for a variety of reasons. This 15 property is a rental property, and our ability 16 to rent it on a market valuation has been 17 significantly declined due to the ongoing 18 situation with regard to the traffic, the 19 safety issues, even the landscape has changed, 20 and it's much more sterile, which is not 21 Single-Family home conducive. Obviously, it 22 impacts our ability to rent the property, and 23 we would like to support this rezoning, which I 24 think will be much more consistent with what 25 the valuation and the positive aspect will be
Page 159 1 here. 2 And, then, in addition to that, there's so 3 much traffic and parking issues that also does 4 not allow it to be as attractive as comorable 5 properties for the expense and the investment 6 of this property. Thanks very much for hearing 7 us. And -- that's it. Thank you. 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, ma'am. 9 THE SECRETARY: Jorge Navarro. 10 MR. NAVARRO: Hi, can you hear me? 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes, we can. 12 MR. NAVARRO: Great. Did you want to swear 13 me in? 14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Attorneys, I don't 15 think need to be sworn in, unless I'm 16 incorrect -- 17 MR. COLLER: I'm wondering if Mr. Navarro 18 has an interest in a property? Is he appearing 19 as an attorney or is he appearing as a property 20 owner? 21 MR. NAVARRO: I'm appearing as an attorney 22 representing 25 of the property owners within 23 the rezoning boundary. 24 MR. COLLER: Oh, well, then you don't need 25 to be sworn.	Page 160 1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: State your full name 2 and address, please. 3 MR. NAVARRO: Thank you. 4 For the record, Jorge Navarro, with offices 5 at 333 Southwest 2nd Avenue. I'm here this 6 evening on behalf of 25 of the property owners 7 that are located within the Crafts Section 8 neighborhood. 9 As you've heard, and you will hear this 10 evening from many residents that live in the 11 area, who are 100 percent in support of the 12 City's efforts to re-designate this area to be 13 consistent with the surrounding uses and the 14 Zonings that exist there today. This 15 application has been a long time coming for 16 these neighbors, who have been expressing 17 concerns and issues that have been presented by 18 this inconsistent Zoning to the City for years. 19 As the City's Downtown core has actually 20 grown and developed over the last decades, 21 these neighbors have dealt with traffic, 22 littering, security, and the many inherent 23 issues associated with having Single-Family 24 Residential located directly adjacent to your 25 Downtown core and to your Commercial District,

Page 161 1 that has high intensity uses, without any of 2 the buffers, transitions, landscaping, 3 streetscape that you traditionally tend to find 4 in a Single-Family neighborhood. 5 As the neighbors have expressed and will 6 express this evening, this area is no longer 7 viable or suitable for Residential 8 Single-Family uses. This application, as being 9 proposed by the City, fixes a problem, and 10 simply put, just makes sense. When you look at 11 the existing Zoning Map, it's easy to see why 12 this application makes so much sense. This 13 area is an isolated pocket of Single-Family 14 homes. It's located in a sea of Commercial 15 Zoning, and it's essentially your hole in the 16 doughnut, which we are trying to fix and round 17 out your Downtown core. 18 The neighborhood is isolated and separated 19 from the other Residential areas in the 20 neighborhood by Southwest 42nd Avenue, which is 21 a major commercial thoroughfare. It's also 22 bifurcated by University Drive to the south, 23 and directly to the North and east, it abuts 24 your Downtown core, without any buffers, 25 physical barriers or transitions from these	Page 162 1 intense Commercial uses. 2 As a result, and as you've heard tonight, 3 these families have had an issue with having 4 good quality of life in this area, whether 5 it's, you know, cut through traffic, loading 6 from Commercial vehicles, trying to get into 7 your Downtown, overflow parking from some of 8 the Commercial uses and the retail uses in the 9 area that use this parking to walk over to 10 those goods and services, privacy, safety and 11 noise. 12 So we would ask that you support the City's 13 application to re-designate this area to 14 Commercial. I think that everyone's entitled 15 to the reasonable use of their property, and I 16 don't think that it's no longer reasonable to 17 have Single-Family here, and as you've heard, 18 this area no longer provides the high level and 19 the quality of life and the high living 20 standards that the City Beautiful has worked so 21 hard to achieve and provide for its residents. 22 So, on behalf of the residents of this area 23 and the 59 residents that have signed the 24 petition that we submitted, we would ask that 25 you support the Crafts Section neighbors and
Page 163 1 vote to approve this application here this 2 evening. Thank you. 3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you. 4 THE SECRETARY: Anthony Villar. 5 Maria Menendez. 6 (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.) 7 MS. MENENDEZ: And thank you very much. 8 And thank you, and good afternoon Board 9 Members. It's great to see you all. 10 For the record, my name is Maria Menendez 11 and I live with my family at 322 Catalonia 12 Avenue. We've lived here for 27 years. We 13 love the City of Coral Gables. We love it for 14 the quality of life and the services it strives 15 to provide the residents, but the quality of 16 life in our small neighborhood area has 17 diminished over the years, and the changes -- 18 the discussion to change the Zoning and Land 19 Use for this area has been going on for a very 20 long time, more than fifteen years, that I can 21 recall. 22 During the 27 years in my home, and you 23 will hear from other residents that have lived 24 there even longer, the City has not provided 25 any improvements or funding to our three-block	Page 164 1 Residential areas, no trees, no grass, no 2 traffic calming, no amenities, no neighborhood 3 enhancements. Over the years, the City has 4 viewed this three-block area as not worthy of 5 an investment, due to the proximity to 6 Commercial and the potential for rezoning and 7 re-development. 8 Our area is not compatible to the typical 9 Coral Gables Single-Family Residential 10 neighborhood. It is an enclave. We are 11 separated from other Residential neighborhoods 12 by Le Jeune Road on the west and by University 13 Drive on the south, that includes the 14 four-story historic San Sebastian Apartments, 15 that buffers the Residential area to the south 16 from us. We have Commercial Zoning to the 17 north, and separated by an alley, and to the 18 east, across Salzedo, that we share with our 19 Commercial neighbors. 20 I would like to share with you some of the 21 challenges we face in our neighborhood, and on 22 a daily basis, that has gotten worse over the 23 years. Our wide Residential streets are 24 speedways for testing cars for the Mercedes 25 Benz dealership just north of us. Our wide

Page 165 1 Residential streets are cut through to and from 2 work frequent by speeding cars trying to avoid 3 traffic congestion on Le Jeune Road and a 4 school zone just north of us along Palermo. 5 Our wide streets are currently being used 6 as a delivery route for the construction 7 material and equipment for the Plaza project, 8 formerly known as the Agave project, east of us 9 on Ponce. Our Residential streets are used as 10 overflow parking for Commercial areas that 11 surround us and Commercial events from the 12 Knights of Columbus Banquet Hall and Ponce 13 Circle Park east of us. Although we have 14 restricted parking, it is not enforced 15 regularly. 16 Our quality of life will continue to be 17 impacted by additional developments in our 18 area, such as the Mercedes Benz expansion to 19 the old police and fire station, bringing the 20 dealership activities closer to our Residential 21 neighborhood, an additional development site 22 anticipated in our same area resulting from the 23 land exchange from the Mercedes Benz, a new 24 high density development proposed at Catalonia 25 and Ponce, east of our neighborhood, which is	Page 166 1 eliminating the dedicated right-hand turn from 2 Ponce to University, vacating this right-hand 3 turn will potentially divert traffic east on 4 Catalonia Avenue, when traffic is backed up 5 from a red light at Ponce and University. This 6 is bound to happen, especially during peak 7 hours, when Commercial traffic is heading home 8 in the evening. 9 And, finally, the existing Commercial just 10 north of us, the Commercial Zoning just north 11 of us, allows for High-Rise development. A 12 parcel assembly of 20,000 square feet or more 13 may be built up to the height of 190 feet -- 14 MS. REDILLA: Time. 15 MS. MENENDEZ: -- less than 200 feet from 16 our Single-Family neighborhood. I'm almost 17 finished. 18 I believe that you are all in receipt of a 19 petition signed by 100 percent of the property 20 owners along the 300 Block of Catalonia and 21 Malaga Avenue. We are the residents that 22 initiated this modest request some time ago. 23 Therefore, I, along with my neighbors, 24 respectfully request that you recommend 25 approval of the rezoning and Land Use change
Page 167 1 for our area, as presented and supported by 2 Staff. 3 Thank you, Board Members. Thank you for 4 your time, your service and your consideration 5 of our request. 6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, Maria. 7 MS. MENENDEZ: Thank you. 8 THE SECRETARY: Richard Formoso. 9 (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.) 10 MR. FORMOSO: Hi. My name is Richard 11 Formoso, and I own the property at 301 Malaga 12 Avenue, and I support the rezoning. I obtained 13 the property in 2017 with the intent of 14 occupying the house. After a year long 15 renovation, during which time I became more 16 acquainted with the immediate area, I decided 17 not to occupy the house and rent it out. 18 The main driver of this decision was the 19 impact on the quality of life the surrounding 20 Commercial area has on the home. I have had 21 some difficulty renting the house due to the 22 same issues. It seems that this area, 23 surrounded by Commercial property to the north 24 and east and also Multi-Family apartments to 25 the south and Le Jeune to the west, would be	Page 168 1 better utilized if absorbed into the adjoining 2 Zoning. I believe the area is no longer 3 compatible with Single-Family residences, and I 4 support the rezoning of this area. Thank you. 5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you. 6 THE SECRETARY: Waldo Toyos. 7 (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.) 8 MR. TOYOS: Good evening, Chairman and 9 Board Members. My name is Waldo Toyos. I 10 reside at 1044 Coral Way. I am here on behalf 11 of Coral Gables Knights of Columbus. We are 12 the neighbors to the east of three blocks on 13 Salzedo and Catalonia Avenue. We have been at 14 our location since we built it in 1950 and we 15 are in support of changing the Zoning for our 16 neighbors to the west, and I hope that you do 17 support the change, as this just makes sense. 18 These three blocks should be Commercial. Thank 19 you. 20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you. 21 Next person. 22 THE SECRETARY: H. Yaniz 23 (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.) 24 MS. YANIZ: Good evening. My name is 25 Esperanza Yaniz. I, along with my sister, Dr.

Page 169 1 Teresa Santos represent 330 Catalonia, my 2 mother's property, Maria Rodriguez. 3 We support the rezoning. My mother has 4 lived there for 25 years, and like everyone has 5 said, I support this. The traffic -- not only 6 the traffic, but the speed that the cars go 7 through there, it's become dangerous. As far 8 as my mother, she's still in a good health 9 condition. She takes walks. And I fear the 10 minute she tells me she's going for a walk. 11 It's just dangerous and we support the rezone. 12 Thank you. 13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you. 14 THE SECRETARY: Claudio. 15 (Thereupon, the participant is sworn.) 16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: State your name and 17 address, please, for the record. 18 MR. NARANJO: Yes. Claudio Naranjo, 356 19 Malaga Avenue, 33134. 20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Go ahead, please. 21 MR. NARANJO: I've lived here eleven years 22 with my family and support the City's rezoning 23 effort of the Crafts Section. I don't consider 24 this area -- I'm reading off notes. I'm 25 looking down here -- I don't consider this area	Page 170 1 Residential any longer. There's constant 2 traffic cutting from and out to Le Jeune Road. 3 On one occasion, while crossing Malaga, I 4 missed being run over by a speeding car by two 5 or three inches. 6 These streetwide public roads are on sewer 7 and lend themselves easily to a Commercial 8 application. Thank you very much. 9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, sir. 10 THE SECRETARY: Santiago Beunza. 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Santiago, are you with 12 us? 13 MS. BEUNZA: I'm Amalia Beunza. I'm 14 Santiago's wife. This is actually my son's 15 Zoom account. 16 (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.) 17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Could you please state 18 your full name and address, for the record? 19 MS. BEUNZA: My name is Amalia Beunza, and 20 our address is 300 Malaga Avenue, and we want 21 to say, we purchased the property not too long 22 ago, probably about two years ago, with the 23 intent of actually moving in. However, once we 24 were there and doing some of the remodeling 25 that we were doing inside, we discovered that
Page 171 1 that really wasn't what we were looking for, as 2 far as a Residential property. 3 So my husband and I do support strongly the 4 rezoning of the area. The home is nestled 5 between Commercial businesses, allowing for a 6 lot of noise, traffic, parking issues, and not 7 affording the kind of quality of life that you 8 would expect in a Single-Family Residential 9 neighborhood. So, again, we support the 10 rezoning of the area. Thank you. 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you for your 12 time. 13 THE SECRETARY: Juan Castro Lopez. 14 (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.) 15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Could you please state 16 your name and address, for the record? 17 MR. CASTRO LOPEZ: My name is Juan Castro 18 Lopez. I'm here representing SRG Corp., which 19 is the owner of the San Sebastian Apartments 20 that are located on University Drive 21 (Unintelligible), to the property that's being 22 relocated. 23 My family has owned -- 24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Would you please state 25 your address? Mr. Castro, if you could please	Page 172 1 state your address. 2 MR. LOPEZ CASTRO: Yes. 300 University 3 Drive, Coral Gables, Florida. 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you. 5 MS. CASTRO LOPEZ: I'm here representing 6 SRG Corporation, which owns the San Sebastian 7 Apartments. My family has owned the building 8 for many years, and I have to say that while 9 I'm not opposed to the rezoning, I have serious 10 concern about the impact the new rules will 11 have for the people that are deciding to stay, 12 which are the people that, you know, will have 13 a problem with the increased traffic. I think, 14 before this is approved, I think we should try 15 to find solutions on how to minimize the impact 16 for those residents that are not going to be 17 selling their properties, and that they're 18 going to decide -- they will decide to stay 19 living there. 20 So I would ask that Commission, that they 21 defer voting on the issue, until, first, 22 solutions to some of these issues have been 23 addressed and until the specifics of the new 24 Zoning are approved, which I understand are not 25 yet. Thank you.

Page 173 1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, sir. 2 THE SECRETARY: Rochelle Yanes. 3 (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.) 4 MR. YANES: All right. My name is Alain 5 Yanes. I live in 341 Malaga Avenue. I moved 6 in about ten years ago. I live with my wife 7 and my three children, who are preteens, and -- 8 they're 15, 13 and 11. When we moved in, they 9 were very young. 10 The neighborhood has changed in the last 11 ten years. I feel like it's no longer safe for 12 them to ride their bike. It's -- the street 13 that I live in is used mostly for people to 14 drive by and cut across, and I feel like -- 15 it's just not a safe neighborhood anymore for 16 children -- families with small children. I've 17 heard my neighbors so eloquently explain the 18 reasons, and I totally am in support of the 19 rezoning. Thank you. 20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, sir. 21 THE SECRETARY: Maria Perera. 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Is Ms. Perera here? 23 I don't see her. 24 Jill, do you see her? 25 THE SECRETARY: She's using a different	Page 174 1 name, Griesse. 2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Is she unmuted? 3 THE SECRETARY: I'm trying to unmute her now. 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. 5 THE SECRETARY: I also sent her a private 6 message, no request (sic). 7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Unfortunately, I don't 8 see the name that you -- oh, I see Griesse. 9 Can we unmute her ourselves? 10 MS. PERERA: I'm sorry, I had a call on the 11 other line from my office. 12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Even if we don't see 13 you, could you raise your right hand and let us 14 know that you're raising your right hand? 15 MS. PERERA: Yes, I am raising my right 16 hand. My name is Maria Perera. 17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Can you swear her in 18 this way? 19 THE REPORTER: I'm supposed to be able to 20 see her. 21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Ms. Griesse, is there a 22 way to put on your camera? 23 MS. PERERA: Yes. I have two Zoom calls 24 going on at the same time. I'm not sure how to 25 do that. Give me a second.
Page 175 1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. 2 MS. PERERA: I'm with my China office on 3 the other. I apologize, but I'm by myself here 4 and I don't know how to do it and I don't want 5 to lose my signal with them. 6 Is it possible that you can swear me in as 7 if I were on the phone? 8 MR. COLLIER: She can speak. It's just not 9 going to be considered sworn testimony. 10 There's so much testimony that's been in this 11 matter, that somebody speaking, that's not 12 sworn in, she'll go unsworn, and it's not 13 considered sworn testimony, but there's other 14 testimony. 15 Or if she could take a pass and we can try 16 to come back to her. 17 MS. PERERA: Oh, yes, you can come back to 18 me. That would be great. I'll finish with the 19 other one and I'll get back. Yes. 20 THE SECRETARY: Actually, she is the last 21 speaker, unless I missed someone, or she can 22 submit her comment at Planning@CoralGables.com. 23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Ms. Griesse? 24 MS. PERERA: You want me to submit them in 25 writing? Okay.	Page 176 1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Unless you'd like to 2 speak now. 3 MS. PERERA: Okay. I'll speak now, then, 4 but I won't be sworn in. 5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: That is correct. 6 Please proceed. 7 MS. PERERA: So my name is Maria Perera, 8 333 Malaga, and I do agree with everybody, with 9 everybody's comments. I do thank you, Board 10 Members, for your time and service. I fully 11 support the rezoning of this area. I'm a 12 hundred percent supportive on that, and I hope 13 it can be done as soon as possible. 14 My property is a rental property and I have 15 seen a huge decline. It's very difficult to 16 rent, and it's -- and I agree with everyone's 17 comments about the traffic congestion, the 18 speeding cars, the safety concerns, and the 19 noise, the pollution and so many other things. 20 So I'm happy that this is -- you know, 21 up-front, that you can consider it, and I hope 22 for a positive consideration on your part. 23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, Ms. Perera. 24 MS. PERERA: Thank you so much, sir. 25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Anybody else --

Page 177 1 THE SECRETARY: Sorry. There's one more 2 speaker that came back into Zoom. 3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. 4 THE SECRETARY: Anthony Miyar. 5 (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.) 6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: If you could state 7 your full name and address, please, for the 8 record. 9 MR. MIYAR: Sure. My name is Antonio 10 Miyar. My address is protected. I'm calling 11 on behalf of my parents, Miguel Miyar, Caridad 12 Miyar, 345 Malaga Avenue. They have asked me, 13 you know, to represent them. My father is 95 14 years old. My mother is 93. They purchased 15 the house in Malaga in 2003. They were 16 extremely happy when they purchased the house. 17 At that time, the Mercedes dealership was 18 parking all of their cars, picking up with 19 shuttles and picking up all of the employees. 20 The City of Coral Gables was so kind to put 21 up permit parking. As a matter of fact, 22 tomorrow I'm going to go renew my dad's parking 23 for his permits outside, which has controlled 24 the parking somewhat. However, people still 25 come and park in front of other people's	Page 178 1 houses. It's very difficult for them, for my 2 dad and my mom, at their age. My neighbor next 3 door has small kids -- next door to my parents 4 has small kids, and for them to play outside, 5 also, I've noticed. 6 And I've noticed a gentleman earlier, when 7 I just got back, that he talked about that he's 8 against this, but he owns a building, an 9 apartment building, and people from those 10 apartment buildings park on our street, and 11 this is something where my parents are not 12 happy. With their age and everything, they're 13 still healthy, however, it really bothers them. 14 So when they found out about this Zoning 15 change that the City has proposed, they're 16 extremely happy about it and they're very 17 supportive of it, and they want to thank the 18 beautiful City of Coral Gables, and if they 19 decide to move, they will continue to live in 20 Coral Gables. Thank you. 21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, sir. 22 Anybody else, Jill? 23 THE SECRETARY: We have one more speaker 24 that came back. Jorge Arias. 25 (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.)
Page 179 1 MR. ARIAS: Good evening, Board Members. 2 Thank you for your time. Jorge Arias here, at 3 318 Malaga Avenue, and I do support the 4 rezoning of the streets in the Crafts Section 5 neighborhood. I've lived here for fifteen 6 years. However, the neighborhood has changed, 7 and going over some of the concerns some of the 8 other residents have regarding the development 9 to the north, and, of course, to the east, with 10 The Plaza, that's only going to change -- it's 11 only going to increase the traffic and the 12 parking, you know. Our streets lend themselves 13 to easily park, and whether it be the Mercedes 14 Benz dealership employees or whether it be the 15 building to our south, to the south, the 16 Sebastian Apartments, also add to the parking 17 problems. 18 Also, safety, I know that several residents 19 have experienced break-ins into their cars or 20 even homes, and that just doesn't lend itself 21 to what we know as the City Beautiful, and it 22 doesn't just fit. We are isolated, and we 23 don't really benefit from those tree lined 24 streets that our neighbors to the west of Le 25 Jeune benefit from.	Page 180 1 So our two children can't really ride their 2 bicycles safely, due to the increased traffic 3 cutting through the neighborhood, or if it's 4 not those that are cutting through, it's the 5 Mercedes Benz dealership testing out their high 6 powered cars. 7 So, again, I do support the rezoning, and 8 thank you for your time. 9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, sir. 10 Jill, anybody else? 11 THE SECRETARY: No, I don't think I missed 12 anyone, but -- unless I did -- 13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: And by phone, we don't 14 have anybody? 15 THE SECRETARY: No. No one on the phone. 16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. At this point, 17 I would like to close the public for comment, 18 and I'd like to open it up for the Board. 19 Robert, let's start with you. 20 MR. BEHAR: Thank you. 21 This has been a very interesting hour or 22 so. Unlike the previous application, previous 23 item, on this, I want to truly commend Staff 24 for the great presentation and making it very 25 clear. I commend you guys for that. Great

Page 181 1 job, thank you. 2 I don't think I've been involved in any of 3 the meetings in the last -- since I've been in 4 the Planning & Zoning, off and on for the last 5 fifteen years, that I have seen so much support 6 for an application of rezoning. I'm very 7 surprised that the only objector is the owners 8 of the Multi-Family building that is at the 9 edge of what we're looking to re-zone, because 10 what I think this would create is exactly what 11 he has, and yet he's objecting, but he has the 12 right to do so. 13 I have an idea, and I am taking my 14 architect's hat off, and I'm going to put my -- 15 a little -- try my want to be attorney's hat or 16 re-zoning attorney, and use my guidance to tell 17 me, if we -- I know that we're trying to -- in 18 the new rezoning, this would be -- I believe 19 we're going to be MX1, but if we were to today 20 approve, like a Mixed -- MXD, with a high 21 restriction, similar to the Commercial 22 Low-Rise, that when I compare in the new Zoning 23 Code, the Commercial Low-Rise -- MXD with 24 Commercial Low-Rise, that only allow 77 feet, 25 would be the same as the MX1. Can we re-zone	Page 182 1 this today, so it could continue forward 2 independently of the total Zoning Re-Write by 3 doing that today? 4 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Behar, I believe what 5 you're saying is that it would be a Mixed-Use 6 Overlay, right? 7 MR. BEHAR: Correct. 8 MR. TRIAS: Like we have in some other 9 places, yeah. 10 MR. BEHAR: Correct. That way, Mr. Trias, 11 we could move it forward to -- you know, to 12 Commission and we don't have to wait for this, 13 because I -- listen, I'm in strong support of 14 this, and I think this is -- you know, and I've 15 been around the City long enough, for the last 16 fifteen years or, you know, more, since this 17 area has come into play, and I think it's about 18 -- personally, I don't know about the rest of 19 the Board Members, but I think it's time for 20 this to happen. 21 So I don't want to delay it any further. I 22 want to find a way that -- a mechanism that we 23 could approve, in a way, tonight, to move it 24 forward. 25 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. That would be a change
Page 183 1 of Land Use, which we have as one of the items, 2 and then it would require writing an Overlay 3 specifically for this area, which we don't have 4 at this moment. So, I mean, that could be one 5 of the recommendations you make. 6 MR. BEHAR: Any other way, Mr. Trias, that 7 we could do this today? 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Craig. 9 MR. COLLIER: Yeah. I think it's 10 problematic, because of the way it's 11 advertised. Sometimes, when something is 12 within the scope of the ad, normally you find 13 it like in County applications, where somebody 14 is asking for, the State used one acre or the 15 request is, and you have a request within that 16 request. So you could go to a step down Zoning 17 that would be within the ad, but this is kind 18 of a different animal, with an Overlay. 19 What I would suggest, because this 20 ultimately is advertised for the Commission, I 21 think what you could do is adopt this; however, 22 with a recommendation that you consider, if the 23 Board is not inclined to do the Mixed-Use, to 24 recommend to the Board that it be advertised in 25 the way that you suggested, and it ultimately	Page 184 1 may have to then be re-advertised as such, but 2 at least you could have that recommendation. 3 So I think that's -- that would be the way 4 to accomplish it. I mean, even how we're doing 5 this right now, we don't really have the 6 Mixed-Use in place, so it's sort of 7 theoretical, as it is, but since you're a 8 recommending body, I think you can include that 9 as an alternative, that you recommend that this 10 type of Zoning be considered for this section. 11 MR. BEHAR: Let's listen to the rest of the 12 Board and then we'll come back. 13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Robert, any other 14 comments? 15 MR. BEHAR: No. I think this is -- 16 personally, I think this is a very good idea, 17 but that's it. 18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you. 19 Rhonda. If we could unmute Rhonda, please. 20 MS. ANDERSON: There we go. I think I got 21 it. I'll get used to this eventually. 22 In general, I think it's a long time coming 23 with this area, and I do think that we can do 24 some nice things in a wholistic fashion, 25 because the problems that exist on the east

Page 185 1 side of Le Jeune, and when we do this building, 2 will spill over to the west side of Le Jeune. 3 So I'm making the following suggestions, in 4 addition to what's already been laid out. That 5 we look at the traffic impact in a wholistic 6 fashion, and instead of going project by 7 project for traffic calming to be implemented 8 in the streets that will be impacted, that we 9 use a formula, for instance, for, if this is 10 built out to its totality, with a number of 11 units, to have impact fees contributed towards 12 that traffic calming that's going to be needed 13 to be done, because you'll have an impact on 14 traffic on the west side of Le Jeune, maybe not 15 to the extreme speed that we do on the east 16 side of Le Jeune, but you'll have it 17 nonetheless. 18 A good example is the Bacardi Building, 19 which used to be the Hurricane building, some 20 impact fees were brought back into the west 21 side of Le Jeune to add traffic circles, 22 medians on Segovia, those types of things. If 23 you're doing an entire area, it could be better 24 apportioned between all of the projects, rather 25 than burdening one of the projects.	Page 186 1 So those are thoughts on the traffic 2 calming that's going to be necessary for the 3 increased traffic. The other thing I think you 4 can do is some things in the way of green 5 space, like we did in the North Ponce corridor, 6 and to plan it out at this stage, where you can 7 identify where there are specimen trees, 8 whether they should be left in place or moved 9 to an appropriate location. 10 I note, Article 2-405, for the tree 11 protection plan, (unintelligible.) I suggest 12 that we all adopt it and apply it here and 13 you'll end up with a nicer, I think, result in 14 the end. 15 Ms. Trias, I don't know what type of 16 development is expected to come into this area 17 with this being a Mixed-Use, more Residential, 18 but I do think something like you have in the 19 North Ponce, a green corridor (Unintelligible). 20 What do you see coming? 21 MR. TRIAS: Well, the idea behind MX1 is to 22 have the smaller increment Mixed-Use, and right 23 now, if we were to do what Mr. Behar is 24 proposing, unfortunately, some of the other 25 rules of the Code encourage the 20,000 square
Page 187 1 feet, encourage very large assemblages and so 2 on. That is one of the reasons why we were 3 proposing the changes that we discussed earlier 4 today. Now, that's one aspect of things. 5 Another aspect of things is the street 6 design, which includes potential landscape and 7 greenery, which would be the North Ponce. That 8 was also done. That was done as a capital 9 project. 10 So, I mean, what I would say today is that 11 this type of support and this type of 12 discussion should give you some comfort in the 13 sense that the Code, as proposed, that gist of 14 the Code, are actually fairly useful and have 15 support, and I think the cleanest way to do it 16 is the way we're proposing it. 17 There could be other ways to do it, as 18 Mr. Behar is proposing, and we're very happy to 19 look into them. I'm not a hundred percent 20 ready to tell you, this is the way to do it, 21 but we could certainly, if you choose to 22 forward this, we could come up with some other 23 alternatives. 24 MS. ANDERSON: Short of adopting the 25 proposed Code as it is right now, is there a	Page 188 1 mechanism for this to move forward as it was 2 written? 3 MR. TRIAS: Possibly, and I say that, 4 because it may require several amendments to 5 the text of the Code, to allow for the smaller 6 increment development. But -- 7 MS. ANDERSON: Go ahead. 8 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. Go ahead, Craig. 9 MR. COLLIER: Along those lines, you could 10 do an alternative either MX1 -- or in the 11 recommendation, is approve MX1, or, in the 12 alternative, an Overlay, as has been suggested. 13 That way you've given the Commission the 14 option, and if -- 15 MR. TRIAS: For example, the Industrial 16 District Overlay changed the size of the parcel 17 to 10,000 square feet in that area only, and it 18 was done specifically as an Overlay for that 19 area. Those kinds of things can be done, but 20 I'm not sure it's going to be any faster than 21 reviewing the Code again and trying to explain 22 it better, so that we all feel comfortable with 23 what's being proposed. 24 MS. ANDERSON: I would not want to see this 25 area go to large assemblages or, you know,

Page 189 1 another large development, which is going to 2 garner even more traffic into the Residential 3 area west of Le Jeune. We're not solving a 4 problem, but -- we're resolving a small 5 problem, but making a bigger problem down the 6 line for all of the residents that are between 7 Red Road and Le Jeune Road, which is already a 8 pretty significant thoroughfare at certain 9 times. 10 So those are my comments on that. Do you 11 have any thoughts on the green space, you know, 12 of putting in Article 2-405 and applying it to 13 this area as well. 14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. Rene. 15 You may have to unmute Rene. 16 MR. BEHAR: Rene is doing exercise in his 17 bicycle. 18 MR. BEHAR: May I, while we wait for Rene? 19 My only reason is that, if any chance the 20 Code is not going to move, you know, as fast as 21 we may want to expect, there's a mechanism here 22 that could allow this to move forward. 23 Mr. Trias and Mr. Collier, that's my intent. 24 MR. TRIAS: The answer is, yes, and we need 25 to think about it a little bit and I need to	Page 190 1 confer with Mr. Collier. 2 MR. COLLIER: So I think Miriam -- can you 3 unmute Miriam please? 4 MS. RAMOS: Hi, again, everybody. Ramon, I 5 think that Craig's suggestion is a real good 6 solution. What I'm hearing, from at least the 7 Board Members that have spoken, is that they're 8 in favor. So perhaps a vote that recommends to 9 the Commission either/or would resolve the 10 timing issue and allow this to move forward in 11 either event. 12 In other words, if the Commission takes too 13 long or needs additional time or whatever comes 14 up with the Zoning Code Re-write, that it 15 wouldn't hold up the rezone. 16 MR. TRIAS: Or the Commission may not 17 change the Code, that there still be an 18 opportunity to do this. 19 MS. RAMOS: Correct. So I think that the 20 best -- since this is a recommending Board, 21 maybe the best thing is to recommend either/or. 22 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. I agree. 23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. Rene. 24 MR. MURAI: Yeah. A couple of questions. 25 One is, there are some lots that are not
Page 191 1 included, right? 2 MR. TRIAS: No. They're included in that 3 rectangle. There were some lots that had Site 4 Specifics regulations, and those were special, 5 and that's the third request, but they're 6 included. 7 MR. MURAI: So all of the lots in these 8 blocks are included? 9 MR. TRIAS: Yes. 10 MR. MURAI: Okay. And the second question 11 I have is, I see that with Mediterranean Bonus, 12 you can go up to five stories, I think; is that 13 correct? 14 MR. TRIAS: Six, with the right size 15 parcel. 16 MR. MURAI: Right. And there's a whole 17 bunch of -- obviously, a lot of Single-Family 18 homes there. How is that going to impact all 19 of these Single-Family homes, if they go all of 20 the way to six stories, the people who are 21 still living there? 22 MR. TRIAS: It's unlikely that that will be 23 the standard of development, because you have 24 to provide parking, you have to do many things. 25 So it's more likely that the typical	Page 192 1 development will be smaller and more 2 incremental. 3 MR. MURAI: Yeah. My concern, Ramon, would 4 be that somehow or another somebody assembles 5 parcels and goes up to six stories and you 6 still have, you know, a whole bunch of 7 Single-Family homes there, and, you know, it's 8 going to make it even worse than it is today. 9 I mean, other than that, I'm all in favor. I 10 understand the issues, the traffic and so 11 forth, but my only concern is that. 12 And I'm just want to, you know, make sure 13 that the residents know that it can go up to 14 six stories, not just three stories. That's my 15 concern. 16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. Thank you. 17 Chip. 18 MR. WITHERS: Yeah. When I was Chair of 19 the Zoning Board in 1991, we were talking about 20 this issue. So I think, in all fairness, if we 21 wait another month or two months to get this 22 done -- I don't see the urgency to push the 23 Commission for an Overlay. I would rather go 24 with the MX1. 25 Look, we already have an attorney that's

Page 193 1 representing 25 homeowners, and I'm not going 2 to speculate on anything, but when you see an 3 attorney saying they're speaking on behalf of 4 25 homeowners, there has to be some kind of 5 assemblage going on. That concerns me. 6 And I'm not -- listen, I'm very happy for 7 these folks. I hope they have a very big pay 8 day, because they're going to sell their homes 9 and make a lot of money, and that's what it's 10 all about. So their investment was good in 11 Coral Gables, and I'm glad the City Beautiful 12 is paying them back. 13 I do agree with Rhonda, and I do agree with 14 Mr. Murai, that, you know, my concern is -- 15 here's an opportunity for, you know, a big area 16 of Coral Gables, that we have the right 17 opportunity now to let the Commission vision 18 it, design it correctly. Let's do something 19 right. Let's not just allow, you know, big 20 assemblages to take place and big buildings to 21 get built. 22 I'm in favor of the MX1. Hopefully, with 23 the changes, it will allow smaller sites to 24 develop, that we kind of keep those heights and 25 densities down.	Page 194 1 MR. MURAI: I'm with you. 2 MR. TORRE: I concur with what Chip just 3 said. I think we should just probably do the 4 right thing and wait for it to be done with the 5 MX1. All of the specifics to MX1 we discussed 6 earlier are appropriate, and what's on CL right 7 now is not. So MX1 is more comfortable for us. 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you. 9 Maria. 10 MR. TORRE: I'm sorry, I am in favor, so 11 that's not an issue for me to delay or anything 12 else. It's just to make sure that it goes 13 through the right motions. 14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Sorry about that, 15 Venny. I thought you were done. I apologize. 16 Maria. 17 MS. VELEZ: I agree wholeheartedly. I like 18 the MX1 concept here. I do think, also, that 19 we do need to take into account the surrounding 20 area. I remember when Village of Merrick Park 21 came up, traffic increased in the surrounding 22 areas, in the vicinity, in the Residential 23 area. So we do have to look at that, as well, 24 and do traffic calming and looking at the 25 bigger picture. I think that's a really wise
Page 195 1 thing that Rhonda brought up. 2 I think MX1 would be a perfect solution for 3 this neighborhood. I'm all in favor of going 4 forward with the MX1. I don't think we need to 5 go into Overlays or anything at this point. I 6 don't think that would go any quicker. If, for 7 any reason, MX1 doesn't go through with the 8 Rewrite, then we could certainly consider 9 putting elements of an MX1 concept into a 10 specific Overlay at that time, but definitely I 11 would hold off and do the MX1. Thank you. 12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you. 13 I agree also with the MX1. I would have a 14 concern about massing a lot of properties and 15 what that would do to other homes or 16 Residential areas or homeowners that do not 17 want to sell. So I agree with the comments 18 that are being made. 19 Is there a -- 20 MR. BEHAR: By the way, Eibi, excuse me -- 21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes, go ahead, Robert. 22 MR. BEHAR: What I was proposing is, at the 23 end result, is what the MX1 will allow, okay. 24 It was not to be able to assemble big lots. 25 The intent is, at the end, it will be exactly	Page 196 1 the same thing that the MX1 would allow, 2 nothing more, nothing less. 3 I agree that we need to be very 4 restrictive, and, yes, Chip, you're right, this 5 has to be planned correctly, because this is an 6 opportunity that the City has to create 7 something very good here, but what I was 8 proposing, again, is nothing more than what the 9 MX1 would allow -- eventually allow. 10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. Is there 11 anybody that would like to make a motion? 12 MR. MURAI: Yeah. I'd like to make a 13 motion to approve the recommendation of the 14 Staff, so it could go to the Commission, with 15 our recommendation, with a caveat, at least, 16 just to -- it's not part of the motion, but 17 perhaps the Commission or the Staff can mention 18 to the Commission my concern that I'm not sure 19 this is an appropriate area for six-story 20 buildings and Mediterranean Bonuses. 21 MR. COLLIER: Well, we're going to have to 22 take each of the items separately, and, of 23 course, you can put those comments on all of 24 the items, but the first item is going to be 25 the Comp Plan change. That's Item E-3.

Page 197 1 So the first motion would relate to E-3, 2 and any of the comments or recommendations you 3 want to add to that. 4 MR. MURAI: I move it, with the comments 5 that I made. 6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So you're moving E-3 7 with the comments that you just made? 8 MR. MURAI: Yes. 9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Is there a second? 10 MS. VELEZ: I'll second. 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Maria second. 12 Any discussion? 13 MS. ANDERSON: A couple of questions, 14 really. With the Mediterranean Bonus, a lot of 15 times, we've asked the architect, to put in 16 some other, you know, more green space, things 17 of that nature, not lower the units per acre, 18 and then allow the application of Med Bonuses 19 to get some better -- 20 MR. MURAI: I did not understand what you 21 said. 22 MS. ANDERSON: Okay. 23 MR. MURAI: Maybe I didn't hear you. 24 MS. ANDERSON: Okay. With the 25 Mediterranean Bonuses, we get the benefits of	Page 198 1 some better architecture and green space is 2 increased in areas. Perhaps what we could do 3 is lower the density down, so that with the Med 4 bonuses, you're not getting to do larger sizes, 5 that you're concerned about. This is just 6 really a discussion item for our question now. 7 Mr. Trias. 8 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, you could do many things 9 like that. It's just that it would require 10 additional amendments and it may complicate 11 this a little bit too much. Almost you would 12 have to do what Robert Behar is proposing, 13 which is an Overlay. I'm not sure. I mean, I 14 think if the concern is the height and the 15 number of stories, maybe it's better just to 16 directly talk about that, height and stories, 17 more than density, I think. 18 MS. ANDERSON: Okay. 19 MR. MURAI: My concern, as I stated, is the 20 effect, as I think Chip stated, on the people 21 who are not selling, the people who are going 22 to continue to live there. All of a sudden, 23 they have a six-story building, that takes away 24 sun, light and everything. I just want to pass 25 that on to the Commission to consider and to
Page 199 1 the Staff. 2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Right now, what we do 3 have is, we have a motion and we have a second. 4 Do you want to amend your motion? 5 MR. MURAI: No. 6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Or do you want to keep 7 it the way it is? 8 MR. TRIAS: The motion is for the Land Use 9 change, and the Land Use change doesn't control 10 the Zoning details that we're talking about. 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Correct. It's as 12 presented, for the MX1. 13 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, but the first motion is 14 Land Use only. 15 MR. COLLIER: The first one doesn't relate 16 to the MX1, which is the Zoning category. This 17 is to change it from -- there are some parts 18 that are Single-Family high density and other 19 parts that are Multi-Family Duplex Density, 20 also Commercial Low-Rise intensity; is that 21 correct, Ramon? 22 MR. TRIAS: Yes, sir. Yes, sir. And the 23 change of Land Use, is just change of Land Use, 24 and it has nothing to do with MX1. 25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. Rene, is that	Page 200 1 still your motion on E-3? 2 MR. MURAI: Yes. 3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Maria, you second it? 4 MS. VELEZ: Yes. 5 MR. TORRE: This is zero setback on the 6 sides. If you have a home, and you have six 7 stories, you have a problem either way. 8 (Unintelligible.) 9 The issue is the architecture and the 10 parking, and there's going to be a right answer 11 there, and I think there are some other 12 complexities in that regard. So I'm not sure, 13 that if we start to change things that are 14 specific to MX1 right now, are we going to be 15 very smart, because we have to see how the 16 whole thing really shapes up. I think we have 17 to understand MX1 a little better. 18 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. And the other thing I 19 would say to everyone is that, keep in mind 20 that we also have the Board of Architects' 21 review. We have a lot of other types of review 22 that ensure high quality buildings. It's not 23 only Zoning, in a pure sense. 24 MR. MURAI: But, Ramon, if you're entitled 25 to the Mediterranean Bonus based on your

Page 201 1 architecture or whatever the criteria is, 2 you're entitled to that. But it goes to the 3 Board of Architects. Can the Board of 4 Architects simply say, we don't want three 5 story buildings here? 6 MR. TRIAS: The Board of Architects has to 7 approve your project. It's not like you're 8 just entitled -- 9 MR. MURAI: Yes. No, I understand they 10 have to approve their project, but can they 11 just simply say, well, we don't like five-story 12 or six-story buildings in this area? I doubt 13 it. 14 MR. TRIAS: It is not unusual to change the 15 massing of buildings, and I was thinking more 16 in terms of what -- the issue, what happens 17 when you have a house next to you, and you're 18 trying -- well, you know, those are the types 19 of discussions that take place most of the 20 time. However, if there's a concern, certainly 21 we can look at it more closely. 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Craig, if you could, 23 please, right now, so I understand this 24 correctly, we're voting only on E-3. And E-3 25 only deals with moving it from Single-Family	Page 202 1 Density or Multi-Family Duplex Density to 2 Commercial Low-Rise intensity. It does not 3 take into account the MX1 yet. 4 MR. COLLER: That's correct. And I guess 5 the concerns about the height could be -- your 6 recommendation may be more applicable to the 7 MX1 District and what would be permitted. 8 MR. TRIAS: Yes. 9 MR. COLLER: So I think it would be more 10 germane to E-4 than probably E-3. 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Correct. 12 MS. VELEZ: Oh, okay. 13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Correct. That's why I 14 was asking that question. 15 MR. BEHAR: But if the MX1 is not approved, 16 what happens then? 17 MR. COLLER: And that's why I said to all 18 of you in the very beginning of this, to a 19 certain extent, we're looking at a theoretical 20 Zoning District. You are making a 21 recommendation. When we talked about, well, 22 there was some discussion and some people 23 thought, well, maybe we should have an 24 alternative to have an Overlay, so that would 25 also be a recommendation.
Page 203 1 If we were at the Commission stage, we'd 2 have to be a lot more specific and the title 3 would be more specific, but because you're 4 making a recommendation, you have the ability 5 to be more flexible in what you want to tell 6 the Commission, and then the Commission will 7 have to tailor the item accordingly. 8 MR. MURAI: Okay. Yeah, I'd like to move 9 my motion please. 10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. We have the 11 motion as Rene. We have a second from Maria. 12 Call the roll, please. 13 THE SECRETARY: Rene Murai? 14 MR. MURAI: Yes. 15 THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? 16 MR. TORRE: No. I think the issue of the 17 height should not be brought up at this point. 18 (Unintelligible). I think we have to really 19 get into the means of this, before we start 20 putting restrictions on what's going to get 21 approved. So the answer is, no. 22 THE SECRETARY: Maria Velez? 23 MS. VELEZ: Yes. 24 THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? 25 MR. WITHERS: Yes.	Page 204 1 THE SECRETARY: Rhonda Anderson? 2 MS. ANDERSON: Yes. 3 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar? 4 MR. BEHAR: Yes. 5 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat? 6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes. 7 The second item, we're now going into E-4, 8 which is going to be where the MX1 is. 9 MR. BEHAR: But we can't do MX1 now. We 10 can't do this. That's the conflict we have 11 created. 12 Mr. Coller, can you elaborate on that? 13 MR. COLLER: Yes. As I said before, 14 because we knew in the very beginning that MX1 15 doesn't exist at this point; however, at some 16 point, the Board -- the Commission is going to 17 have to take your recommendation, making a 18 decision on what they want to do. 19 So yours is a recommendation, and it is 20 dealing with a potential Zoning category which 21 at this time does not exist. However, because 22 you're making a recommendation, not a decision, 23 we believe that you could make that decision. 24 You could also make recommendations for 25 alternatives, if you wish.

Page 205 1 MR. MURAI: I'd like to make a motion. 2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Go ahead, please. 3 MR. MURAI: Yeah. The motion is, when the 4 Commission approves the Zoning Code and the 5 changes that were considered today to create 6 the MX1 category, that the Commission -- that 7 we recommend that this area be included or the 8 Zoning of this area be changed to MX1, with my 9 comment on the Mediterranean Bonus and my 10 concern about the height. That's not part of 11 the motion. That's just for the Staff to push 12 on. 13 So the motion is to approve -- when the MX1 14 is created, to approve a Zoning change in this 15 area. 16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: And would that be 17 without the alternative of an Overlay? 18 MR. MURAI: Without it. 19 MR. BEHAR: But just as a discussion, Rene, 20 if the -- the alternative will achieve exactly 21 the same thing that the MX1 will achieve, okay. 22 What happens if the MX1 is delayed for, I'm 23 going to play devil's -- a year. We're going 24 to wait for a year for this to be. You don't 25 think that an alternative that will achieve	Page 206 1 exactly the same right -- 2 MR. MURAI: No. My answer is that I agree 3 with those who said that we should -- this 4 doesn't have to be done this way. It has to be 5 done the correct way, with the whole Zoning 6 Code and the new Zoning classifications. So my 7 motion stands as it is. 8 MS. ANDERSON: I agree with you. 9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Is there a second on 10 his motion? 11 MS. ANDERSON: I'll second the motion, and 12 the comments. 13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have a first, 14 second. Any discussion? 15 Having heard none, call the roll, please, Jill. 16 THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? 17 MR. TORRE: I want to be clear to Staff, 18 the residents, Commissioners, that I'm for this 19 item. The only thing I am against is the 20 restriction on the Mediterranean Bonus, because 21 we have not studied or viewed MX1 substantially 22 as it pertains to this area to make that call 23 currently. So I'm voting, no, not because I'm 24 against the item; I'm voting against the 25 restriction of the Mediterranean Bonus.
Page 207 1 MR. MURAI: But, Venny, the motion doesn't 2 include any restriction on Mediterranean Bonus. 3 That's just a comment that I wanted the Staff 4 to push up to the Commission. 5 MR. TORRE: Okay. I will put that I am 6 right now in favor and my vote should be yes on 7 both items, the first one and this one. I 8 understood it to be that you wanted it to go up 9 with that being stricken from the change. 10 MR. MURAI: That's just a comment, that I 11 wanted the Commission to consider the effect 12 that the bonus will have on the adjoining 13 residents, and I think Chip spoke to the same. 14 MR. TORRE: Can I revise my previous vote? 15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Venny, let's finish 16 this one first, and then we'll ask Craig. 17 MR. TORRE: Sure. I just want to make sure 18 I don't get seen as somebody who was against 19 this, because that's not the case at all. 20 MR. COLLIER: Well, if he wants to change 21 his vote, let him change it now. 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: For the previous? 23 MR. TORRE: The clarification that came 24 from Rene made me understand that that's not 25 what the intent is. So that vote should be	Page 208 1 yes. Thank you. 2 MR. COLLIER: Okay. 3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. Then we're 4 changing the previous vote for Venny to a yes. 5 And, then, on this one? 6 MR. TORRE: Yes, sir. The answer is, yes, 7 both times. 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you. 9 THE SECRETARY: For E-3 and E-4 is yes? 10 MR. COLLIER: Oh, I'm sorry. You already 11 voted, no, on the first one and we moved on to 12 the second one. Was it your intent to 13 change -- 14 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: That's why I was 15 asking -- 16 MR. COLLIER: It's a little late on that 17 one, you can ask for -- well, you weren't on 18 the prevailing side. 19 MR. WITHERS: I'll bring it up on the 20 prevailing side. I'll bring it up as soon as 21 we get this voted on. I'll bring it up. 22 MR. COLLIER: All right. We can have a 23 reconsideration. 24 MR. WITHERS: I'll bring it up. I'll bring 25 it up.

Page 209 1 MR. TORRE: Thank you. 2 THE SECRETARY: Maria Velez? 3 MS. VELEZ: Yes. 4 THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? 5 MR. WITHERS: Yes. 6 THE SECRETARY: Rhonda Anderson? 7 MS. ANDERSON: Yes. 8 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar? 9 MR. BEHAR: And just for clarification, all 10 this does is, we're going to wait for the MX1 11 to be implemented and go into effect before 12 this area goes into effect, correct? 13 MR. MURAI: That's my motion. 14 MR. BEHAR: I'm going to vote, yes, on it. 15 THE SECRETARY: Rene Murai? 16 MR. MURAI: Yes. 17 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat? 18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes. I'm going to 19 vote, yes, but if I may say, I would like for 20 the Commission to consider an Overlay, if it 21 helps out, not to create bigger density or hurt 22 the neighbors, but if it helps the process. 23 MR. MURAI: Just a recommendation. Fine. 24 MR. BEHAR: Mr. Chair, I agree with you a 25 hundred percent.	Page 210 1 MR. WITHERS: I would like to recall a 2 previous item, Mr. Chair. 3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes, sir. 4 MR. WITHERS: The item right before this. 5 I'd like some clarification on one of our Board 6 Member's vote, if that's possible. 7 MR. COLLER: We have a motion for 8 re-consideration. We need a second. 9 MR. MURAI: Second. 10 MR. COLLER: You can voice vote say, aye, 11 so it brings it back to you. 12 (All Board Members voted aye.) 13 MR. COLLER: Okay. So now we're back to 14 the original motion, and, then, is the desire 15 then to call the roll again on the motion? 16 MR. WITHERS: Yes. I don't know if I heard 17 the vote correctly. So maybe we can revote on 18 this thing, what do you think? 19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Aye. 20 MR. COLLER: Sure. You're now at the point 21 where you can call the roll. It's approval in 22 accordance with Department recommendations. I 23 think it was a straight approval on the Comp 24 Plan amendment. 25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Jill.
Page 211 1 THE SECRETARY: Rene Murai? 2 MR. MURAI: Yes. 3 THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? 4 MR. TORRE: Yes. 5 THE SECRETARY: Maria Velez? 6 MS. VELEZ: Yes. 7 THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? 8 MR. WITHERS: Yes. 9 THE SECRETARY: Rhonda Anderson? 10 MS. ANDERSON: Yes, and re-incorporating 11 the prior comments. 12 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar? 13 MR. BEHAR: Yes. 14 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat? 15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes. 16 And, now, the last item is E-5, correct, 17 Craig? 18 MR. COLLER: Correct. 19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Is there a motion? 20 MR. MURAI: What is E-5? 21 MR. TRIAS: E-5 has Site Specifics on a few 22 of duplex properties that limit the height to 23 one story. It's a Site Specific, I believe, 24 from the 1970s. 25 MR. TORRE: I'll move this.	Page 212 1 MS. ANDERSON: Does this cover all of the 2 lots or just some of them? 3 MR. TRIAS: Originally, it was all of the 4 duplexes facing San Sebastian. 5 MS. VELEZ: Okay. So we would be deleting 6 the height requirement of the one story height 7 requirement? 8 MR. TRIAS: Well, there's a requirement for 9 height, but also a bungalow type, which is not 10 very clear in my mind what that means. 11 MR. MURAI: It's not clear in your mind and 12 you want us to vote? 13 MS. TRIAS: It's not clear in my mind that 14 it means anything. 15 MR. MURAI: I have no idea what you're 16 saying. 17 MR. COLLER: I think the desire is to 18 eliminate the bungalow mention; is that 19 correct? 20 MR. TRIAS: Yes, sir. 21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: That's the way I 22 interpreted it, also. 23 MS. VELEZ: I will move this. I'll be happy 24 to move this item, E-5. 25 MR. BEHAR: I'll second.

Page 213 1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Hold on, guys. I 2 think Venny went ahead and made a motion. 3 MR. TORRE: It doesn't matter. 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: It doesn't matter. 5 Sorry. 6 Maria makes the motion. Robert seconds it. 7 Any discussion? None. Call the roll, 8 please. 9 THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers? 10 MR. WITHERS: Yes. 11 THE SECRETARY: Rhonda Anderson? 12 MS. ANDERSON: Yes. 13 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar? 14 MR. BEHAR: Yes. 15 THE SECRETARY: Rene Murai? 16 MR. MURAI: Yes. 17 THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre? 18 MR. TORRE: Yes. 19 THE SECRETARY: Maria Velez? 20 MS. VELEZ: Yes. 21 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat? 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes. 23 I'd like to thank everybody for their 24 patience for sitting here for about 25 four-and-a-half hours and going through this.	Page 214 1 I know it's unusual times, but I wish everybody 2 well, and I thank everybody for their service 3 and what everybody is doing. It's much 4 appreciated. 5 And I also want to thank the Staff and the 6 outside consultant for the hard work and all of 7 the time that they have put in, and I don't 8 want them to think it's not noticed or 9 appreciated. Thank you. 10 We already have our set date for the next 11 meeting. Jill, what date was that? 12 THE SECRETARY: Next meeting is August 13 12th. 14 MS. VELEZ: No. 15 MS. ANDERSON: No, 19. 16 MR. TRIAS: Next meeting is August 12th, 17 the regular meeting, and then the Special 18 Meeting is the 19th. 19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So we have set up two. 20 We have one a date specific. 21 Okay. Is there a motion to adjourn? 22 MR. MURAI: I'll move it. 23 MS. ANDERSON: Move it. 24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have it moved. 25 Second. Everybody in favor?
Page 215 1 MS. ANDERSON: Second. 2 (The Board voted aye.) 3 (Thereupon, the meeting was concluded at 8:40 4 p.m.) 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Page 216 1 C E R T I F I C A T E 2 3 S T A T E O F F L O R I D A : 4 S S . 5 C O U N T Y O F M I A M I - D A D E : 6 7 8 9 I, NIEVES SANCHEZ, Court Reporter, and a Notary 10 Public for the State of Florida at Large, do hereby 11 certify that I was authorized to and did 12 stenographically report the foregoing proceedings and 13 that the transcript is a true and complete record of my 14 stenographic notes. 15 16 DATED this 6th day of August, 2020. 17 18 19 S I G N A T U R E O N F I L E 20 _____ 21 N I E V E S S A N C H E Z 22 23 24 25