

CITY OF CORAL GABLES

--MEMORANDUM--



TO: Honorable Mayor and Commissioners
CC: City Manager, City Attorney and Development Services Interim Director
FROM: Vice Mayor Rhonda Anderson
DATE: March 3, 2025
SUBJECT: 2021 Blue Ribbon Committee Transcripts

In response to inquiries from residents concerning the 2021 Blue Ribbon Committee's discussions regarding proposed revisions to the Zoning Code, attached please find a complete set of the transcripts of the committee's meetings.

Highlighted in yellow are the areas in which inquiries were received after a Commissioner's newsletter transmitted on February 26, 2025 inaccurately claimed that the Blue Ribbon Committee "suggested" conceptual review should occur at the Planning and Zoning Board level in 2021, "but that [it] had not been acted upon by the prior Commission."

**City of Coral Gables Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting
July 22, 2021
City Commission Chambers
405 Biltmore Way, Coral Gables, FL**

Blue Ribbon Committee Members

Chairperson Felix Pardo

Board Member Aramis "Mitch" Alvarez

Board Member Robert Behar

Board Member Willy Bermello

Board Member Glenn Pratt

Board Member Javier Salman

City Staff

Assistant City Attorney, Gustavo Ceballos

City Architect, Juan Riesco

Historical Resources Director, Warren Adams

Public Speaker(s)

William Arthur

Sue Kawalerski

Samuel Lawson

Gordon Sokoloff

Maria Magdalena Estupinan

Maria Longo (phonetic)

Alexander Adams

Enrique Bernal

Maria Cruz

Jackson "Rip" Holmes

Board Member Pardo: Mr. City Attorney, I'd like to say something. Just to clarify, the board members all received -- this is something that I came up with because I was both at the Sunshine

meeting and at the Commission meeting where I heard the public and I spoke to the Commission twice. I just took down some notes and I put these. This is not meant to be disrespectful to the board members. This is just to put a mark down of what the key issues were before you start your presentation, so they all understand.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Not a problem at all.

Board Member Pardo: Thank you.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Before we do the presentation, I'd like for all the board members to give a quick introduction of themselves. It's just for the purposes of everyone knowing who exactly is on this board and the -- and how we're basically going to proceed forward. I'll go ahead and address after.

City Architect Riesco: My name is Juan Riesco. I'm the City architect.

Board Member Pratt: Glenn Pratt. I'm the representative member for the Board of Architects.

Board Member Salman: I'm Javier Salman, former Planning and Zoning Board member for eight years and now chairman of the Board of Adjustment.

Board Member Alvarez: My name is Aramis Alvarez, also known as Mitch, practicing architecture on my own independently, and doing small projects that show up in housing.; ex-member of the Board of Architects for two terms.

Board Member Pardo: I'm Felix Pardo. I'm a practicing architect. I've sat on most of the planning -- as chairman of the Planning and Zoning Board, and I sat on the Board of Adjustment two different times, as the chairman of the Board of Architects and a few other things -- a few other committees.

Board Member Bermello: I'm Willy Bermello. I am chairman of Bermello Ajamil and Partners, architects and engineers, practicing architect, residents of Coral Gables for 47 years, and former member of the Board of Adjustment of the City of Coral Gables.

Board Member Behar: Robert Behar. I'm an architect. I have practiced and lived in the Gables for over 30 years, currently a member of the Planning and Zoning Board, and past member of the Board of Architects.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Great. So, I'm still pending the resolution, but I'll go ahead and give a quick brief and overview to all of the people who are watching and in the room. So, if you are aware, in our last City Commission, the Commission decided to create this panel specifically to review Section 5-200 of our current Zoning Code, which is the Mediterranean standards. As part of their resolution to create this committee, they required that all members, as you just heard, are all architects. Five of you were elected and -- were appointed, my apologies, by each one of the Commissioners, and then you have the board as a whole, appointee, Mr. Pratt, and you have the City architect that comprises the seven members of this particular board. And as was previously discussed, the topic of our discussion will be structured strictly around 5-200 and all of the standards that we currently apply in our zoning code. The issue has come up a couple times about process and other aspects of our zoning code that is outside the boundaries of this particular sub-committee, of this blue-ribbon committee. We are going strictly on the Mediterranean standards, how they apply and what we believe would help the City implement this Mediterranean bonus in a more concise way. And as Mr. Pardo so -- put so eloquently, we tend to stray off the intent of this Mediterranean bonus. So, with that said, does the board want to --? Are there any motions to elect a chairperson?

Board Member Salman: I'll make a motion to elect Felix Pardo as our chair.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Is there a second?

Board Member Alvarez: I'll second that.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Mr. Pardo, do you accept that nomination?

Board Member Pardo: Sure, I accept that.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Okay.

City Clerk Urquia: All in favor? All in favor?

The Board Members (Collectively): Aye.

City Clerk Urquia: Any opposed?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Well, I'll turn it over to you, Mr. Pardo. I'll be sitting right over there, if there's any legal question that do come up, feel free. And if there's any other questions, the City Clerk and the City architect are more than here -- more than happy to help out in any way we can.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you.

City Clerk Urquia: One quick thing, Mr. Pardo. Also, at the request of Mr. Pardo, Mr. Adams is here. He has been asked to be present at the meetings in case any questions arise with his expertise.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. Alright, so one of the issues that has come up that has been brought to the Commission specifically and the Administration, is the certain issues based on developments that have already been built and/or are under construction. So, getting back to the original standards of the Mediterranean and the intent of the Mediterranean bonuses, which goes back to

1986, the bonuses were created specifically and for the design of Mediterranean architecture in keeping with the original intent of what the founder George Merrick had intended from an architectural and planning standpoint. So, in 1984, a specific building was built at that time called the Bank of Coral Gables, which is on the corner of Ponce de Leon and Almeria Avenue. At that time, that was the first commercial heavily Mediterranean Revival building erected in the commercial district. And this was in answer to several glass boxes that had gone up and other styles that had gone up, which worried at that time, the Commission and many of the residents. So that was back in 1986. After that building was built, there were a series of other buildings that were also designed using a Mediterranean Revival design, and Mitch Alvarez had to do with the Colonnade building, which was designed in such a way that the developers, Michael Fung and David Weaver, were instrumental with Mitch to be able to save the historic Colonnade building, which still stands there today. They developed around it. If memory serves me right, they were able to obtain 11 variances from the Commission and they were able to, number one, save the historic building, and number two, inspire again, more of the Mediterranean Revival using all sorts of elements there. Then the Hyatt building was built on Douglas and Alhambra, and those three buildings, I think basically went up -- if memory serves me right -- without the implementation of the Mediterranean ordinance, which was also known as Chapter 30(xxx) in the former zoning code. So, once the Mediterranean bonus regulations were added, the intent was clear on the purpose, and we can have copies of the original zoning code, specifically the purpose, where you see exactly what the intent was at that time. Over time, the Code has evolved and there was a major rewrite in 2007, and that was adopted by the Commission and basically took all previous resolutions -- basically nullified them and started off new with this zoning code, which had a few kinks in it, and that has been altered over time. So, the reason that we are here is that there is a concern or a perception of a lack of compatibility between existing neighborhoods and new developments. Now, although our charge is to be specific on Section 5-202, which are the Mediterranean bonuses, please keep in mind that Section 5-102, which are design standards, is very clear that the Board of Architects and the City architect has 20 factors that they have to be reviewing of the projects that come before them, first on a preliminary level, and then as a final adaptation. We have the City architect here, and we have a very capable representative of the

Board of Architects here. And the -- sometimes what has happened is in the discussion of these projects that are asking for Mediterranean bonuses, apparently, sometimes the massing, the height, the uses, the compatibility -- which are all part of 5-102 -- are not necessarily looked at with a keen eye because somehow, they think that these are zoning issues. So, therefore, one of the things that I think that this board should consider and discuss is on Section 5-102, which are the design standards, to make sure that based on the fact that the Board of Architects has the charge and it says specifically, must evaluate each one of the factors, because of that, I would like to ask the City architect and the representative of the Board of Architects to make sure that they can confirm that this is something that even though it may not have been done recently, will be done in the future.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chair, can I ask a question?

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: Maybe I heard him wrong, but I thought the City Attorney had said that this panel is going to be focused on Section 5-200.

Chairperson Pardo: True and...

Board Member Bermello: Are you suggesting that we also consider...

Chairperson Pardo: No, we're not legislatively -- what we are talking about is altering or amending only 202.

Board Member Bermello: Right.

Chairperson Pardo: 201 design standards are perfect there, but it's a matter of execution.

Board Member Bermello: Right. And...

Chairperson Pardo: But the board -- you know, you've sat on the board.

Board Member Bermello: And some issues may be of compliance rather than whether it's on the...

Chairperson Pardo: Correct. And that's when -- since we have -- and you're absolute -- a hundred percent right. Since we have the City architect and the representative of the Board of Architects, just wanted to make sure because sometimes either because they may be instructed or they may assume that -- you know, these things that they should be looking at, which are in black and white and don't have to be changed in any way, shape or form under design standards for all projects is a clear signal that they have to be looking at that in order to make it more compatible, in order to make it more pleasing to the surrounding neighborhood.

Board Member Bermello: To me -- and I guess at some point, we'll all get into a discussion from our personal experience in working in the City, and you've alluded that part of this reason is a number of projects that I'm sure citizens have responded, maybe not in a positive way. And you know, we all go through the City and we all see projects that you sometimes wonder how they actually happened, and some of these are not too far from here. And in many cases, I see two things, I guess, that maybe even any regular citizen would see. Buildings that seem to encroach right up to the public right-of-way with absolutely no front setbacks, no sense of arrival. And if you drive today on US 1, you are stricken by what you see in at least two very large projects. Usually, when you have the opportunity and you're blessed with that opportunity of having -- of being the architect for a large project is a tremendous responsibility of stewardship, not just for your client, but for the community that you serve. And as I look at the ordinance and you look at the abilities of someone to encroach, and it's written in black and white, you know, and you don't have to go too far as to why those buildings are so close to the public realm, because we allow it.

Chairperson Pardo: Correct.

Board Member Bermello: And you know, and I think those are areas that we can -- I would certainly focus on. You know, I always wondered -- and he happens to be a client of mine. I wasn't the architect, but how was the Aloft built so close to Le Jeune Road, a high-speed traveled arterial, the same on US 1. So, I think there are areas that we can go in and tweak. I recall -- let me just -- I got enough white hair to remember when the Mediterranean bonus ordinance was -- and what they were trying to accomplish. And as an incentive, you know, obviously, the FAR, because, you know, we're in a free society and you get more by providing incentives than by being punitive and requiring someone to do X, Y and Z, and allow the marketplace. But what happens is that in the definition of what is Mediterranean, which is what we all strive to, and we've come up with a series of elements and components that if you do X, Y and Z, you're Mediterranean, and that, therefore, it's going to be a good design. And as it often happens, you don't have good design. You do get those elements, you can check the box, but you're left with something that is less than desirable. There's a particular project done by one of our colleagues here that I love. It happens to not be Mediterranean, but it's sensitive, it's well-designed. It's modern. It has a beautiful tree on the rooftop. And you know, maybe, you know, just good, complementary, sensitive design with well-planned urban design response to the neighborhood. You talk about complementary and -- so maybe it's a time that good, sensitive, smart building be given maybe as much due as a particular style. If you read about George Merrick, I mean, he was a master in sales. And you know, at that time, just past the Columbus exposition, you know, and the (INAUDIBLE) movement, the City Beautiful movement in this country, he came up with a plan that he thought would be the best way to sell. When it got tough, he came up with different styles. So, as we know -- so maybe it isn't just a cookie-cutter of the Mediterranean, which obviously needs to be looked at. But I know before today, I've talked with many of my colleagues, and I think we aspire to make sure that we have excellent design. Maybe it doesn't come sometimes by way of Mediterranean. I've seen some projects done on Ponce de Leon that I think are extremely charming, which are more on the Bahamian/Bermudan style. I forget -- I don't know exactly who's the architect behind them, very pleasant. So, maybe we look at that. I would focus on what other bad things that we're all reacting to. And for me, the issue of encroachment is a serious item. You

know, I don't care what age, where you come from, where your background, your intellectual ability. You drive down US 1 in some of these projects and you see the -- and then you're impacted by the mammoth factor of it, not because of the FAR, but because they're very large land areas, and there's a lack of green space. It's not even the height. It's the fact that it's almost like on steroids. That's kind of like my sense of it. I mean, I grew up in major cities that have much more height. You know, as an architect, I designed one of the tallest buildings in Miami, the Four Seasons, so it's not an issue of height offends me. But it's -- when it's done with elegance and sense -- and I think one of the things we have here is, you look at the Mediterranean ordinance, one of the things that it allows you to do is do certain things that I think it becomes a problem. And also, this issue of how do you define "Mediterranean ordinance"? And too many projects can check the box, and they're -- in my opinion at the end of the day, they're not really Mediterranean. They're not Mizner architecture. I even wonder whether there's Mediterranean ordinance when you get past a certain height. If you look at great cities in the world, many of the major cities in Spain or Paris, and after seven stories, you know, it's tough. It's like, you know, you do a 19-story building or a 15-story building, and you try to make it Mediterranean, it's a very tough order. So...

Board Member Behar: It's not appropriate. It's really not (INAUDIBLE). It's not appropriate. And I agree with you a hundred percent. I mean, we have a lot of the same, you know, concerns. I think that what's happening is -- and the fundamental problem is that, yeah, you check those boxes and you put, you know, elements in a composition of the building and you get the Mediterranean, you know, applied a hundred percent. I look at the building that, you know, you're referring to every day. It's in front of my office. And you look at the massing, the articulation, the volume metrically. That building doesn't give anything that it should be considered to be -- in my opinion -- Mediterranean. I think that when you look at the composition and the component of a real Mediterranean -- which, by the way, I don't even think it's seven stories. When you go to Italy, you go to Spain, they're building like three, four, or five stories. And you know, when you see the articulation of those buildings, it's a more broken-down massing. When we look at some of the examples that we've seen lately, they're not. They just go up, and that's a building that, you know, from the get-go that project was -- should never have been allowed to have gone up to that

height and that massiveness. And I think that's the problem we have. I don't think that we should be, you know, focusing on the little detail because you could put a lot of -- for lack of a better word, decoration on a building and you're going to get the 3.5 Mediterranean bonus, you know, incentive. I think it's more important to create spaces, public spaces, to the public benefit that truly make it a more -- a better project for the community. And I think that, you know, in my opinion, this is not broken. It needs to be fixed.

Board Member Bermello: The other thing is, it seems to me that the overwhelming drive is make it as tall and as many units as you possibly can; squeeze it in there, you know. A lot of our clients, you know, they come to us with that mentality. And you know, and they're reacting to the flow in the marketplace. But I mean, we live in a residential community that is really -- the core of Coral Gables is families, families, not one-bedroom tiny units, not two-bedroom tiny units, but people that have kids, people that want to stay here after they age and get to like my age. And maybe some of the things that we should think about is what can we do creatively, thinking outside the box, Mr. Chair, to -- within the Mediterranean, to create the incentives where large units for families are not penalized on the same level as you were doing a one- or two-bedroom units. And that if you decide to provide more open space, provide less units, provide less height, that there be an incentive, an economic incentive to do that. Right now, the incentive is just the opposite: How can you build it as tall as possible; how could you build it with as many units as possible. And maybe we should, in our thinking, introduce -- I'm not saying to change the code, but I'm saying maybe introduce the incentives which don't exist today. And I will tell you, for example, Armando Colina is currently developing a project where the old police building is, which is going in that direction for family living. He's not trying to have as many units as you can. He's trying to have the right units for this community. And so, I think we're giving an opportunity to -- here sitting on this panel -- address some of the issues that I think maybe should have been addressed years ago. And I'm happy to be sitting here with all my colleagues, and hopefully, we can come up with some great ideas that will be well received by the community, and that hopefully will -- I know the project (INAUDIBLE), because you're stare at it in front of your offices every day. I go through those too going into my office every morning. And not to belabor the point or the developer or

the name of the projects, we all know which ones they are. We know that they're -- something went wrong, and unfortunately, we can't erase it. They're going to be there for many, many, many years to come. We look at it every day. It reminds us of the importance of what we're doing here today. And you have my commitment to try to make sure that we do this right, and that we have good design and not just design by checking boxes. You added this detail, so you got it, and then the rest is a mess. So...

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you. Thank you both. I just want to read into the record very quickly, the 20 things that are in the -- in Section 5-012 (sic), design review standards, which really get pulled into because these -- the Mediterranean component of it has to address this also. So, all design in Coral Gables has to address this. And that is that it says, "In applying the standards set forth in Section 5-102, the Board of Architects shall review each of the following items on the application: Number one, aesthetics. Number two, architectural compatibility with neighboring properties and uses. Number three, architecture. Number four, building and building components, including" -- and then there's a litany of accessory structures, arcades, loggias, building appendages, including the following: balconies, et cetera, et cetera. You can read it. D, building entrances, exits for vehicles and pedestrians. E, building height. F, building materials, textures, fenestration, and surfaces. G, building openings. H, building scale and mass. I, building façade step backs, not setbacks, but step backs -- although step backs will be addressed under the Mediterranean. J, building rooflines, a design, then lighting, parking, paved surfaces, signage, stairs, ramps, escalators, et cetera. But the key elements there are architectural compatibility with neighboring properties and uses, building height, building scale and mass, and building façade step backs. So, when you go to 202, right now, we have a series of boxes that we get checked off. If it's residential, you have 6 out of 12. If you have commercial, it's 8 out of 12. I may have them backwards, but the thing is, you check these different things off. The funny thing is that when you look at those checkoffs, some of them have nothing to do with architecture, but you can check them off. So, how do you value someone that is stepped back, a building at great cost to make a tall building look more compatible to its neighboring areas? And then you give them the same

credit for having something which is minimal or silly. What I think we should try to strive to do is to alter those checkoffs.

Board Member Behar: Incentives.

Chairperson Pardo: Those are all incentives, and they were intended to be incentives from the get-go. And the reason that we suggested back in 1984 to the people that we were meeting with -- and that was that we knew that it cost more money to build, but we would have a better product to be able to build it that way. But the point is that when you look at 502 (sic), you have an incredible amount of noise. It has nothing to do with the symphony. Though I took my -- me personally, I took 502 (sic) -- and I encourage all of you to do the same thing -- and I made a few marks, and this is something that I think we should discuss. Because when you go to the charts, it is so discombobulated from the original intent and the word -- the words were clear. So, those incentives are the ones that have to be looked at again. Because when you give someone in feet 70 feet more -- or 70 percent more rather, in feet, in height, not floors, but in feet, or you give them 18 percent more floor areas, or you give them an incentive of having less parking, and then having sat on the Board of Adjustment, how difficult is it to a homeowner to get a variance, a setback variance? They have to basically have a triangular parcel where at no fault of theirs, they cannot enjoy the same setbacks that their neighbors have. So, this is one of the few cities for variances that it can't be a self-imposed variance. But then you take this enormous building -- as Mr. Bermello said -- and now there are no setback. You could go to zero. In fact, you could encroach into a public right-of-way, so it could become even more imposing. Now, there may be areas, and there may be instances where that is okay, and also, depending on where it is. Having a colonnade to cover someone's sidewalk, the same as in Belonia, having an arcade that has a setback and amenities where it becomes more park-like because it's facing a residential area, those are two different circumstances. And the other thing I wanted to mention to all of you is that I think that sometimes if something goes wrong, the blame is normally squarely on the Board of Architects. But sometimes those projects, by the time the Board of Architects sees them, there's no flexibility anymore. So, a schematic preliminary coming into the Board of Architects, where the Board of

Architects and the applicant and the architect have more flexibility to be able to respond to their comments, especially when you're looking at height or massing or many of the key elements of design, I think it would be appreciated by the applicant and by the owner, because at that time, that flexibility still is there. But the problem is that many times -- I won't get into it -- but many times, those projects that already come before the Board of Architects are basically already cooked. And sometimes, once that souffle is cooked, you can't just add salt and pepper. You have to do it during the process. And that is, I think -- the funny thing is, if you go back to the 1986 Chapter 30 Code, it says specifically in black and white -- and we have here, of course, Mr. Warren Adams, from Historic. He was kind enough to provide me at my request a copy of the original 1986 graphic that gave the examples of those eight buildings that are in the Code now, and it had had a very delineated -- you know, these are the elements, not just leave it up to somebody's imagination. And then it also had the actual code there. And in the Code, it said that when the preliminary would come in, and once the Board of Architects would approve the preliminary, then it would go to Zoning for a computation verification that everything was okay before the final plans went back to the Board of Architects for final approval. It is in black and white. And I think that when that was written 30-some odd years ago, it wasn't a bad idea. Because if you go to Zoning and you cook it all and you come back to the Board of Architects for the preliminary review, it's already so far ahead that it gives the Board of Architects less of a say in what the final product should look like. That's something that I'd like you to think about. Yes, Mitch.

Board Member Alvarez: I'd like to make one suggestion, and then make comments, if that's...

Chairperson Pardo: Can you speak into the mic?

Board Member Alvarez: I think each one of the members here have lived through enough projects in his lifetime to learn from visual observation, reaction from the people, comments. We all have families. I go around with my daughter-in-law, or with my wife, and they say, "How did the board ever approve this? This should never been approved." You know, they don't know anything other than what they hear through the environment of family-related architects. But at the end of the

day, they're all sensitive, very sensitive to setbacks. They're very sensitive to how a building touches the ground, at what happens when it gets down at the ground where people interact with the building. They were very sensitive how the building creates environment by transparency, fenestrations, whatever. And many of these things need a tool for the Board of Architects. I think the architects need to have leverage with the zoning. The zoning behaves like a straitjacket. Every time any one of us has taken the pencil to put together a project has realized that zoning is a limiting consideration. If there is enough leeway before decisions are really taken for good or bad, before projects are delayed forever, that interaction -- it was very wisely presented that the zoning interaction with the architects before application of zoning codes -- and you mentioned it, bonuses, incentives. This restriction of the height, 12 feet -- I mean, 12 building floors or 15 building floors. I think people -- once you have a certain height building, whether it's 12 or 14 or 15 is irrelevant. It's not between 12 and 30, but it's between a range. What really transcends is why is it not set back. I don't have a place to walk. My sidewalk is impaired. Where is the transparency? What are you offering the citizens that walk around it every day to go to work or go to school, or go wherever, you know. There is -- the public is reacting intuitively. Personally, I think the biggest bad thing I've seen happen in the City is the building that Agave company is building on the front of the park, and that's a major, major massive building. It doesn't fit in the scale of Coral Gables. And they tried to embellish it with beautiful details, costly details, beautiful, covered arcades with protruding canopies incorporated, while series and beautiful, but the fact remains that it's gigantic to the scale of the City. So massive...

Chairperson Pardo: You're talking about the Plaza.

Board Member Alvarez: Massing is a nominal consideration.

Chairperson Pardo: The Plaza building.

Board Member Alvarez: And a lot of the things...

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE) Circle.

Board Member Alvarez: At an early interaction between the architects, the board, individual architect -- with the zoning, as a practitioner, give them some freedom. Let the people in Zoning drop the straitjacket and open a little bit to understand what is the objective of the project, you know, and let the process of creation of the space be evolving, and many other things. I think each one of us could put a list to experiences, thoughts that each one develops as we move around and live and bring it in for our next meeting. Put it in writing, recommendations, and let's create some opinion consensus that is favorable.

Chairperson Pardo: Mitch, when you did the Shops of Merrick, how did you work with the City because of all the open spaces and the tiering of the shops?

Board Member Alvarez: Well, we confronted enormous opposition just because people thought that the traffic would be brutal. I tried to explain them. (INAUDIBLE) company had put \$800,000 for traffic improvements on the table, and that means traffic lights, turnarounds, rotundas, landscaping, signals. I have never experienced any traffic problem there. And as a matter of fact, the way the project evolved, it's a beautiful project. It's an urban space like the City has no other, where you can bring your family, babies, kids, older people, and spend a Sunday afternoon. It's enjoyable. But there was enough flexibility and there was no straitjacket there, and the spaces were allowed to exist. If everybody approaches a development where you have to maximize the square footage because the FAR tells you you can build 3.0, and you're just building 1.85, you're nuts. You're crazy. Your clients will tear you apart and tell you you don't know what you're doing. When we did Douglas Entrance, we had to live to a maximum of 3.0. And I said, "No, it's not 3.0." Preserving the historic Douglas building makes the site impossible to achieve 3.0 because the parking you got to put in with demand so much space (INAUDIBLE). We can build so much parking, and that's going to determine how much building square footage you're going to build, and not the 3.0 by zoning. So, it was initially by the project developer to preserve the existing old building in detriment to the mathematical yield of the 3.0 zoning. With that, you know, flexibility,

if you offer the flexibility at the design stages with interaction between the City, the appointed City officials at Zoning, and the architect's group, it will benefit everybody, and you will have a better product.

Board Member Bermello: You know, this concept of flexibility and the early intervention of the Board of Architects before the straitjacketing, I think will be a step in the right direction. I recall, Felix, on a project that we were doing, we were willing to set back our building twice the required setback. It was a ten foot. We wanted to make it 20 feet. But we wanted to provide a porte-cochere so the driveways and people could park under it and get out without being abused by the inclement weather, right? Well, the porte-cochere, or the canopy, did protrude into the setback of the ten feet, that we were recessing the entire building, 20 feet. That's an example of flexibility, that when you see someone that is giving a public good, which is more than just an ornament, but providing (INAUDIBLE). Something that I think any neighbor -- I think if you did a survey of what issue bothers people the most on the project that I think you were alluding to, it's that encroachment on the public right-of-way, lack of a setback, without a doubt.

Board Member Salman: The other issue and the other big issue, at least for me, is one of massing and not having the proper step backs at a six- or seven-story level that becomes much more of an urban scale project for a city of this size. And its intent with regards to Merrick's plan and vision for the City, if you look at the original plans for the entire city and the build-out, it was not to be all high-rise, although he allowed and included in those designs, you know, buildings of 10 and 12 stories without a problem. But if you look carefully, they were all set back, not at 100-foot level, at a 50-foot level. Just that alone wouldn't transform the building on US 1 that we all seem to object to, a building on US 1. The second issue here that I see besides the overall massing, which may be part of a submittal requirement for the Board of Architects to review before there's any decoration, fenestration, or detailing -- and you know, we have powerful tools that we didn't have in 1986 to be able to do. The ability to do electronic modeling, insert it into the site so we can all see it before it happens, maybe that becomes part of the requirements for the review.

Chairperson Pardo: It's used in many other...

Board Member Salman: And it's used all the time.

Chairperson Pardo: And I'm sorry, including percentages of push and pull, et cetera.

Board Member Salman: Exactly. But those are tools that we have at our disposal that need to be incorporated into -- in the modernization or whatever comments that we have, that we come to consensus as to what should be done. And the final issue that I see is the resistance of floor plate. I think that anything that is within the bonus area needs to be of a different floor plate, that it can't be the same shaft going up, but it needs to set back or change in such a way to address the fact that that bonus is there and that it's being used properly. You know, we can go back to -- there's some modern buildings that do that admirably well. Just on the other side of the complex that we all have a little bit of heartburn on is a building designed, you know, in the early 90s. It was a commercial office building. And I think Mitch's office did it because I remember meeting with the...

Board Member Alvarez: Which was that one?

Board Member Salman: The one on the park.

Board Member Alvarez: Regions Bank.

Unidentified Speaker: Regions Bank.

Board Member Salman: The Regions Bank, the Regions Bank. The building's completely set back. It's set back at the corners. The corners are addressed architecturally, and the building slowly evaporates at the top. You know, the top couple of floors is different. It's set back. It's an open loggia at the top. It completely transformed a completely modern building into what I think

is probably a wonderful expression of a modern -- you know, an abstract and Mediterranean building, and it's -- no one's ever objected to that building.

Chairperson Pardo: I want to...

Board Member Salman: So, I think that the numerical application -- if we look at the issue being one of a numerical application of the Code, the way it's written, where it's, you know, 8 out of 12, 10 out of 12, it is unweighted. You can choose the ones that you want to meet and get the bonus and walk away from the ones that you don't want to meet. And I think that they all need to be there, and I think the buildings that include all of them would not be objectionable. And it would not be a straitjacket for the design professional dealing with it.

Board Member Alvarez: The straitjacket (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Salman: And would allow for the creativity and the open public benefit that the bonus was intended to create in the form of open spaces, in the form of public galleries, in the form of proper setbacks and step backs, and in the creation of -- because towers are by definition way-finding vehicles. We use towers to know where we're at. In medieval times, people knew where they lived based on the triangulation of the church tower, right? And so each was different, and it wasn't by accident. It would have been easier to build them all the same. But the reality is that each has -- each building needs to have its own identity and not just be a formulaic representation of the Code. And I think that's primarily what has been missed here is in the application of the Code has been much too formulaic and allowed for the exception of some of the key and critical components; those of open space, those of step backs, and those of a development with regards to the upper stories that are being given as a bonus. And if we can address those three issues, I think that this committee will be successful.

City Clerk Urquia: I just really quick want to remind the different board members to speak directly into the microphone because we are getting complaints that some of the audio is not carrying through.

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE) in Italy is known for its towers.

Board Member Salman: (INAUDIBLE), right.

Chairperson Pardo: So, that's something -- and by the way, Mr. Adams, the largest building, historical building that we have is the Biltmore Hotels. If memory serves me right, the 12 stories are in the tower element and the wings are only seven stories, is that correct? Mr. Pratt, you've been awfully quiet.

Board Member Pratt: No, I'm absorbing, I guess, all of the comments and thoughts. There are a number of things, I guess, that people have spoken, and one of the things that you kind of alluded to was that the Board of Architects looks at, just as like boxes or things...

Board Member Salman: I didn't...

Board Member Pratt: No, I'm not -- I'm just talking to Felix, I'm sorry. And no, I think that, you know, the Board of Architects reviews in totality the entire design with respect to, you know, its location, its massing, and you know, the fenestration, all of the things that go to create better design and better architecture, which is, I think, you know, the bottom line that the BOA is trying to achieve, and to get the most they can and the most benefit for the City and the residents and the people that are going to be using the space so that there -- it becomes a much more usable urban area and, you know, promotes the vitality that the City, you know, really needs in order to have businesses and downtown residents, you know, stay here and drive in. Mitch and I've sat with numerous members of you on various boards over the years, and I know that we all have tried to, you know, look at the projects, and to -- and Robert, you know -- you know, we all have come

back many times on projects with suggestions or addressing comments that the BOA makes to try it and give another thought or directive to, you know, projects. And I know that Mr. Bermello -- you know, we've -- in projects that he's presented, the Board of Architects really looks thoroughly at the project, and it's not something that we're limited or in terms of time or, you know, ability to review. The -- and also, to Javier's comment, and one of the things that I think it would be suggested having more three-dimensional studies and massing studies as a part in all of the large projects that the Board of Architects sees, that's generally a requirement. It's not required in terms of something written in a document, but just as all of the architects that produce larger structures, you know, that's one of the first things they generally do is study the massing. And there's so many different things that go into creating the three-dimensional -- the volume of the building. But I think what I really want to get home though is, to Mitch's point, what really ties the hands of most presenters, as well as the Board of Architects, is that we have a zoning code that is very restricted and that limits in terms -- it has, you know, a number of limitations that don't allow the use of certain things that would benefit the project, such as parking. You know, parking is -- there's a requirement for parking that I think, you know, has always been a difficult issue to resolve and integrate into the project, and because having all of the parking generally with a commercial level and, you know, a parking pedestal and then the commercial development or residential development on top of that, you know, it creates -- it just generally creates a large volume. And I think that that's what, you know, is being talked about, and that's generally the problem that most of the buildings that people are talking about that we're referring to as being, you know, the buildings that are causing issues, the ones on Dixie Highway, is because they have to -- they have all of the parking to accommodate on the site. And so, you know, I don't know that that's something that is going to probably be something that will be continued to be looked at and resolved and potentially tweaked in the future as more autonomous vehicles and Uber and people, you know, leave their -- you know, people living in those environments, in the more urban areas, you know, decide not to have two vehicles, and can do with only one, you know, or take public transportation. You know, I think there needs to be something that's addressed with, you know, parking. But I think that, you know, to a large extent, you know, a lot of the problem is really driven by just the volume that the Zoning Code creates. And you know, I think that if there were some flexibility

given to -- and I see it in the new code that there is, you know, some more allowance for the Board of Architects to review and, you know, provide some relief for other -- or for the designers to be able to manipulate step backs or that there is some flexibility -- because you know, when you start saying that everything has to happen at a certain level, not everything works -- not all projects are identical. And so, there has to be some flexibility built into it, and I think that, you know, that's something that I would hope that maybe we could take a look at too in terms of, you know, how that's developed.

Board Member Alvarez: You have to give the architect a bargaining tool with the client. Set your building back five feet. He's going to look at me and say, "I got a hundred feet of frontage. Five feet costs me 500 square feet per floor. Twelve floors costs me 6,000 less building." If I tell him, "Don't worry about it. We'll build it. Instead of 12, you're going to have 13 stories, and those 6,000 feet you're going to recuperate on floor number 13," that's an incentive for this man. If you give the (INAUDIBLE) a starting -- it's just an illustration of a measurable situation. If you give the power to the architect, interaction with the zoning, knowing that the zoning is not going to be a wall like this, no, they're going to hear you and deal with the project. That's a tool for the architect to defend why he should have five feet setback. It's an example. It could be 10, it could be 5 or 4 or something, depends on the site.

Board Member Bermello: Mitch, along the...

Board Member Alvarez: It opens the door.

Board Member Salman: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: Along those same lines that you're mentioning, and that Glenn is mentioning, for example, in the Code, back of house, mechanical rooms, electrical rooms on the ground floor are not counted towards the FAR. But that same room at the executive level is counted towards FAR. So, what happens is, obviously, you cloud the ground floor, which is the

area that impacts the most the adjoining neighborhoods, as opposed to allowing more open space because you translate, and you take some of those spaces and you put them on a second or third level. Well, right now, the Code is still prescriptive numerically and quantifiably that it straitjacket's the designer and the Board of Architects because it seems like the whole pressure is towards being able to replicate and provide compliance of what is by as of right. Everything is aimed at that. What is as of right? That you can say, you check these boxes, you can go past go and collect. There's no process, and we all work in a world of process. But that process is eliminated by a prescriptive formula, quantitative numbers that sometimes doesn't make any -- if you look at what is the difference between a commercial, a mixed use, and a residential use, that the amount of landscape, open space should be different. It's not the use. It's where the location is, right? I mean, if you're in a suburban area, the amount of landscape should be a little different than if you're in, you know, ground zero on Miracle Mile...

Unidentified Speaker: Right.

Unidentified Speaker: Right.

Board Member Bermello: And your property is, you know, lot to lot.

Unidentified Speaker: Right.

Board Member Bermello: Right now, if you look at how it's measured, it doesn't take into account the obvious. And we end up with a lot of bad situations because of that prescriptive formula-based system that takes out the concept of a site plan review process where there's flexibility and allows the architect to do something really great, as opposed to, "No. I got to do it like this because it's only five percent," and this will be only -- and if it's more than 14 feet, it's the second four. If you're doing retail space, you want the floor to be as high as possible. You could get a (INAUDIBLE). So, for right now, if through this process we can introduce some sense of common

sense that the ultimate result is what we're after -- not necessarily having a cookie-cutter process that generates what we've seen today, you know.

Board Member Pratt: Just to your point too, Willy, I think that -- you know, you mentioned the project about, you know, the ten-foot or wanting to make a greater space and providing more green space and open space on the ground plane. And I think that, you know, for the most part, the public or the general public, that's really the only space they really participate in is the ground plane and...

Board Member Bermello: Right.

Board Member Pratt: Green space and whatever commercial or restaurants or, you know, facilities are in that ground floor. And I think that if there was -- I mean, we all -- I mean, that's, you know, our paramount duty is, you know, to design something nice. We all strive for that. I mean, we're not -- nobody's looking to be a show-off architect, you know. We all try to make the best projects we can, but if we had the ability to do exactly what you're saying, to make bigger green space or larger green space and make the amenities nicer on the ground plane, there should be some -- like Mitch was saying, a landowner or a client is going to be -- they're not going to want to give up space on the ground floor, which is premium space, to pedestrians or to people that are not, you know, paying rent. They want, you know, the most space -- the rentable space or usable space they can potentially get. But it seems to me, like if you're looking -- you know, and I go back to - there were nice buildings being built before the Mediterranean bonus. Tom Spain and I did the 550 building back in 1982, and I think that's been a nice building amenity.

Chairperson Pardo: 550 Biltmore Way, for the public.

Board Member Pratt: I'm sorry?

Chairperson Pardo: 550 Biltmore Way for the public...

Board Member Pratt: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: To know which building.

Board Member Pratt: Just down the street with the lion. But -- you know, so there were -- yeah, the -- when the glass buildings were made in 19 -- back in the early 80s, the response -- you know, there was a backlash to that -- and that was also kind of an architectural style at the time too. You know, and the response was to create some method to give developers incentives because those were inexpensive buildings to build. They were basically a concrete deck and a curtain wall. It's not nearly as expensive -- and you can get, you know, a 3.0 or whatever the FAR was at the time, I think, 3.0. And you could -- you know, that was -- it was inexpensive to build, and you got a lot of square footage for the dollar. Unfortunately, it didn't, you know, really benefit the urban environment that much or the residents. It benefited the developers. And so, you know, that's really one of the reasons why the Mediterranean bonus -- and sometimes -- because I go way back too -- and when it was originally tossed around, back when Ron Robinson and others were promoting it, and there's been over the years -- or as I've personally seen, there's been a number of side discussions as to whether it should be called the Mediterranean bonus or whether it should be just bonus incentives for creating better architecture and greater urban, you know, amenities and making better architecture for the City. Whether that's, you know, Mediterranean or some other style, whatever the architect or the client desires. And I think that, you know, the -- I don't recall how the point system really came into, you know -- and the boxes that you're referring to, how those came into being with .3 and .2. You know, and maybe one of the things that we might also consider or study would be maybe instead of having such a large group of, you know, of .3 or .2, make it into smaller increments and identify the elements that you're looking to try and achieve so that if somebody wants to really create a nice building with a lot of public amenities and ground plane upgrades with, you know, different treatments, that they can do those things, you know, without having -- and if they want to create a -- you know, do all of that in a Mediterranean style, they can get the .5, but that their -- yeah, I think if it's maybe broken down into smaller increments,

it may be easier to judge also for, you know, the -- and to quantify in terms of, you know, the different reviews that the design is going to have to go through, whether it's the DRC or preliminary Board of Architects and final. The other thing I think that would be a beneficial thing is -- I think Willy mentioned it too -- is that, you know, when you do a large project, it's not that it's fully baked. It's just that there's so many things that go into it that, you know, you've got to accommodate all the utilities, FP&L, you know, all the services and all the different components that go to service and make the project work. You can't move around those things easily. A lot of times your hands are tied when it comes to FP&L and where, you know, service is going to go into the building and how you access the building for parking. So, if there were some type of review before the DRC, before things become -- as you said -- fully baked, if that maybe was something that is done -- kind of a non-binding, but just like the DRC really isn't a non-binding type of a review. It's just really a review that all of the departments give their comments and with respect to, you know, whatever the project needs to comply with. But maybe the BOA or some type of a design preliminary -- pre-preliminary -- if that's even a word -- could be instituted where, you know, there could be input from the board into -- before things get to the point where they can't be changed.

Board Member Alvarez: Actually, we have the mechanism -- we have the Board of Architects, which is...

Board Member Behar: Mitch, speak into the mic.

Board Member Alvarez: The board is composed of people that are in real life practicing and confronting situations. So, if we're going to present a real case scenario and you have the client with specific needs, his vision, and his capacity financially for the project, and the Board of Architects is the instrument to come to the meeting and request a meeting with the full participation of the zoning, not the guy who's pushing the zoning review normally. The zoning people that are capable to lead, create, and adjust to a zoning condition as the project evolves and is presented,

not the guy that is everyday looking at, "Oh, you exceed two feet in the front." No, this is not the person there. You need the people higher in thinking and...

Board Member Pratt: Oh, that have the vision for the City.

Board Member Alvarez: Yeah, for the City. In a spirit of working together very much, you can integrate it into the Board of Architects without appointing him as member of the board, but it could become a special review board for projects of a certain character (INAUDIBLE) and significant. Because we do that among ourselves. We appoint seven architects with a tiebreaker. All board members sit, and we devote two, three hours, sometimes, the full morning for a project. But we're missing that element, which is the person representing the zoning and planning with capacity. Nobody's going to chew him up because he said something that somebody didn't like. And we had a City Manager once that was that type of guy who chewed somebody up if he didn't like what he said. You're dead. We don't have that. In this participatory manner, we can have the flexibility to do exactly the points that we're discussing here.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chair, I think what Mr. Pratt is saying I think is so important, which is before you go to the DRC -- once you're in the DRC, you're already straitjacketed, and we've used that term, because at that point, all the points -- and then you can't really move. If you come for a pre-VDRC hearing with the Board of Architects -- and maybe it's not in every project, but maybe it's on projects over a certain size. Because what we're talking about here is, you know, massing, building spacing, encroachments. We're not talking about single-family homes, right?

Board Member Pratt: No, I think it's -- yeah, I think it's...

Board Member Bermello: So, projects over a certain size, over a certain magni -- or at certain locations...

Board Member Alvarez: Locations (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Bermello: Or it could be next to a historic structure or in a particular street. I mean, we can come up with where the -- that project is reviewed and the architect from the applicant is given guidance which will cover and temper the DRC. And when they get to certain points of, "Well, you're two feet off here," they say, "Wait a second. This project is going to go. That's not the important issue here. Look at what they're doing here with open space, with building setbacks," you know, "The step backs after 45 feet or 50 feet," whatever. You know, so that -- because right now, everything is dealt with the same way. You could be off one bicycle and that is as important as an encroachment, and so there's something off.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. And that's what the case is, that the way these incentives are done, it's wrong. But the other reason that we're here, very specific, is because the people that are here in the public and the people that are on Zoom listening, people are concerned that one day they've got, you know, a low density next to them across the street, and the next day, they have a 16-story building. You know that compatibility portion I think is also part of what -- you know, part of this discussion. I remember many years ago that one of the larger developers came in who put the first -- the closest building to Douglas right on Miracle Mile. And when they came in, they were talking to Planning. And Planning wanted a 15- or a 16- or 14-story element right on Miracle Mile. And it just so happens I chaired the Planning Board at that time, and I refused. I refused until they flipped that massing toward the back street away from Miracle Mile. That made all the difference in the world in the scale -- the human scale, whatever. Now think of it this way. Most of the people that are here, and most of the people that are concerned that live in the single-family area, that live where it's one and two stories, and they get to open their front door and see these big buildings, the buildings have to have come how? Really listen carefully to those neighborhoods. From a massing standpoint, from a height standpoint, and from a use standpoint -- use is also very important, not just as you say (INAUDIBLE)...

Board Member Alvarez: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: Because the use -- if you put something across the street from a single-family area and you have commercial uses, and then when the people go to use those commercial uses and you have delivery trucks and you have employees, I'm not so concerned about the people that go to shop there or go to an office there. I'm more concerned about the employees because that employer may not pay for that monthly parking charge. So where is the employee going to park? Right in front of somebody's front door...

Board Member Alvarez: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: On the swale...

Board Member Alvarez: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: In their single-family area.

Board Member Alvarez: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: That's where the incompatibility and a lot of the concerns from the citizens are.

Board Member Alvarez: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: And so, the use part in those design standards is there for a very good reason. And sometimes...

Board Member Pratt: But Felix, to that point, you -- first of all, you know, the Zoning Code and the Comprehensive Plan is in place, and you're not permitted to have, you know, 16-story buildings next to...

Board Member Behar: Next to a residential.

Board Member Pratt: Single-family residences. You know, that's the reason that they have the stepping down, you know, from high-rise to mid-rise to low intensity and single family.

Chairperson Pardo: And I'm talking about not only the filtering into these single-family residential areas because it basically destroys the area, you know.

Board Member Pratt: But I don't understand what you're talking...

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Pratt: You have a (INAUDIBLE).

Chairperson Pardo: For example -- I'll give you an example. We talk about use. I gave the use of maybe like retail or employees parking in the residential areas. Let's go to another thing, noise. So, all of a sudden now, you have music. There was a consultant here a couple weeks ago before the Commission, a week ago before the Commission. The consultant talked about 80 decibels. He played 80 decibels here in the chambers. You know, which way is the wind blowing and that kind of thing. But still, at the end of the day, you know, they were talking about the hours of operation. We have to be -- I think we have to also be proactive because if we bring zoning in here, you know, to opine on projects or be there as a resource for us, we also have to make sure that we, as the architect of the City, we also look at the compatibility issue when it comes to the comprehensive land use plan, when it comes to these things. Because at the end of the day, you could have a building that maybe this space over here is for the single-family residential, but you have some of these intensities over on the other side. That makes all the difference in the world. The sound, et cetera, is over for the other side.

Board Member Behar: But where specifically because I'm not aware or not familiar with where the single family really abuts a -- in the Comprehensive Plan, the only areas that abut a commercial is Le Jeune Road, some portion of Le Jeune Road, a little portion of Bird in front of Merrick Park, and I think that's about it. I don't think there's a -- anywhere else where you have single family abutting a 16-story building. I mean, I -- unless (INAUDIBLE) and...

Chairperson Pardo: Robert, you're correct. You're correct, and that's one of the reasons that when you abut single family and duplex, that you can't be any higher than...

Board Member Behar: Than 45 feet and you have to step it back a hundred feet, and that's a good transitional way to keep that intensity from the residential.

Chairperson Pardo: Exactly. There are some -- because of the mixed use, because of the mixed-use component within residential, you already have existing conditions on Biltmore Way, for example, where you have commercial uses inside of residential that exist there now. Parking becomes an issue because of the implementation of parking in those areas. The residences want it for people that have come to visit them in the residential area, but then you have these commercial, almost auxiliary uses there. So, some of those exist; there aren't many. But the key here, for example, right now is if you want to live in the CBD are, you're going in with your eyes open. You know, you know that you're going to have more activity. You're going -- but if you're living in a single-family community, and you can hear the sound traveling a certain way, when we look at these buildings, you know, there's maybe a way that we can re-orient some of those uses and activities in a certain way that would maybe soften, you know, the possible negative impacts on those areas. But you're correct. Most of those are in the main arterial (INAUDIBLE). And because of that, fortunately, the only exception that I know on Le Jeune Road is Coral Gables High School because Coral Gables High School is not considered residential, so therefore, one of the buildings was able to go right up to the site, you know, and it went straight up. If you look at the Bacardi building, which is further north on Le Jeune Road, if you notice, it's stepped down. And that originally -- staff was trying to force the developer -- Armando Codina -- to actually put the

high vertical portion, and the neighbors were able to convince Mr. Codina to step it back the way that it was intended to be able to protect that scale, et cetera, you know, from the side. So, one of the things that we should look at -- and this is another question I have, I think, for the attorney. You're on the spot. You know, we have a lot of people from the public here that are sitting here and listening. And up to now, you know, we're kind of getting our sea legs, if you will, to understand, you know, what the direction of this committee will be, you know, for this in the future meetings. The question I have is, I've been told that, you know, the public is invited because it's a public meeting. I've been told that the public does not necessarily have to participate unless we open this up. So, at the same time, there is nothing, I think, from keeping comments to be sent to this board from the citizens, which are both on Zoom and here in person. And depending on what this board would like to do, I think it -- I think this is all depends on what you all want to do. I think we should open it up just this first meeting, this first meeting, to the public to at least -- for them to say, "Hey, don't miss this or don't miss that." I mean, this depends on what the board would like to do. And I'd like to listen to the architect -- the City architect before that happens. But first of all, Mr. Attorney, what do you say?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: My apologies. That microphone is not working, and I want to make sure I'm on the record. It is up to the board, it's up to the Chair, whether you want to hear from the public and allow public comment. That is strictly within your purview. That is your choice. That being said, given today that day is the first meeting, I think given the time, I think the remaining portion of your meeting probably will be better spent narrowing down the focus of what parts of 5-200 you guys want to take a look at, provide -- maybe discuss what aspects of maybe the design standards, maybe, you know, the tables -- Tables 1, 2, and 3, which I believe I think would be the primary focus of this committee; assign how you want to break that down for future meetings. But it is strictly up to you whether you'd like to allow comment now or at a future meeting. I think maybe it may be a little bit more useful once you have a bit more direction, you have a bit more work done in the modification of 5-200, and then allow public input at that point. But it is 100 percent up to you.

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Attorney, the only reason I even brought it up is since it's the first meeting and we have to -- we want to basically put everything on the table so we know what direction we're going, that would be the only reason I would...

Unidentified Speaker: Mr. Chair, I would...

Board Member Pratt: I would say let them talk now. I mean, we're all voicing opinions.

Unidentified Speaker: Now is the time for them to say something.

Board Member Pratt: Unless, you know, there's a time constraint.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I, once again, defer to the board. If that is the will of the board, I will just ask that they try to limit the discussion to the purview of this board. So, I know there's been a lot of discussion. There's been a discussion about DRC, zoning designations, how their setbacks -- that's just outside the boundary of this blue-ribbon committee. So, I would ask that any comments be directed towards the Mediterranean bonus, specifically 5-200 and any of its subsections.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. How does the board feel?

Board Member Behar: No, I think we should. I think we should.

Board Member Pratt: On the Board of Architects, we always encourage the public to talk, and if there's...

Board Member Behar: If I may just address something because, you know -- yeah, we're learning and we have a straitjacket, or whatever you used. Unfortunately, the reality is we cannot change zoning that easy. So, whenever you're dealing with a project, it's not like, you know, if I give more

incentive, more open space, I could go another story. Well, really, it's not that simple. And so, I think we go back and really concentrate on how do we make what we have today better, okay. And Glenn and I have had a conversation of those points. Maybe we don't -- you know, we break it up, the incentive, a little bit more to be able to get something better where the public benefits. But the zoning part that we've been talking about, I'm sorry, I don't think we have any opportunity to do that today or for this committee to do anything.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Pardon my interruption. Just -- I believe -- I'm sure that those discussions happened before, but now since you are a part of this blue-ribbon committee, any discussions in regards to the Med bonus should only happen amongst the Chair in the Sunshine, so at publicly noticed meetings.

Board Member Behar: This has happened in the past.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I know. That's -- I'm just -- I just heard it, so I just let everybody know.

Board Member Behar: (INAUDIBLE) four years ago, we've been going at it.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I figured.

Board Member Bermello: Can I --? Before -- because I agree a hundred percent, Chair, that we should open it up for public comment, at least in this specific first meeting. But I know -- are we going to be closing the meeting at 6? Is that the game plan?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: That's up to the board. It's currently scheduled from 4 to 6, but...

Board Member Bermello: Because the only thing I would recommend, Mr. Chair, is that since I know you've made some comments already, some write-ups, that maybe those get distributed to each member of the panel...

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: And that we have a task or homework...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: That we take and read your comments and that we add, subtract, multiply, whatever, and come back, and in some way, consolidate...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: The combined comments for this board, that we then have like, let's say, a redline that consolidates and doesn't duplicate. If three of us are saying the same thing, let's not say it three times. We'll all be in agreement so that we have -- maybe by the next meeting or two meetings from now or whatever the date that you set on the timeline -- a redline version that addresses the comments that I think we're all...

Unidentified Speaker: Talking about the same thing.

Unidentified Speaker: Talking about the same thing.

Chairperson Pardo: Same thing.

Board Member Bermello: We're all talking about the same thing. I don't think anybody here is saying anything different. We're all saying it eloquently in our own words. But it'd be good if we

-- you started it. Maybe we can then add to it and get those comments to the City Attorney. And if then they can re-distribute back a redline that we can all see, that'd be great.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Mr. Clerk, do we have any future meetings already scheduled, or should we...

City Clerk Urquia: Not yet. That was going to be one of the next questions.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah, okay, great. So, I think Robert was right. And basically, what we're going to do is take the points and we can erase them or whatever but come up with a point system. Back in the day, in '86, what they did is they actually took every type of component and they gave it to you in square footage instead of points. It was always based on square footage. If you do this, we'll give you one square foot for every one square foot of this you give us. So, you know, in FAR. That's the way it was done originally. Now, it's points. So, I would say try to keep to the points. So, rewriting the factors, you know, that the -- those factors for the additional -- those elements, and then, I think, waiting, that would be the homework.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: The attorney said the limits...

Board Member Alvarez: I think we're getting into a lot of detail there maybe. I think we...

Board Member Bermello: Just 5-200; is that correct?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: That is correct.

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: Could you send to each one of us 5-200 in Word?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Not a problem. I can go ahead and have that...

Board Member Bermello: That would be very helpful.

Chairperson Pardo: 5-200 and only dash one and dash two.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I don't believe there's anything else. I think it's only 5-1 and 5-2. There's no other subsection.

Chairperson Pardo: Send it separately, if you could.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Yeah, it's 5-201 and 5-202. But 5-202 is literally only a couple of sentences highlighting particular buildings that meet the Mediterranean style.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. Mr. Clerk, can you do what you do with your cards for speakers? If there would be anyone that would like to speak tonight, if you could please approach the Clerk so they could fill out the -- Thank you, Mr. Attorney.

City Clerk Urquia: And in the meantime...

Chairperson Pardo: And also, Mr. Architect, would you like to bring in --? Would you like to say something because you haven't said anything into the record yet.

City Architect Riesco: I don't have anything to add. I think what's been discussed is pretty much on point. I think some of the discussions are veering from Mediterranean bonus point scenarios into zoning issues, and I think that there may be some overlap and maybe some confusion there. You know, we're talking a lot about tall buildings and massive buildings, and some of those things are direct responses to zoning classifications, land use issues that are allowed, and therefore, are not really a portion of the Mediterranean -- you know, the Mediterranean bonus is a small portion

of what's allowed by zoning. And I want the public to really be clear about that. The Mediterranean bonus points allow you one story -- on Table 1, one story and a .3 FAR addition. And the second table allows you an additional .2 and another story. So, at the end of the day, as Mitch said earlier, you know, the difference between a 14-story and a 16-story building is not that impacting versus an 8-story building and allowing a 16-story building. So, I just want to be clear on that point, that we need to stick to the concept of the Mediterranean bonus, but the Mediterranean bonus does not allow a 16-story building. It's a condition of zoning and the zoning designation allocated to that site, and the Mediterranean bonus is a portion of that. It's not fully responsible for that, and that's what I want to be clear that it's understood here. Because there may be some misconceptions in the public that the Mediterranean bonus is allowed a 16-story building. That's not true. Mediterranean bonus may allocate an additional floor or two and some additional FAR, but it does not allow you to go to 16 floors, okay. And I want to be sure that that's on the table and everybody understands that. That's the only comment I want to reiterate.

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Clerk, can you call the first -- thank you.

Board Member Pratt: No, Mitch had something to say.

Chairperson Pardo: Oh, Mitch, I'm sorry.

Board Member Alvarez: I just want to add one thought here for the people out there. Don't confuse quality of design with overloading ornament on a building. Just because you put arches, barrel tiles, and fenestration (INAUDIBLE), you got a Mediterranean building. That's the worst thing that we can do as people and as designers. Don't let that make you think that this is a Mediterranean building just because -- that's a cliché and a bad one.

Board Member Behar: Mitch, the wiser -- the older you get, the wiser you get.

Chairperson Pardo: That's why he's sitting in the center. Mr. Clerk.

City Clerk Urquia: Okay. So, the first speaker we have is Mr. William Arthur.

William Arthur: Good afternoon. Many of you know that I'm an architect. I was speaking with a lot of the people who are here today, and I just wanted to share with you my thoughts on what I've heard. A lot of these people have some really interesting stories about buildings that they've watched get built over time. Some of these people have been living in Coral Gables all their life and seen a lot of changes. I think that their expectation is, is that somehow out of this committee will emerge lower density and reduction in -- increases in setbacks and reduction in building size, which we know is not possible as a part of this committee. What I would maybe think about -- my question is, is how do you think the committee would be looking at maybe purifying the Med bonus table? There's a lot of things in there that it seems to me, as a young architect, that are probably more zoning related than Med bonus. And then my other thing to think about is when applying the table and looking at the seven buildings that are the examples, half of those buildings are quite small. Most of them are under 5,000 square foot. How would we apply those elements to buildings that are half a million square feet or more, in the case of the Plaza?

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you, Mr. Arthur. I really appreciate it. I remember your grandfather very well. Also, a very good architect, to say the least.

City Clerk Urquia: Next speaker is Ms. Sue Kawalerski.

Chairperson Pardo: And by the way, Mr. Arthur, the Douglas Entrance and the Biltmore are a fairly good size, but not the size of the buildings that we're talking about, and you're correct.

Sue Kawalerski: Hi. Good evening, gentleman. I'm Sue Kawalerski. I live at 6830 Gratian Street, right down the street from you. And tonight, I'm representing the Coral Gables Neighbors Association. I'm the president of that association, and there are thousands of people that belong to it, so I'm representing a very august group. But I want to say, I really commend all of you up here.

You are very intelligent people. It's obvious you're intelligent, you're creative, and you know what you're doing. I particularly liked when Mr. Bermello started out because it seemed like you have a real sensitivity to what the residents want. I think all of you do. In fact, I would like to see this panel meet all the time, not only on the Med bonus, but just to have these kinds of discussions about where we want the City to go and what we want it to look like. I know that you're handcuffed. I know that you're handcuffed meaning not only by the Zoning Code, but when you're sitting on a board, you're only hearing certain projects. You're not discussing, you know, the whole world view at that point. I think this kind of panel should, you know, go on beyond this Med bonus opportunity, and I think this is an opportunity. It's an opportunity to get intelligent people together, creative people together, set a new course, build on the best and not what has just been acceptable. So, we're relying on you. I have to tell you, the residents on the Zoom call, the residents that email me all the time, we're really relying on you and we respect what you do. And when you said, you know, like the ground space, you know, how residents interact with the ground, yeah, we want to interact on the ground. And what we've been seeing on US 1 with the Paseo de la Riviera and the Gables station, you can't interact with anything but concrete. You know, it's -- they're walls. We're becoming a walled city. We don't want that. You know, this is a very special city. When we drive down US 1 from Miami, we should know that we're in the City of Coral Gables. And when we leave the City of Coral Gables, it should be very obvious that we're someplace else. And I think at this point in time, when we're talking about future development, the US corridor, there's a lot to build up on the US corridor. This is how we look to the world. I mean, US 1 is an extension of I-95, right? So, we should look different, not only on the US 1 corridor, but in the Riviera neighborhood. You know, that is a residential neighborhood, and the Paseo de la Riviera is a blessing in disguise because it was the first project that went up, and I think a lot of people said, "Oh, my God," when they saw it come out of the ground because no one realized what it was going to look like and how it would impact the neighborhood. And I got to tell you, it catalyzed residents, and that's a good thing. The residents know best. You're all residents. I think you're all residents.

Unidentified Speaker: We are.

Ms. Kawalerski: You know best. You know what you like and what you don't like. And I know you get pressures probably from your clients. They want to build higher and more dense and no parking and whatever. But I know that you have a responsibility to your neighbors because we are your neighbors. So, we put the good decisions in your hands, and let's make this more than just a Mediterranean bonus committee. Let's go beyond this after we're done with this work. Let's go beyond this and have a continuing discussion. Thank you.

Unidentified Speaker: Thank you.

Unidentified Speaker: Thank you.

(APPLAUSE.)

City Clerk Urquia: So, the next speaker is Mr. Samuel Lawson.

Samuel Lawson: Good evening. When I hear all of you speak, I feel like we're in incredibly safe hands because you clearly have the best interest and the knowledge and experience. And I feel like if we just take you and put you in charge, everything would be fine. I don't think that's the way it really is going to work, but that would be great. I only know one person on the board -- it's Felix -- but I really loved what you were saying about in general architecture and the difference between Mediterranean and other styles. So, while the Mediterranean construction is extraordinarily beautiful, I think that it's, you know, juxtaposed to other incredible forms of architecture is something that should not be forgotten. If you look all over the world, there are incredible projects going on everywhere, and they pop up overnight in major cities across the world with some of the most amazing glass and steel beautiful structures ever. Lake Gary, for instance, and everything else; there's a beautiful structure in downtown Miami. What I heard though -- my son goes to Cornell, and if you've ever gone to that -- or he did. He graduated from Cornell. If you've ever gone to that campus, there's an example there of incredibly beautiful older building,

and juxtaposed next to it is something elaborate and modern that's really cool too. Unfortunately, there are a couple of buildings on that campus that are also -- were very ugly, that were recent additions over the last probably 40, 50 years. So, the one thing though is that absolutely that it seems what's important that you're all talking about -- and I can tell you, I represent a small community of neighbors too. We call ourselves the Youth Center community, for lack of a better term, because we all basically about the Youth Center. It seems that the -- you know, it seems like the idea of green space and setback or step back or whatever is important, but what I've heard that is an issue -- and I'm wondering if you're planning to address it in this committee -- because it seems like this is definitely the architectural piece of it. But what it also seems like is there's something going wrong in the process of translating this into like the final product. So, I don't know how far you can reach into that. So, you know, you may create this effort and do all this great work and it sits there in this piece that you redline and correct and edit, but then that being translated into something that actually happens, it seems like, from what I've heard, there's a problem there. I don't know where it is. I don't know why it's there. Also, I heard at the City Commission meeting, Mayor and Commissioners talking about the fact that, you know, when they were discussing a moratorium -- a temporary moratorium, they talked about the fact that they needed to do their job and they needed to get together and vote on projects and that no project could come through yet that they had voted on. And others had talked about the fact that they had voted on projects, and they were very proud of their voting record and the projects that they approved and disapproved. But I also heard through the grapevine that a lot of projects that end up built in Coral Gables actually don't make it to the City Commission to vote on. So, again, I'm talking about process things that I'm wondering, with all of your, you know, clearly, you know, incredible architectural background and your care and love for what this is going to look like, what can you do beyond just editing this ordinance? Last thing I would say is that it seems like -- and I agree with what you said. And by the way, I'm amazed at Merrick Park. We've been enjoying that place for years, and we never had any traffic issues there. And I think that building those -- you know, dipping in when these developers are coming in to really work on the surrounding traffic, et cetera, is absolutely necessary. I had something else. I can't think of it now. But I think the biggest thing is what can we do beyond what is the architectural design and edits that you make

to dip into the process and actually make it happen? Because that seems to be a problem. Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you.

Unidentified Speaker: Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: Just so you know, the projects that don't go before the Commission, those projects -- those are the ones that are under the other section that isn't being changed. But the Board of Architects is responsible, you know, for looking at massing, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. There are certain types of projects that must go to the Commission, and then those are normally the larger projects, the projects that have more impact. But all projects are important that go to the City architect and to the Board of Architects. And therefore, because of the Code and because of what the City architects -- in other words, the Board of Architects -- review, they're reviewing the design criteria, which is another section of the Code. And what we're talking about is a section of the Code that gives bonuses; in other words, above and beyond what is permitted by zoning.

Mr. Lawson: And so I do remember my other point. So, by the way, I've been involved as a professional and my profession is in data analytics. And I've been involved in all sorts of process things that you can all imagine in my career, so I understand process and all the intricacies. I don't understand this one, but I know something is up. The most important point that I think I should have come up here to make was, I think what you said at the beginning, which is that the Mediterranean bonus -- which I don't know much about either -- seems to impact Mediterranean style construction. But there's a lost opportunity to embed in that the same type of bonus structure for all types of architecture, that way those don't fly under the radar and don't get the same loving, you know, TLC that they need. So, one hundred percent, because there's going to be all kinds of construction around here that won't be Mediterranean in design, and it definitely needs that focus. So, that's the point. Thank you.

Board Member Pratt: If I could just respond to you, as the representative of the board. All projects that come to -- any project that's being proposed to be built, whether it's a single-family residence or a multistory building or anything, changing your windows or your roof tile, anything that is on the exterior of the building or any new projects go before the Board of Architects, all projects. And so, any -- whether -- there's no projects that fly under the radar screen. Everything is reviewed by the BOA or the City architect.

Board Member Behar: And there's a process because after that, it goes to the Planning and Zoning.

Board Member Pratt: Well, if it's seeking -- yeah, if it's seeking some type of request that require special permissions from the -- from Planning and Zoning or the City Commission.

Board Member Behar: Nothing goes under the radar. Everything has a process, whether single family or multifamily project, they go through a process.

Board Member Pratt: That's one of the reasons why the City of Coral Gables, the overall fabric of the City is such an enhanced place because everything is reviewed by the BOA.

Mr. Lawson: I'll leave quickly so other people have an opportunity.

Board Member Pratt: But thank you for your comment.

Mr. Lawson: The one thing that I heard -- again, because I've heard a little bit more about the rumbling of the process. The one thing I heard -- and -- is that the Board of Architecture (sic) is sometimes in some way circumvented on -- you know, not circumvented. Let's not use that word, but doesn't have the -- that somehow, you know, different exceptions pass through that maybe the Board of Architectures (sic) would not have found favorable. I've -- you know, so listening to the City Commission meeting online and the Mediterranean ordinance section, I heard a lot of public complaints about possibilities or things that changed in scope as they went along, and maybe didn't

follow the original Board of Architecture (sic) approval or oversight. I don't know, but again, I'm a little bit, I think, more focused on the process of it actually coming into play.

Board Member Pratt: You know, as a current member of the Board of Architects, I'm unaware of anything like that that you're referring to, but if there is some instance that somebody could actually document, I would -- you know, I think the City architect or, you know, I'm sure the City staff and Development Services would be happy to talk with you or review those things. But the BOA is strictly pro bono. We meet weekly. All the members are architects within the City and either live in the City or have their offices in the City or both. And there's no outside agenda or anything that the Board of Architects has other than just to try and promote Coral Gables and make Coral Gables the best we possibly can.

Mr. Lawson: I think there's about a two-and-a-half-hour video that crossed over this -- that covered this section of the Med -- the proposed moratorium on the Med ordinance. And there was a lot of detail from citizens there, so I'm not going to try to recount it, but it was interesting.

Board Member Pratt: I would speak to anybody, I guess, that's listening on Zoom or that made those comments previously. I did watch both the City Commission and the workshop. I don't know that I totally recall what you're referring to, but I would encourage anybody that's watching or in the audience now that if there are some instances or documents that, you know -- I'm not exactly sure I totally understand what you're -- what the implication is you're saying, but I can tell you that the BOA is -- it doesn't have any agenda other than, like I said, to make good architecture for the City, or to try and elicit as best projects that is possible.

Mr. Lawson: Well, thank you. And we've worked with the board at our home -- at our residential home, and we had a great experience. I thank you for that. And thank you all. I can tell you're incredibly motivated and I think we're safe in your hands, so thank you very much.

Board Member Pratt: Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you.

City Clerk Urquia: Next speaker is Dr. Gordon Sokoloff.

Gordon Sokoloff: Hi. Thank you very much for being here and for spearheading this project, Mr. Pardo. I spoke in front of the Commission last week, and I represent the Ponce Neighbors Association, and that is a group of residents who live along Ponce de Leon. And right now, they are dealing with the noise level. They're concerned about the future noise level coming from the Plaza. They've been dealing with the noise coming from the construction, and now we're also deeply concerned about a project in the pipeline, a 16- or 17-story building right across the street from Christie's. So, we're very concerned about that, and we're an example of neighbors that have to deal with that. And hopefully, this board will -- all of you being residents of Coral Gables, that's something that we all have in common. The other thing that I'd like to tell you is, I was the Chairman of the Transportation Advisory Board for the last nearly two years. I sat on the board for eight years. I termed out. Now, I'm the vice chairman of the Parking Advisory Board. I'm also born and raised here and heavily vested in living here, like you all are. As such, I'm concerned about the infrastructure of Coral Gables, the user ability. And as -- in my position, what I plan on doing is -- and the Mayor knows about it and several of the Commissioners I've talked to -- is actually form a counsel of boards so that you guys aren't necessarily sequestered. I'm trying to organize a board of representatives from all the 32 boards in the City so that we can communicate with one another. And I think it's important because we represent the citizens, and that's kind of important. You talk about being handcuffed by the zoning codes. I'm not so sure that you're not handcuffed maybe by the DRC because that's the first stop where some of these projects come to. And so, when you have a project that gets by the DRC that's, let's just say, the 16-story building being approved that's zoned for a seven-story, you know, zone, and then suddenly it's in your hands, you're already trying to deal with something that's been ushered in by the City staff. And it's not -- I'm not anti-City staff, but I believe that the staff needs to be directed by the Commission and the Commission is elected by us, and we all need to be on the same page. And I think that the

City staff needs to be reined in and understand that the people, including you, it seems, don't want this city overbuilt with things like the Plaza that we're seeing. It's a gorgeous building, but it's completely out of scale. It belongs in Las Vegas or New York. But these are efforts that I'm going to make, and I really hope that you are able to tighten up the Mediterranean bonus significantly so that developers aren't, you know, using everything they can to go taller, bigger, and more dense, which ultimately takes away from our quality of life. Thank you very much.

Unidentified Speaker: Thank you, Doctor.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you.

City Clerk Urquia: Next speaker is Maria Magdalena Estupinan.

Maria Magdalena Estupinan: Good afternoon. My name is Maria Magdalena Estupinan. And I'm very concerned about what I've heard here today. I have a couple of questions for you. I believe we, the residents, wanted a moratorium because we wanted to put like a stop to the excess of development. My concern is you're all architects, and you're very, very connected with developers. And I hope that this will work out because we asked for the moratorium to see what the -- this bonus was allowing the developers to kind of bypass the Zoning Code. I can tell you that we are not mad. We are beyond being mad, okay. We want results. I know that design is very important, but the most important thing is to kind of stop the -- or take out the loopholes that they have, these developers, to do whatever they want. Now, why am I concerned? Because I heard the word "incentive" many times here today, like we can give some -- more incentive or a different incentive. We don't want any more incentive. We want to stop the excess of development. We don't want to become another Brickell, and that's where we're headed. Now, my question is, are we going to do this every week? Are we going to have the same day and the same hour? Because it would be good for the people to know that every Thursday at 4 o'clock, we're going -- meeting. Okay, and we'll be able to have like at least half an hour for our input. When you finalize the whole thing,

how do we know, okay, that it's not going to be worse than what we had before? And again, I thank you and I hope that this works out, but I'm concerned. Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you.

City Clerk Urquia: Next speaker is Ms. Maria Longo (phonetic).

Maria Longo: Hi. I want to thank you for your time here. And I want to tell you that I'm one of those people that when some buildings get built, wondered how did that happen? How did it even happen? How come -- did it go through the architectural board? I'm in favor of Mediterranean Revival architecture in the City of Coral Gables. I see the value. One of my favorite cities is Santa Barbara. And especially, I see the value because Miami is very diversified, and we already have Brickell, and then we have Wynwood, and we have the Design District, and we have Doral. And then we have a city like ours that was founded by an extraordinary person with an incredible vision, who started traditional architecture, who traveled, who sent his architects that traveled to the Mediterranean in Europe, and went to New York, certain neighborhoods in New York. I think one is Tuxedo. And he understood and he studied the movements, the City Beautiful movement, the garden movement, and I'm in favor of it. But I have a question for you, Mitch, because I love the Colonnade Hotel, the way that it was done. I love the building in front of the Ponce Circle. And I'm wondering, okay, what happened that you get some really good buildings, and especially back in the 20s. We have the Biltmore Hotel, which is beautiful. It's enormous and it's beautiful. I don't want what people call Pollo Tropical. So, how did you accomplish -- how were those buildings accomplished? What was there then that we don't have now that we are seeing so many poorly designed buildings, that they don't have a human scale? You know, they say that beauty is in the eye of the beholder, but I think most people recognize ugliness too. And it affects me personally, and it affects everybody, and it affects long-term. I mean, we want to go to Paris, why? We want to go to Aspen, why? We want to go to Santa Barbara. What do those places have that people love and they're romantic and they're beautiful. And you walk and you feel a sense of well-being, a sense of place. So, my question is, what happened then that --? Why can't we go back to

doing things the right way? And I have a suggestion for you. I used to be a teacher, and I was a pretty strict teacher, but I was a good teacher. Actually, I won the award in 1998 Teacher of the Year in the entire county. And I was wondering, and I would like you to consider, since design is important -- right? -- because we know that you can get really good design and some people cannot get a good design. My suggestion would be two things. One -- Mitch, you mentioned it -- is the review panel and some sort of process where there's another review panel, maybe with some anonymity, because I think it's kind of complicated sometimes -- (INAUDIBLE) wouldn't know if it is or not, but I would be uncomfortable telling a friend, change your design. And sometimes I've seen that designs come to the board -- to the architectural board that they're already so advanced and so poor, you would have to redesign them. So, at a certain level, if we have some big projects to have some review panels with some anonymity with people that are -- have a background in traditional architecture, that have studied classical architecture, that have a track record. That's my first suggestion. And the second suggestion would be, if you're giving a bonus and you're giving density and intensity, you should get a wonderful project, a beautiful project that you walk by and you are in awe and you're inspired by it. Well, why can't we require that designers have some track record? If they're going to give to developers -- I have developed and I'm telling you what I'm sure -- maybe -- I think -- I'm pretty positive that if you were giving me a lot of density, a lot of intensity, and I could do bigger projects, that you would tell me, you have to have an architect who has a track record in traditional architecture and does not give us (COMMENTS IN SPANISH NOT TRANSLATED) Pollo Tropical, somebody who really knows. And I think, as a developer, if you want to be able to get that much more out of it, and probably you're going to -- go design (INAUDIBLE) thoughtful. The designer, a classical architect takes into consideration the context, which is one of the things that I have seen we have failed, context. So many times, I had to stand in front of Planning, not because I wanted to, but because I feel responsibility because the project is coming close to my house where I go, "Oh my god." That project is in front of a historic property and it's totally out of context. Once it's built, we can't go back. So, my two suggestions would be some sort of review panel, and the second one, requirements of some sort -- I'm not an architect, but some sort of requirements of a track record in Mediterranean Revival or traditional architecture. Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you.

(APPLAUSE)

City Clerk Urquia: Next speaker is Mr. Alexander Adams.

Alexander Historical Resources Director Adams: Hello. I'll be pretty quick. I don't -- I know we're late, and I don't want to be verbose here. One point I want to make, I think we do need to stick directly to just the Mediterranean architecture and the Mediterranean bonus. You know, I think all the residents here and the ones that I hear from, they like Coral Gables being Mediterranean. You can do modern, but you don't get the bonus. We get a bonus because it's a particular item that the residents want to see. So, we don't want to change the name of the bonus. We don't even want to talk about other things. This is really about Mediterranean bonus and buildings that get a bonus to do something great, and they mentioned that. On the other hand, yes, there's a huge issue with parking. We heard several places, you know, and how it creates a pedestal and all. Why is the Biltmore beautiful? Because it doesn't have parking, you know, it really doesn't. It's off on the sides. If it had a pedestal and it had to put all the parking in the middle -- in the building, it would look totally different. If we're not going to allow the height, you know, in proportion -- proportions, I think, are the big thing missing right now also. You know, if we're not going to allow height, then maybe we have to do an incentive for the parking to go underground, and that's expensive in Miami. And as far as I was involved -- and I represent myself -- I've lived in downtown. I've had a house right next to downtown. I've always been right here in the downtown area over 10 years and seen it grow. And the reason the Agave project looks different, it was originally designed with two floors underground. And those two floors that came above ground to go from a five-story garage to seven, is just night and day. I mean, it's -- you know, you went from proportions of just over a third of the building to almost half is parking, right? And so, it sounds small, but it's huge, two floors all the way around that thing. So, how we do proportions is a big one. And even small items -- you look at the Douglas Entrance a long time

ago, but it's a botch job, right? I mean, you have horizontal windows, no (INAUDIBLE), like it doesn't pass any rule of traditional Mediterranean, or any of the examples there. So, I do think there are some things that we can look at. They can be tweaked. I like the idea even that maybe there should be more than two categories, maybe you get, you know, more bumps for things. And I will say, on the opposite side, don't just throw a cupola on the top of the thing. That's also just as bad. You know, I mean, we don't always have to have a cupola, and we don't -- you know, it can be an expression vertically, but there's other types of expressions and things, you know. So, I think that's where your kind of parameters and box, and yes, you get boxed in, FPL vaults and everything else. But I think if you had to narrow it down, this is a bonus. Keep it with Mediterranean traditional and all. And we need to really key in on proportions and the forms, whether you need a form-based code, whether you need 3Ds, whatever it is. And that would be my...

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you.

City Clerk Urquia: Next speaker is Mr. Enrique Bernal.

Enrique Bernal: Good afternoon. And thank you for taking the time to keep this city the way it was. I just have a very simple question. The Chairman read a document that -- and spoke about compatibility with the neighborhood. And then we heard today that you have many checkboxes for granting of the Mediterranean bonus. I'd like to ask is one of those boxes "neighborhood compatibility"? And if so, what weight is it given relative to all the other 17 whatever things?

Chairperson Pardo: Actually, that's not in the boxes. It's in the other section under design standards, which are for all projects.

Board Member Pratt: And the BOA is very adamant about -- or that's something...

Chairperson Pardo: The context.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, the context, more so or -- well, for all projects, but even more so for -- especially for single-family residences and for how it fits within the neighborhood. In other words, it's not an incentive. It's a requirement.

Unidentified Speaker: Yeah.

Mr. Bernal: Okay.

Unidentified Speaker: (INAUDIBLE) the base...

Board Member Pratt: And a lot of projects are rejected by the Board of Architects because they don't comply with context or they're designed within the contextual character of...

Mr. Bernal: Okay, well, that was my question. Thank you very much.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you.

City Clerk Urquia: The next speaker is on Zoom, and it's going to be Ms. Maria Cruz.

Maria Cruz: Good afternoon. First of all, let me thank all of you for giving us your time and your efforts in trying to make our city the City Beautiful that we moved to. I heard something today that made me happy, and I think is an excellent idea for the projects to go first to the Board of Architects for a preliminary look to make sure that if it's something that is not going to work, that they can hear it before they spend millions of dollars doing plans and whatever, and then not be able to tell them, "No, too bad," because they've already spent time and money. But I must tell you that some of us have been listening to the people, to the residents, to the taxpayers. And most of us see -- most of us have concerns about bonuses and incentives. Most of us really do not believe that we should be giving any bonuses or any incentives. Most of us, I think, believe that

we moved to Coral Gables because we liked the way Coral Gables looked. And instead of giving bonuses and incentives, maybe we should take away if they do not build the way that Coral Gables -- that Merrick conceived Coral Gables. I'm going to tell you that my big issue is when someone buys a property, somebody buys something that they want to build in Coral Gables. They should look at what they can build. They should pay attention to what's possible to be built and not expect any variances, any waivers, any bonuses. What they buy is what they can build. The problem is they -- my perception, and I've been here since 1976. My perception is that they find an inexpensive, a cheap land, a lot, an old house that needs to be torn down and can go for very little, and maybe two or three houses, one next to the other, they buy it for very little money, very little, you know, in quotes. And then they figure out that they cannot make enough money if they have to follow the rules. So, then they have to come and cry and beg because they're not going to be able to make enough money. And we -- "we" meaning the employees, the staff, sometimes the elected officials -- feel bad because they've bought this property and they cannot build what they plan to build. Well, they should not plan to build something that doesn't fit in the land that they bought. It's a simple issue. They need to buy enough land or the property in the location where they can build what they want, or they shouldn't buy it. There's no discussion about it. I am sure that most of us that live in, you know, homes, most of us that live in residential areas, if we were to go to the City and say, "Well, you know, now that I have seven more kids, I need to add another story to my house," they may not be very agreeable to it because my -- the little lot where they want to build it is not big enough for that kind of building. Well, that has to apply to the developers also. The message should be do not buy in Coral Gables unless you're sure that what you're buying lends itself to what you want to build. End of the story, no more discussion. And there should be a gatekeeper. Before the process starts, there should be somebody that when they come in first and say, "I'm buying this property," or "I bought this property and I would like to do such and such," that they can look at them in their face, and say, "I hate to tell you, don't buy it, because you will not be able to build that," instead of trying to come up with ways to help them build what they want to build, even though they shouldn't. And that's my thought for the day. And once again, I thank you all for giving us your time, your expertise. And please remember that the residents, the

taxpayers, are here to stay. The developers come, build, take their money and run away. Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you.

City Clerk Urquia: The next speaker is Mr. Jackson "Rip" Holmes.

Jackson "Rip" Holmes: Greetings. Nice to see our distinguished panelists. I feel -- I got to start out with the larger picture. My perception is that Citizens United has allowed developer money to control elections in Coral Gables. And that as a result, we no longer have a government of the people because the developer money -- as an example, there's -- a developer can give an unlimited amount of money to a PAC. And people that have run and won, or run and almost won, have told me it really is now impossible to win a seat on the City Commission and be able to appoint members like yourselves to this panel without developer support. So, it taints -- I mean, I hate to say this, but you don't have infinite time, so I'm going to get right to the point. I think that we don't have a government of the people. We have a government of developers. And I think, from what I've seen today, I've been disappointed. I don't even think -- Mr. Bermello, you and I know each other, and so you're going to forgive me even if I may make you mad right now, so I ask you forgiveness and -- upfront. I thought that Mayor...

Unidentified Speaker: (INAUDIBLE).

Mr. Holmes: Thank you. Mayor Lago was going to be on board with this. He seemed to think that there was -- that we're giving away too much Mediterranean bonuses. Living in the world of reality, I thought, you know, with that direction. But now, you, Mr. Bermello, are challenging the very premise of some of the things that Mr. Pardo pointed out. You're saying that there is no tainting of the process. I hate to say this, but I believe Mr. Pardo and not you. But what's most upsetting to me is that it suggests that maybe Mayor Lago is not really on board with trying to control this thing. Now, focusing narrowly then on the Mediterranean bonus, over the years I've

talked with developers, I've learned that, in the proper context, a Mediterranean bonus is worthwhile. As I've already said, I think that we've lost that context completely. We should have a moratorium on Mediterranean bonuses and only allow them for special circumstances because all of development is out of control. But I'm worried now, Mr. Bermello, that maybe you're not really -- maybe Mr. Lago's not on board, maybe you're not on board, and are we going to get anything out of this? I think that in terms of the narrow focus of this committee, we need to really seriously pare back. Let's say that on a -- if there's a hundred percent being given out now, let's say it needs to be cut back to -- at least back to 25 percent of the present in terms of what is allowed for a Mediterranean bonus because we're getting buildings that really don't look Mediterranean. We've lost the focus. We've lost the purpose. I think there is a legitimate purpose. It's been blown out. I could go on, but I will add another larger picture remark. With all of this runaway development enabled by Citizens United, we're no longer really a suburb. Anyone that thinks about moving here to Coral Gables to get some kind of place where their children can grow up safe from urbanization and the crime that comes with urbanization is not really getting good information. And no doubt I'll get myself in trouble for this, but I'm going to get away -- this will be my last comment. For Mayor Lago to say, "Oh, we're doing such a great job. People want to move here," that's really not an honest statement. People want to move here because they're still living in the past. The present is that there's runaway development in Coral Gables. It's a runaway train. It's not really a suburb anymore. Look at the Wawa project. It's not even safe for children. And let's try and get our story straight. Thank you very much.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you. Mr. Clerk.

City Clerk Urquia: So, the last -- he was the last speaker, but we did receive a comment through the chat. It's from Mr. Cesar Mergoza (phonetic). And he said, "Question: The Mediterranean bonus seems to be misnamed. It seems the objectives are design, classic Coral Gables, as well as open space and compatible neighborhood design. Keep buildings to five stories or fewer and to avoid encroachment through small setbacks. Can we use this opportunity with the blue-ribbon committee to adjust the document to incorporate the incentives that seem to have unanimous

agreement?" He further added, "Also, what is the timing to get the final recommendation from the committee? I believe residents will like a thoughtful, yet speedy resolution to this prior to year-end, preferably."

Chairperson Pardo: Is that it, Mr. Clerk?

City Clerk Urquia: That it is, sir.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you. Alright. So, based on that, as a segue into that, I would suggest to the committee that we meet on a weekly basis for, including this meeting, a total of four meetings. In other words, to try to see if we could wrap this up in such a way -- what we'd like to do, I would think, is make sure that we take the direction specifically as stated by Mr. Behar earlier about looking specifically at the bonuses, narrowing it down to those elements or bonuses that are elements that are relevant, and it would be us individually coming up with our own, all seven members, then analyzing those at the next meeting to see, you know, which are worthy, et cetera, whether there should be still a level one and a level two or only one level, to understand specifically of how the historical context would come into play, and then go in that direction. Mr. Behar.

Board Member Behar: No, I agree with that. And I think that's the way we need to proceed because a lot of the comments that were made, unfortunately, we don't have...

Chairperson Pardo: The power.

Board Member Behar: The ability to do any changes.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Behar: I mean, that's the reality. And whether I agree with that -- and there's a lot of things that I am agreeing with all the residents and the comments, we cannot do. We cannot do

anything about it. So, let's concentrate on what we can and let's try to improve that. And I think that taking those five -- or two bonus -- those two incentive levels and making the most out of that is going to be the most beneficial to this process.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, fair enough.

Unidentified Speaker: That's what we're charged to do.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. Now, one more thing.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chair, I agree a hundred percent.

Chairperson Pardo: Yes, sir.

Board Member Bermello: I just still believe that we should all be provided the entire section, and that we all review the entire section, and that we comment on the entire section, and then we have a process by which we can each redline and consolidate. And it seems to me that, at the end of this process, there should be a version that shows what the findings of this group are to the Commission, and that it be posted in a way that every resident in the City can review, can opine, can comment, can come back and tell us we missed X, Y and Z, or we agree with you, or you did a great job. Or like one of the ladies apparently thinks, we're not doing a good job, or whatever the case may be, so that there's full involvement by the citizenry in what is being done. And there may be some things that we can't change, but I think there's certainly a message that we can send. And maybe there may -- and there could be a difference. In other words, there are some things that, as a panel, we may not be able to modify. But I think -- it seems to me that what I -- I hear - - at least from a number of the citizens -- is that -- and what they've heard from, I think, all of us, is that they have heard their own voices, and that they're counting on us as this panel to convey that message. So, I -- and some of these things may have to do -- beyond just the bonuses. But if

we can have a -- and I like the idea of meeting every week for the next four weeks, and let's see that we get it done.

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE) to get it done.

Board Member Bermello: And work hard to get it done.

Chairperson Pardo: I agree. Same day, same time.

City Clerk Urquia: I was going to confirm. So, is it going to be for the next three weeks or the next four weeks?

Unidentified Speaker: Three weeks.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, the next three would make it a total of four.

Unidentified Speaker: Four.

Chairperson Pardo: But if you recall, the City Attorney can say, we've got a lot of pressure from the Commission saying, you know, see how we could -- what we could do in 30 days. In other words, the 30 days starting today, so that would make it four weeks. If we don't set a timeline, we won't accomplish...

Board Member Pratt: We won't finish.

Chairperson Pardo: So, we're going to do that, I think. I know at least the rest of the members, not me, but the rest of the members are pretty smart. I figured that they could come up with something pretty quick on that. And I want to also say one more thing. I've had Mr. Adams sitting here. Mr. Adams has a particular charge that I am going to indulge myself as Chairman. Mr.

Adams, I would like to have something in writing from you to all the board members, okay. And what I want to have from you is how existing, historically important -- not necessarily -- I said carefully, I said historically important, not necessarily designated. Because there are many buildings out there, such as the San Sebastian Hotel -- or San Sebastian Apartments. Most residents in the City of Coral Gables assume that is a designated historical building. It is not, just so you know. But it is historically significant, and since 1986, that particular building has been used as an example for the Mediterranean ordinance. Mr. Adams, can you approach?

Historical Resources Director Adams: Just for clarification, a designation report is being prepared. It just has not been completed and submitted to the board yet.

Chairperson Pardo: Correct.

Historical Resources Director Adams: And if you're asking for me to provide information on buildings which may not necessarily be designated but are historically significant...

Chairperson Pardo: Well, what I'm saying is, not -- I'm not asking you -- don't -- as I always say, don't put your liver in a quiver, okay.

Historical Resources Director Adams: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: Let's put this in the proper context.

Historical Resources Director Adams: Sure.

Chairperson Pardo: It's the impact of development, new development, on historically significant projects. In other words, how does it impact them?

Historical Resources Director Adams: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: Visually, massing, all these different things.

Historical Resources Director Adams: Sure.

Chairperson Pardo: I think that's very important that we at least understand and take a look at. I know for a fact -- and there are municipalities, there are counties, in fact, throughout the United States, that are -- that have certain requirements to make sure that they don't lose the fabric component of those buildings. And sometimes there are distance requirements, you know, how - - that's just another one of those design constructs, I think, which has been very silent, in my opinion. Having been a trustee of the Dade Heritage Trust, having worked on historical buildings, I would tell you that that is one of our greatest resources. And that's why I would just like to have your expertise as an opinion, just so we understand, whether we use it or we don't use it, but at least we acknowledge the importance of those historic buildings.

Historical Resources Director Adams: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright.

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Salman, you were going to say something?

Board Member Salman: We've heard a lot of commentary from the public, and I think that we are all in agreement that we see something that needs to be addressed, and that it doesn't necessarily completely exist within the Mediterranean bonus. I think we're all aware of that. I don't think there's anything limiting us with regards to our personal opinions and what we do outside of this committee to make those other changes (INAUDIBLE). Because there are certainly issues with regards to design, which is becoming apparent and becoming apparent to everyone that are not necessarily within the character of the City, and that's what I think the public is objecting to. I think that's what we as professionals are beginning to object to. And this is only one component.

We have our limits with regards to our charge here, which is specifically with regards to how the Mediterranean bonuses are calculated and applied. And -- but we are members of this community, and we have the ability to address other issues outside of this. And we should take this opportunity to do so.

Chairperson Pardo: Very good.

Board Member Pratt: And if I could just add one thing too. Actually, to the extent that -- with reference to historic is that one of the things that does have a big play in the Med bonus and in the overall massing of the building is when TDRs or transfer of development rights are given to -- which are a -- an incen -- well, not an incentive, but it's a benefit that is given by the City Commission -- or permitted by the City Commission. But when -- you know, a lot of the projects that I think the residents and people use as the reference for complaining about are projects that have received TDRs, and they're much larger. You know, it allows the project to go up to a 4.375, and so -- but the flipside of that coin is the project is larger, but the use of the TDRs is preserving the historic character and going -- and making it possible for historic buildings to be preserved that create also the character of Coral Gables. So, without the use of the TDRs, or without the ability of the owner of a historic property to sell the TDRs to a developer to utilize in a larger project, they're not going to have the money or the ability to maintain historic properties and preserve. So, you know, one of the things about development is that, you know, there's multiple sides to it. It's not just that everything is, you know, too big. It's too out of -- you know, it's out of scale. There are things, elements that are going into it that make other parts of the context of the neighborhood or the urban character. It's preserving those historic buildings. So, you know, I -- a lot of times, I -- you know, laypeople don't understand that balance that is working to -- you know, new development that is also preserving older buildings. So, you know, I think it's something to keep in mind. But that's something that is very difficult speaking from the Board of Architects point of view to try and find that balance in new projects that come to the board for review that are using TDRs, because it does create a much larger envelope on the site than what's usually, you know, allowed.

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Adams, do you have a TDR accountability -- let's say, available TDRs that exist out there. Are we talking about a lot of TDRs? For the public, TDRs are transfer development rights that are assigned based on the FAR that is not used by normally smaller buildings which are historical. And once they qualify, those TDRs can be sold to be able to preserve those historic buildings, and then they're used in new development. What happens is then that the FAR in the new development then goes up exponentially, and therefore...

Board Member Pratt: But it gets capped at -- it is -- you can't make it go forever. It's capped at 4.375.

Chairperson Pardo: Right, it's capped at 4.375, but the whole point is that, right now, even with the bonuses, the two levels of Mediterranean bonus that exist today is 3.5; at 3.3, and another .2, that's 3.5.

Board Member Pratt: It's an additional 25...

Board Member Bermello: Depends on...

Board Member Pratt: Percent.

Board Member Bermello: The district.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. And depending on the district, it's a complicated formula, but the whole optic of the TDRs, which have been used now for many years, all over the United States, is to be able to transfer development rights in order to preserve historic buildings.

Board Member Bermello: You know, it's like everything else we're saying is there's no other good option for common sense. A TDR applied in the correct location the entire community can

applaud. A TDR applied in the wrong location, and it's horrible. You'll never be able to live off that wrong decision. So, TDRs themselves...

Historical Resources Director Adams: TDRs...

Board Member Bermello: Are not a problem. It's how it's managed and applied.

Historical Resources Director Adams: TDRs...

Board Member Bermello: Where's the receiving site.

Unidentified Speaker: Where's the receiving site.

Board Member Bermello: You put a receiving property that is right at the edge of a single-family neighborhood, and it's going to be impossible to not impact a single-family neighborhood.

Historical Resources Director Adams: TDRs are for specific, specific areas. You can't just transfer them anywhere in the City. They are for specific areas.

Board Member Bermello: With the exception of one...

Board Member Pratt: It has to be within the CBD.

Board Member Bermello: With the exception of one property, where the City arrived at an agreement with one particular property, where because of the courts, that TDR can go anywhere.

Board Member Behar: Well, that's limited...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Those are already exhausted.

Board Member Bermello: But it's, you know...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Those TDRs have already been exhausted. Those no longer exist.

Board Member Bermello: Unidentified Speaker: But for a long time, that was still there. And so, still the issue of common sense and where it's applied has to be -- you know, it's a lot of what we've been talking about, you know. And so, it's not just like saying height is bad or TDRs; it's how it's applied.

Historical Resources Director Adams: And I also think even though the sale of TDRs effectively helps to protect the historic site because you're selling development rights...

Board Member Bermello: Absolutely.

Historical Resources Director Adams: Off the site, so you're reducing the amount that potentially could be built there, therefore, effectively reducing the development value of the site. It doesn't necessarily prevent someone from building something on the adjacent lot. So, while you may have protected the historic building, the context of the building could potentially still be destroyed.

Board Member Bermello: And if you designate the CBD, for example -- obviously, the case -- but if you were to expand that into, let's say, areas of the North Gables, or in areas that, you know, where the boundary is a single-family home, that can have a significant impact. In the middle of the Central Business District, nobody will -- it won't be an issue. It's the right thing to do because you're saving a historic property. You're allowing them the ability to maintain that property, which now, after what happened in Surfside, every condo association is now thinking about, you know, their reserves and maintenance. And TDRs allow you to do just that.

Chairperson Pardo: And one of the reasons -- exactly what Willy was saying is that over time, and the reason we're sitting here today is over time, we started off one way, the original Med bonuses were only in the CBD, period. The TDRs were only in a certain section, period. Over time, it's moved out. So, it would be nice, I think, for this committee to understand from a TDR standpoint, you know, where they are. Because at the end of the day, they could also be added to the Med bonuses, and that's how you get to the over 4 FAR.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I would still want to just chime in, I'm sorry. But the scope of TDRs just is so far outside of...

Chairperson Pardo: Alright.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: The Mediterranean bonus that I don't see how it provides anything else to the discussion.

Chairperson Pardo: We'll strike that.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: But as far as the impact of historic buildings, you know, on the bonuses, you know, where the bonuses are, et cetera, it would be nice to know what other people in the country do when it comes to massing, et cetera, and you know, how they impact or don't impact historical buildings.

Historical Resources Director Adams: And one thing -- you know, I've been listening to what you've been saying. And one thing that's been at the back of my mind is, my department doesn't really deal with the Mediterranean bonus because it's generally for new, large construction, generally, not in historic areas. But my way of looking at things from a historic perspective, based on a lot of the things that were said today, a lot of the things we look for in buildings are honesty

and integrity and authenticity and proportion. And a lot of that seems to be missing sometimes because these details seem to be an afterthought. And you know, most people can tell, like the lady said earlier, how come these buildings don't look as good as the older buildings. Obviously, it comes down to training and understanding what you're doing. But certainly, from my point of view, I tend to look at not just Mediterranean Revival buildings, but all new architecture. I tend to look at as, in 50 years' time, is this the sort of building that we would be trying to designate and preserve? And I think that's an important consideration in new design. You know, as a good design and in 50 years' time, is this the sort of thing that we would be looking to preserve? So, that's certainly my take on newer construction, and I certainly think that's something that's worth keeping at the back of your mind. You know, is this a new design that, in 50 years' time, we would be proud to or would be eligible to designate? And I think that's important as well.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Adams. Mr. Attorney, one last question. And that is, at the next meeting, you know, if the board -- it was a consensus of listening to the public. You know, I think that the next meeting is probably going to be a nitty-gritty workshop, which is open to the public. But do we have the ability of maybe -- you know, if time does not allow for us to, you know, hear public comment at that time, is there a possibility of having the public send us, or through the Clerk, I guess, send all the committee members, you know, whatever comments they have? I think it would be much more...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: The public can always provide comments and send in comments. And at every single meeting, it's up to the Chair, if they would like to allow public comments. So, if the time allows for it, it's always at the discretion of the Chair and of the board, if they want to have public comment. But they can always submit it to the Clerk, and we can provide it to you. That's, once again, strictly up to you.

Chairperson Pardo: I just think that everything was pretty much said today from all of us on both sides of the dais today. And I think, you know, it'd be wise to utilize as much of the time possible to cut to the chase.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Okay. Was there a discussion --? I apologize. I stepped out for two minutes. Has there been any discussion on any sort of a breakdown of parts of the Code for each individual representative?

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Nothing? Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: Very good.

Board Member Salman: It's not a big section.

Board Member Bermello: Will you be sending a Word...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I will provide a Word version of the -- of 5-200 to all the board members.

Board Member Bermello: Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: You're going to have to expand it. Look at the size of the printing.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: If you do have any questions or comments in regard to the document, I only ask that you do not reply all. You can send questions to staff, just not amongst yourselves.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Unidentified Speaker: Thank you.

Unidentified Speaker: Fair enough.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. Is there --? Thank you, board members. Is there any other comment from the committee?

Board Member Salman: I make a motion to adjourn.

Board Member Bermello: I second.

Board Member Pratt: So -- second it.

Unidentified Speaker: Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright. Mr. Clerk?

City Clerk Urquia: All in favor?

The Board Members (Collectively): Aye.

City Clerk Urquia: Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you very much.

Board Member Bermello: Thank you.

Board Member Behar: Thank you.

**City of Coral Gables Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting
July 29, 2021
City Commission Chambers
405 Biltmore Way, Coral Gables, FL**

Blue Ribbon Committee Members

Chairperson Felix Pardo

Board Member Aramis "Mitch" Alvarez

Board Member Robert Behar

Board Member Willy Bermello

Board Member Glenn Pratt

Board Member Javier Salman

City Staff

Assistant City Attorney, Gustavo Ceballos

City Architect, Juan Riesco

Historical Resources Director, Warren Adams

Public Speaker(s)

Chairperson Pardo: Would you like to call the roll, please?

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Alvarez? Board Member Behar?

Board Member Behar: Here.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Bermello?

Board Member Bermello: Present.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Pratt?

Board Member Pratt: Yes.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Javier Salman is currently absent. Mr. Riesco?

City Architect Riesco: Yes.

City Clerk Urquia: Chairperson Pardo?

Chairperson Pardo: Yes. Well, welcome to the meeting. We ran a little long last time, but then again, it was to be expected since we had to basically set the ground rules, and I think we did that. So, I think we'll go through -- first of all, the approval of the minutes. We all received the minutes rather late, but they were pretty verbatim to say the least. If the minutes are acceptable, if someone can make a motion to approve?

Unidentified Speaker: I make...

Board Member Bermello: So move.

Chairperson Pardo: And a second?

Unidentified Speaker: Second.

City Clerk Urquia: All in favor?

The Board Members (Collectively): Aye.

Chairperson Pardo: Very good. Thank you. So, I wanted to just read something very quickly into the record. I actually took some notes of the first meeting, and this is going to be just phrases, phrases of what was spoken by the board members at the last meeting. And if you can indulge me, this is going to be like -- what's the name of that song? I didn't start the fire. So, it'll just be phrases. Okay, first of all, Mitch Alvarez. Mitch mentioned setbacks, how the building lands or touches the ground. The building creates transparency, penetrations. The architect needs leverage with zoning, zoning bonuses for certain height. Why is it that there's no setbacks? Does not have sidewalks. The public reacts intuitively. The Plaza project fails because it's gigantic. Early interaction with the Board of Architects would have helped with zoning. The zoning straitjacket. Zoning represents -- and attendance of -- zoning representation of attendance, not as part of the BOA would be a good direction. The client deals with mathematics, such as 3.0 FAR. If you suggest something less, you're crazy. Mr. Bermello mentioned early intervention with the Board of Architects, encroachment, overall massing, ground floor. Only place public participates. Code is too prescriptive. Why is there a difference between commercial and mixed use for landscaping? Need for retail at ground floor, as high as possible. How do we treat projects near historical sites? Why is a bicycle parking as important as encroachment? No cookie-cutters. Mr. Salman. Overall massing. Massing submittal should be required. Forty-five feet maximum height at 100 feet is good. Setbacks over 100 feet may be irrelevant. Bonus should be used as a separate floor plate. Regions Bank evaporates at the top. Open space, gallery setbacks. Too much formula driven. Setback and step-backs are crucial. Mr. Pratt. Zoning Code is very restrictive. Parking creates volume. Relief by the BOA. Flexibility ground floor only. Is the only place the public participates. Smaller increments for amenities to be achieved. Mediterranean style. Mr. Behar. Forty-five foot, 100-foot deep is a good transition to single-family residential and duplex. We can't change the zoning. It's not that easy. And then both Mr. Riesco and Mr. Behar both said, "How do we make the Code better where the public benefits?" Whether you said it in that order or these Cliff notes, it was just to set the pace of what we discussed and the keynotes that we discussed during that long meeting, the first meeting. So, that being said, on the agenda that we have for discussion, the first thing is that we all agreed that what we were going to try to do was limit the changes to the existing 5-201, Tables 1, 2, and 3. Chair recognizes Mr. Salman.

Board Member Salman: Good afternoon.

Chairperson Pardo: The late Mr. Salman.

Board Member Salman: No, I'm still here.

Board Member Behar: You're late on arrival, but not (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Salman: Exactly.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright. So, the change of Tables 1, 2, and 3 of the existing Code.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chair, I don't believe our voting on that, that might have been, I don't know, maybe the original mandate to this board. But when I was here, one thing that I know that I did say...

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: Is that I think we should look at 5-200 in its entirety, not just limit ourselves to...

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: Tables 1, 2, and 3.

Chairperson Pardo: Very good.

Board Member Bermello: For example, in what I had did as far as my homework that -- I apologize -- got to you -- because I didn't think I could communicate with you and not violate the Sunshine, so I sent my notes to the City Attorney.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: And I realize you got copies that are black lined and it's not as nice or easy to read the redline. But as an example, I deleted entirely Table 3 to pose it as an -- because I feel so strongly that the concept of giving any waivers on setbacks and any concept of encroachment -- unless it's approved by the City Commission because of variances -- is something that shouldn't even be there. So, I didn't like want -- you know, I kind of like -- and I'll just put that out there. I just -- but I think we should start at the beginning, which actually addresses the intent. Because on the intent, there was something that I felt was in congress to what we were doing, and there was one item that I also suggest deleted -- deleting it, and it's under the purpose section. And it was provide for the ability to reduce setbacks and encroachments into the public right-of-way with public open space improvements. In other words, the concept that you can provide open public space -- open space improvements that mitigate or allow you or substantiate the ability for someone to come in and waive entirely setbacks or encroach into the public right-of-way, I think it sets the wrong tone. I mean, I spent -- I don't know how many years now. I think it's going to be almost 47 as an architect, and I've always started understanding what are the setbacks and what are the rules of the game. This kind of says you kind of forget about the rules of the game. And that to me -- so Mr. Chairman, if I may. I thought it was important to go to the beginning. And if there are any areas that are -- and to me, that item was in congress with what I was about to do later. Because to take out Table 3, which deals with encroachments -- basically, Table 3 is a free-for-all for encroachments -- and not to do something about what the intent, is not correct. So...

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Bermello, if you...

Board Member Bermello: That was the only thing I'd like to bring up.

Chairperson Pardo: You are 100 percent right. My intent in the agenda was the changes of Section 501 completely, which is starting with the intent, which you had your markup; I had mine.

Board Member Bermello: And you have yours.

Chairperson Pardo: A little bit. So, the thing is, you are 100 percent right. The only thing I'm going to ask everyone, when they talk about one specific section, please mention numerically the number. There are members of the public here also so they could follow it, and I think that would be important. So, if everyone agrees, then we will start with the Section 5, Mediterranean standards.

Board Member Behar: Mr. Chairman, before we start...

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Board Member Behar: This whole process, you know, I think it's going to be important that, in my opinion, the Planning Department -- because remember, when all this is done, the Planning Department gets to look at it before it goes even to the Board of Architects.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Behar: So, I think it's going to be important for them to be here to hear, not just read the minutes. But I think it would be important to have a member, whether it's the Planning Director or somebody here, for them to know that what we're talking is what it's intended to be, not to get it by reading a document.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. Mr. Clerk?

City Clerk Urquia: Yes, sir.

Chairperson Pardo: You were instructed by the Manager's Office that we would have a representative here from the Planning Department.

City Clerk Urquia: No, sir.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

City Clerk Urquia: The -- I'm here to take minutes on behalf of them, but if you have specific questions to the Department, we can go ahead and address them to the Director directly.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. They have been -- Mr. Behar, they have not been prohibited from coming here. In fact, at one point, one person was named to be here, and...

Board Member Behar: I think it's fundamental that they're here. I think that we should, you know, require for them to be here because, at the end of the day, we're going to go through this. I would like for them to hear all our comments and the intent of what we want to do, not just go back and then, you know, do their checklist. Or, you know, this doesn't work. I think it's important for them to be here, and I will recommend that we -- whether it's Mr. Trias or, you know, somebody from - I prefer Mr. Trias, which is the, you know, Planning Director to be here. I think it's important. That's my opinion.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: I concur with Mr. Behar's opinion. And Mr. Chair, if we need that in the form of a motion from this panel, be so it. Because I think you -- and you're totally correct. This -- I mean, sometimes reading these, it's almost like reading the Bible. You have to read it 10

times over to make sure you have the right meaning and intent that's coming from it. And since we're here talking about it, this is the perfect time. All of us here are on a volunteer basis. None of us are getting paid. So, we do this because we all live here. We love this community, and we want to make it a better place. It seems to me that for Mr. Devin Cejas or Mr. Ramon Trias to be here present, one of the two or a representative that can absorb like a sponge, not just the written word, but the written meaning of the word that is being discussed is very important.

City Clerk Urquia: Mr. Chair, we will go ahead and, you know, pass on your comments to the City Manager. However, I believe that was the intent of appointing Mr. Riesco as a board member to this board was his knowledge of the Code and how it's applied right now. However, like I said, your wishes will be passed on to the City Manager.

Chairperson Pardo: Please.

City Clerk Urquia: Alright.

Chairperson Pardo: So, we would like either Mr. Trias or Mr. Cejas here...

City Clerk Urquia: Will do.

Chairperson Pardo: For each one of the meetings. They could alternate if they'd like. Mr. Behar.

Board Member Behar: I agree. I mean...

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. Mr. Bermello.

Board Member Bermello: I agree 100 percent.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, perfect. Alright. So, getting back to the purpose of the section, literally purpose -- A, purpose and applicability. So, I would like to state that one of the things that I found interesting is that I looked at the original 1986 version of the Mediterranean bonuses. And in there, it is almost funny that the purpose that was written in November of 1986 was crystal clear, the first paragraph of Section 30. And the reason that I say that it is crystal clear is that part of that original first paragraph of purpose of 1986 is shown under (1)(d), and it's only part of the sentence where it says, "enhance the image of the City by providing a visual linkage between contemporary development and the City's unique historic thematic appearance." It sounded like a partial sentence, and the reason is because it is. The 1986 version said that the purpose of these regulations is to encourage and expand the creative use of the Coral Gables Mediterranean architectural style. The use of Coral Gables Mediterranean architectural design in the construction of new buildings and in the renovation or additions to the existing buildings will enhance the image of the City by providing a visual linkage between contemporary development and the City's unique historic thematic appearance. So, you could see only about 15 words of that entire paragraph were used, and there's a tremendous loss under the term purpose. And the reason that purpose is so important in any section of any code, the same as any book, is because it basically tells you this is why we're here. And that's the opening paragraph of this particular section. So, when I did my markup, I found it interesting that it does not say exactly what this purpose was. So, 35 years later, they lost their way, and that's one of the primary reasons I think that we are here. So, I would like to be able to incorporate more of the original section under purpose, because in my opinion, I think that it is crystal clear that first paragraph that's there.

Board Member Behar: But you know, in 1986, I think the reason that this whole confusion started is because we had two or three projects along the Alhambra and Ponce de Leon that were the modern box glass building at the time that created a lot of controversy, for lack of a better word. And that's why the Commission back then says, "We don't want to continue down that path. How do we promote to go back into the Mediterranean style of architecture?" I agree with you, but I think that the way that maybe that was intended did not follow through. But I think that there's a

way -- we should find a mechanism that avoids to do that, but yet gives an opportunity to do contemporary architecture.

Chairperson Pardo: And you are 100 percent right. There's no doubt about it. And I think that there's flexibility in it. And let me just jump one step ahead because you hit it on the head already. Back then, they had a Table 1 and a Table 2. But their Table 1 was broken down into two things. The first portion of their Table 1 had to do with the style. In other words, if you did a Coral Gables Mediterranean architectural style, you got .2 FAR bonus, period, right off the top. If you qualified for that -- in 1986, this is how far ahead this was. But the second part, almost the greatest part of Table 1 had to do then with amenities that we have been discussing for the ground level. That could be any style, okay. So, it is -- and I think I made available through the Clerk's Office the original Mediterranean style guide, which has the original -- very simple, easy to follow. So, in here, that's the ordinance and the table, which was very simple, very simple, the table. So, it says up here, development category. Number one, architectural style. This is Table 1. Architectural style. And right there, off the bat, it shows .20 FAR, architectural style. If you do the style, it's .2. The second item, which is everything else after that, was additional amenities. And they all had to do with pedestrian amenities and the features that we have been discussing very vocally about. So, you are correct. This is not to make all buildings Mediterranean, but if you're able to do all of the above, you can get the maximum FAR bonus because all these things cost money, whether they're Coral Gables Mediterranean or they're modern with these plazas and welcoming the pedestrian, et cetera. All of these things cost money. But we give you -- if you meet the requirements of the Coral Gables Mediterranean -- you get that much more. An example, when we talk about setbacks, which they did not fathom in 1986 that people were going to be doing what they've done with setbacks. And as you said, Willy, that -- you know, the setbacks all of a sudden became fair game for everything, even Table 3 just -- it's a free-for-all. Before, it used to be three balls, you know -- three strikes, you're out, and four balls, you walk. All of a sudden, we're playing cricket. It's not even the same thing anymore. And the other thing is that for a city as stringent as Coral Gables for variances, setbacks are one of the greatest variances to be able to overcome in the City of Coral Gables, but not under these rules or lack of rules. So, therefore, as an example,

you take a building -- and I will quote my friend Mitch Alvarez -- and you have now zero setback because now you're allowed zero setback. But if you take that setback 100 foot -- or his example -- and you set it back 5 feet, 10 feet times the height, you've lost that volume. So why not give it back to the development so you don't lose that square footage? These are one of the simple ways that we can address the setbacks. But we -- I think we all have a consensus that the disproportionate, you know, loss of setback is hurting the perception that the pedestrian has at the ground level. So, that's just one of the examples. But the way that this Code was written in 1986 was pretty comprehensive as far as saying, "Wait, wait a minute. If you want to design in this style, this is great, but then the amenities, you get bonuses." And the other thing that we had discussed too is that not all bonuses are created equal. And as Willy said, "You get the same bonus for a bicycle rack compared to something that's incredibly relevant, such as encroachment." How is that? So, therefore, I think that when you look at this, or at least the way I looked at it going back -- and I analyzed this -- instead of a point system, which is also part of the agenda -- instead of a point system, they actually were giving square footages based on certain things, like the example now that Mitch has discussed about the square footage of those setbacks. Because when you take those things out, the developer is giving them, but you have to give it back to them in a different way. So, if they give us something which is good for the people on the ground level that are going to interact with the building, then they should be rewarded. So, we cannot take out -- in my opinion, we can't just take out mention of the Mediterranean style because that's inherent. If your client wants to do a commercial building that is a different style, they can. They just simply won't get the entire FAR bonus.

Board Member Behar: Yeah, but I think that's a problem. And I think that's one of the biggest problems that we have. And we're going to use the Plaza. We're going to use Gables Station as two examples. Because they get so much emphasis on the style, you get results like that. Perhaps the style should be diminished if we're going to keep the point system on how much value you give to the style and you allow a more diverse -- but yet to get up to -- and I'm just going to throw some numbers out. Instead of getting .2 for the style, maybe it's .1, and you get more point for giving me open spaces, giving me public benefit than the style. Because -- I will use it again. I

will use Gables Station project. You look at that project. It is a very massive -- the articulation, the -- you know, it's not, in my opinion, there. But yet, because they got the style, they get the full benefit of the incentive. I don't agree with that. I think, you know -- and the other point is, you're talking about setback. I want to be sure that I understand. Because don't forget, most of the plotted lots in Coral Gables is based on a hundred foot in depth. So, that was the way that Merrick plotted the City. So, you may not have the flexibility in some cases, especially when you do a mixed use in the CBD or in the MXD, which is what creating the most problem to the neighborhood. To reduce -- to increase those setbacks because the depth of a lot may not be adequate to do your podium because, unfortunately, whether we like it or not, cars are still necessary. And I'm a proponent to try to eliminate as much of the cars as possible, but you can't. So, that's going to be a determining factor in how much setback is going to be required. At least that's what I see when we get -- do some of these projects.

Unidentified Speaker: No, I agree.

Chairperson Pardo: Let's take this approach if you don't mind. Let's take the approach -- let's talk first about the design itself of Mediterranean -- the Coral Gables Mediterranean design. And I agree with you 100 percent in the example that you gave. I want to make sure that I put this in the record. This is from the original guideline. It says, "The Mediterranean design found in Coral Gables has sometimes been referred to as Spanish Revival or Italian. Both of these terms suggest the specific origin of those idioms, which have been adopted for the early 20th century architects and owners in this region of the United States. The term Mediterranean as used in this document allows for the broader interpretation of the style and acknowledges the eclectic legacy of design, which freely adapts Italian, Spanish, and Moorish architectural precedent." The general characteristics -- there are certain characteristics and elements associated with the Mediterranean design, which have general application. These include tile roofs, (INAUDIBLE) and stucco exteriors, shaped parapets and dormers, widely overhanging eaves, towers, arcades and loggias, (INAUDIBLE) windows, elaborately shaped arches, balconies, wrought iron details, sconces, railings, exposed rafters and beams, highly decorative window surroundings, casement windows,

courtyards, which often feature a fountain, doorways which are framed by columns and pilasters, carved or cast ornaments, ceramic tile accents, tile vents, decorative chimneys, often featuring a tiled roof, low pitch roofs, multiple roof slopes. The way that the second part of today's code is written, it basically has one sentence, and it names seven buildings on it. This came right out of that guideline from 1986. The features that you're talking about that are missing, this would have been just a palette that could have been used by the Board of Architects to require much more. And I agree, you shouldn't necessarily get the full amount, but I think it should be zero or the full amount. But they have to do something that is exceptional to be able to get that full amount. I think the biggest problem that we have right now is that right now there's a building in the south part of -- south of South Dixie, in the City of Coral Gables that hasn't quite opened yet. They have a "paseo." It's X amount of feet wide. It's squatty. And when you look through from one side to the other side of the street, from one street to the other, it's very dark, so they had to put artificial lighting in there. And it looks -- it doesn't look very inviting. For me, that's not a paseo. See, and the problem is that if you do it by formula, because it connects from one street to the other street, check; it qualifies. But the way that it's designed, it doesn't have the height, you know, for the retail. It doesn't have anything going for it. It doesn't have the detail that makes it acceptable, so it can't be mediocre and then just say, just because they went from one side to the other, they get a bonus, or they get the approval.

Board Member Behar: That maybe is one piece of one-tenth of that requirement that gives you up to .2. That's one of them. Because in some cases, a mid-block paseo may be adequate, may be good to connect, you know, from one side to the other. I -- you said something that I don't know if -- to understand correctly -- you said that either you get zero or you get in full.

Chairperson Pardo: No, I was talking about the style for the Mediterranean. Because we all know, you know, hey, this is really something. I mean, this is really Mediterranean, and they used all these elements. You could see it. You could see there are some very good examples in the City that have been built in the last 40 years, 35 years that are excellent. And therefore, from the style

standpoint -- and I agree with you as far as the amenities, that it should be if you provide this, but you have to really provide the entire thing.

Board Member Behar: But look, let's use the example -- and I don't know who brought it up last time -- the Regions Bank building, the one that, you know -- that's not a Mediterranean building.

Chairperson Pardo: That's correct.

Board Member Behar: And it's a great building. It's a fantastic example. To me, we should be doing -- we should be allowed to be doing more like that and not be -- I forget the terminology.

Chairperson Pardo: Handcuffed.

Board Member Behar: Handcuffed or in a straitjacket to do -- to be able to get to that point, I got to put cornices. I got to put tiles on the walls. No. I think that building expresses the massing correctly, breaks it up. I think it's the way -- we should be able to go in the direction that to give the incentives -- for lack of a better word again -- to be able to get up to that .5.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, I don't disagree.

Board Member Alvarez: I want to share with you this. I'm going to talk about expectations. People refer to the Mediterranean style, each person in the City has in his own view or heart a sense of what does that begin to look like, the architecture of the period that created the projects that Merrick and Mizner represented very well. The scale of the projects that were very well captured and represented were scaled for small projects. They were three stories, four stories, two stories, villages, pass ways, trellises, bougainvilleas, elements that in that environment work natural. No, we're confronted with most likely buildings that are going to be high or density. The mood through urban America is increase density and avoid dispersion. And the quality -- or not the quality -- the order of zoning is already looking at that with densities that motivate developers

to work for higher density and 50 -- all of a sudden, we're confronting the challenge of designing a 15-story building with high visibility, with great impact vision, glass everywhere because that's what the market expects. So, just to find the style that architecturally will be representable in that scale of projects is immense challenge, if you move away from the low-scale projects to continue presenting Mediterranean architecture as people envision and would love to see. So, expectations are significant. The style is very important. It is -- all I'm saying is, we have to be realistic. You have to open the door for possibility of projects qualifiable as architectural style, but not necessarily making them that style because we are capturing little details that were present in the low-rise buildings and just putting some of them strategically here and there, you know, not trying to -- because these things on a high-rise with a very small, limited space is not going to happen. It's not going to produce the effect. Now, we have immense disadvantage building high-rise, because our soil would be water level immediately after the first basement. And we did a project for clients in front of Dadeland, and the client insisted on two basements, and they went broke. I know a fellow that we met. He was developing -- and you probably heard this story -- in the Coconut Grove area, upward of the original beautiful center that was there. He ran into the same challenge, and he couldn't stop the water. He went broke. So, parking beyond one basement down is impractical, costly, and high risk here. So, dealing with the cars is already a handicap in creating buildings. And we're always going to find out we're sitting offices, hotels, or beautiful homes in the air over a monument of maybe six, eight stories of parking garage, the maximum practical (INAUDIBLE) garage parking experts say don't go beyond 12 because then it doesn't work. People reject it, and it's not acceptable in the market, or even then it's a challenge. So, out of that content, we still have to come forward and say this is Mediterranean and sell it to the community, sell it to the people that are investing, sell it to the people that live here. For us, it's immense challenge to create a product that is viable within the real meaning of possibilities for style. Beyond the bonuses that you can obtain, even if we were not discussing bonuses, it's still -- the subject matter is the cry of the people in the City wanting to see the architectural style expressed. And it's going to continue to be a challenge. This monumental building that is being built, I just happened to take a street that faced -- my perspective was coming down on -- not Almeria, but the

other one maybe -- coming down in front of this gigantic building of the group here, that big project in front of the park.

Chairperson Pardo: The Plaza.

Board Member Alvarez: Yeah. And there was a structure going up on the roof, like my grandchild would do with an erector set, you know. He puts a block and then you start putting things on top. And my wife said, "What are they doing there?" I said, "Qualifying it to become Mediterranean style. They're doing a little turret," or a little observatory or whatever it is.

Board Member Behar: Cupolas.

Board Member Alvarez: Cupola. And then they're projecting the image of architectural Mediterranean style by doing this type of application, which maybe they granted some bonuses, I don't know. But the tendency is to -- and there are not too many other tools. I mean, every time you do this, you put your pencil, you are confronting the same challenge, and these things are interwoven. We're trying to address bonuses, but at the end of the day, the real desire is expressions that become closer to the architectural style. If we can all -- this is almost impossible to, in words, present it, but we have to keep in mind that this -- beyond the bonuses that are considered, the style is going to be forever present in the minds of the people. And the (INAUDIBLE) remain the challenge for us, for you that do a lot of condominium buildings. Our office was not in that practice. We dealt mostly with other type of buildings, but we had to deal with them with building heights, limitations of parking, clarity of windows for the tenants. They expect to have, you know, all these amenities. And when our founding -- Merrick and Mizner -- created the style, they were designing for another scale, another town, another environment that were not facing these types of projects.

Board Member Pratt: Just to -- if I could expand a little bit on Mitch's thoughts. I think one of the things that makes the -- Mitch's building on Ponce so successful is that it doesn't sit on top of a

parking pedestal. There is a -- the parking garage is set behind the building, and the building goes all the way down to the ground plane, which makes -- animates the space and the whole cityscape much nicer. And so, it goes back to what we were talking about previously about parking, and that there's many, many issues that parking creates with trying to -- to try and create the parking garage and integrate that into the overall building structure. It's very, very difficult. And it's something that the Board of Architects really struggles with too, when we look at when the board reviews projects that are submitted, the larger projects that are submitted. And just to use the Gables Station as an example, I guess, because I just drove by there last night and I was thinking about it. And one of the things that -- I know that people -- there's been a lot of statements made that -- about how there's no setback for the building. But on the ground plane, there's a complete arcade and a loggia, which is something that was mentioned as something that was to try and achieve for both coverage from weather and for, you know, setting the pedestrians away from the street and to giving them a sense of protection from high-speed traffic by creating this arcade. So, the -- when the board reviews all of the projects and what's being proposed -- and that was one of the things that I think was partly one of the redeeming things of the Gables Station was that there is a nice public ground plane, especially between the buildings, and there's open plazas. And I don't know if anyone has actually been to there and walked around the site.

Board Member Bermello: Glenn, which project are you talking about?

Board Member Pratt: Huh?

Board Member Bermello: Which project are you --?

Board Member Pratt: The Gables Station.

Board Member Bermello: Which one?

Board Member Pratt: The Gables Station, down on...

Board Member Behar: The one...

Board Member Pratt: Dixie and Le Jeune. I mean, it's very imposing on the street, but there are a lot of public -- again, it's also very isolated. There's a number of contributing factors to why that building is what it is. And with respect to both its location, the FAR that was granted, or the increases that were provided by the -- I think that it utilized TDRs, I believe; I'm not certain. But all of those things went into making a much larger feeling or a much larger building than what would normally be permitted.

Board Member Bermello: Glenn, what it seems to me that that building goes on forever. It almost looks like penitentiary in its scale. Frankly, I mean, I go by it every day, and it's -- to me, it's kind of amazing. And I realize they tried to break up the scale by having the L or the U-shape or whatever you want to call it with the legs, but it's just -- I think -- in other words, I think what I hear from people and, you know, my family, my kids -- I mean, it's everybody -- is the massiveness and the fact that it's bulging over onto the right-of-way. And when I look at it, I fail to see even that as a Mediterranean. So, I wonder, you know -- I look at the Aloft here, just down the street. How did that happen? You know, it's right -- again, you got a -- I don't know -- four- or five-foot sidewalk and -- you know, if you look at the great plazas in Brussels, Salamanca, where you do have the loggias, Piazza San Marco, you never have these colonnades right at the curb edge, which is what we're doing, you know. And I'll tell you, I'm partly guilty in one project. We did the museum parking garage, and there was no way to fit a parking garage of modern times when you have a 100-foot property...

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE) the middle of the parking lot.

Board Member Bermello: Because they're so narrow.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: And we had to overlap a portion of the alleyway and then have all the Dempsey dumpsters from all the retail tenants slide under that and then create the arcade. But I'll tell you, as a -- anybody with a retail business, arcades don't do anything for you. They kill you.

Board Member Alvarez: Absolutely.

Board Member Bermello: I mean, you go to (INAUDIBLE) in Paris, any major street that is a great shopping street, you don't have an arcade. There's no loggia. So when I see these things as a way to waive and encroach and not provide setbacks, when I review this Code, I review it with a lot of respect, respect for people that came before me. So, I approach it like I don't have all the answers. I just have some questions. And I tried to abstain from making wholesale changes unless I see something that I believe someone just didn't see it through as to what is happening today. Maybe that people didn't see through those encroachments and those lack of setbacks what we will be ending up with. And I think if they were here today, they'd probably be reacting the way I'm reacting. But I think (INAUDIBLE) more than just a couple of things, I think on that particular project, I mean, it just goes on forever. And I know that we have in the Code certain requirements of through-block connections, when your building face is more than a certain amount of feet, et cetera. But you do create a wall effect. And I know that what was there before was not nice to look at in some areas, and then you had automotive, and it's kind of in hospital, right? You're right next to US 1, so you could say what is your reaction going to be from an urban form when you're kind of like next to a high-speed area. But I just don't think the response is, you know, kind of like what we got. And I think we're here today to a great extent because of Table 3, personally. That's -- I mean, nobody says it, but if you look through all this, that's what I -- because I've seen some fine buildings done within the Code. And I think every architect really strives -- many times they're under the influence of a client that is pushing them in a certain direction, and you realize you have to make a living, but there's certain things here that I think are the reason we're here. And I agree totally with my colleague and partner, Robert Behar, with respect to the style. I just don't know that if we tried to address that within the very limited functions that we have as a blue-ribbon panel

committee, that we're going to get that done. What I would love for one of the recommendations from this committee to our Commissioners and Mayor, that we should look at -- within the Code to have a section that allows for excellence in design and elements of high public value to receive the same benefits as adding a barrel tile, or a cornice, or a 4-inch recess in the window casement, you know, the elements that we see as Mediterranean. Because I think, in some instances -- and if you're doing anything over a five to seven story, you're going higher, I would always tell my clients, it will be more appropriate to not do Mediterranean than to do Mediterranean. I mean, if my client asked me, that's what I would say. It's just not appropriate. There's no example anywhere in the world of good Mediterranean architecture when you're doing a high rise. It just doesn't exist. I mean, I still think Philip Johnson's attempts were not his...

Board Member Salman: His best work.

Board Member Bermello: Not his best work. And you know, it is what it is. I just don't think that we can solve it, Robert, here. Personally, I would say, I cannot see myself as a -- here the metaphor would be I'm a medic in a war camp medical tent. And I got some clients coming in here that are bleeding to death, and I got to apply a tourniquet and make him live and -- you know, so they -- and that's what I'm looking at here. That we're going to try to come in here -- I think I see that as my role, making sure that the things that got us here are corrected, but I don't think our job will be done. I think part of -- and I agree 100 percent with you, Robert. The issue of providing setbacks -- this 1986 was a knee-jerk reaction to the (INAUDIBLE) glass tower, okay, because I was a kid coming out of college when that was being done, so I was young enough to be there, and I guess old enough to remember. And I think we have an opportunity. The pendulum swung there, and the pendulum was we didn't want more blank -- let's give an incentive to do Mediterranean. And I think the experiment has not provided some good examples. So, I think we can go back and do that. But I would say that right now here, the big things are the things that people are reacting to, and you see them in Gables Station. You see it on Paseo. And you're certainly seeing it in, I think, Mitch's favorite project across from his beautiful design of Regions, which by the way, I think is beautiful. It's timeless, and even though it's modern, it fits, which is the interesting thing, you

know. That building is next to a historic structure, and it will be complementary, which is what the Code says. You know, you guys accomplished the intent, you know, and that's the reason we all like it. I mean, we all react to it, even though it's a tall -- one of the tallest buildings in the area, right?

Board Member Salman: If I could just add to what you're saying. One of the reasons that I cited that building -- not just because Mitch is over here and I know him and love him, that's not it. The issue is that it's an abstracted reinterpretation of what Mediterranean should be in the modern technology and vocabulary of today. To try to reach back and just dress a modern structure and decorate it in such a way that evokes some elements without the spirit is ridiculous. That -- the Regions building is a heroic building. It comes down to the ground. It actually sets itself back from the corners and projects out into the corners again, you know, addressing classical (INAUDIBLE) themes of, you know, dress the corner, address the corner. And they have the advantage of having two corners. And so they did beautiful and symmetrically -- they curve slightly the façade. They have an open area at the top that acts like a loggia and -- so that the building sort of disappears, which was part of the idea behind the Mediterranean bonuses. And you see that in some of the classical buildings and palazzos in Venice, where you go up, you look up and it's a loggia -- right? -- because it's -- you know, it has step backs. It helps let light in and helps let light into the building, light into the street. It creates a semi-public space above the street level. And they build right to -- I mean, with a solid wall -- right to the property line. So, it's not about decoration. It's about understanding. And I think that part of the problem is the morphing of that understanding and the good intent of trying to create public amenities without any kind of understanding of what their impact's going to be on the street. For example, on the Gables Station project, it does have a plaza. It's in the middle of the building or more or less -- in the middle of the construction of building because it's several buildings. How much more powerful and beneficial would that be to the public on the street, both on US 1, and perhaps, on the other street to the north, if that loggia were to step in and create a bit of an open space to break that line, whereas it really doesn't read that way. It just reads as a long, hard wall along, you know, US 1. And there are a million subtle things that taking an abstraction would yield the Mediterranean

result of being able to be in the sun and out of the sun at the same time, being able to have a street that is enjoyable for multiple uses besides walking, and that would add to the intent of the Mediterranean bonus as stated in 1986, which would enhance the City and the public realm of the City. So, wherever we -- the Code, in my opinion -- wherever the Code grants an excess of space or a projection into the right-of-way or an encroachment into the right-of-way, that is something that really should only be done at a Commission level. I don't see that as being a function of the board because that kind of tit for tat is -- you're dealing now with the public right-of-way and the City owns that. And to have that be in play as part of the Mediterranean bonus -- I actually agree with Mr. Bermello that that really shouldn't be there. Or if it should -- or only with extremely tight parameters. What we're objecting to right now are buildings which were designed many years ago and permanent many years ago. I don't think that anybody presenting a building now and knowing what's going on right now would dare submit a building like those right now. But that's still a possibility. And we have to look at what allowed that -- these things to happen, and as Mr. Bermello said, make recommendations for correction and stick to what we're working on here. This is not going to be complete. There are zoning issues. There are planning issues that are outside the realm of this Mediterranean bonus which also come into play. There are issues which are self-inflicted on many projects with the cooperation of our elected representatives, so that they, I think, are now very aware and will be looking very, very hard on some of the projects that come before them going forward. Likewise, the Planning and Zoning Board is not going to just take the board's recommendation -- the Board of Architects recommendation wholeheartedly anymore. They're going to start looking at why are we doing this or why are we doing this.

Chairperson Pardo: I'd like to take a pause just for one minute. And much has been said about the amenities, which I think we all agree with, especially the amenities at the ground level for the pedestrians. The Plaza project, which is gigantic, has tremendous amenities on the ground level for the pedestrians. I think we all agree. I mean, they're being built out now. (INAUDIBLE) you can see it on their models. They have these enormous plazas. They have a lot of the right things going on. But what they don't have going on is the size, the mass. You know, it's -- I think that's where you have the objection. But the funny thing is that they have tremendous amenities that

they're providing. Now, the key is that you make an argument on the style. Now, I'm making an argument about providing amenities that are substantial for the pedestrian, it'll be enjoyable, but there's a big difference between that project, and let's say, the Shops at Merrick Park. And both have amenities, but one is very different than the other, and I'm not talking about the style. I'm talking about the scale, talking about the mass, talking about the human scale of those amenities in juxtaposition with the architecture. Very different. So, therefore, be careful what you wish for because we could go straight down this rabbit hole, and then all of a sudden -- no, but look at the park, and look at the this, and look at the that. But now you have a building that's not in touch with the scale of the City. The scale of the City is very different than the scale of Downtown Miami, very different. But we have to be very careful with it. I want to read one little thing to you, which is actually in Appendix C of today's Zoning Code, which was the Mediterranean Village PAD, which was written specifically for that project. And under intent, it says, "The City finds that the current regulations sometimes lead to unprecedented results, and in some cases, have fallen short of ensuring the City's desired outcome." So, it's amazing that in their own appendix, that is like 50, 60, 70 pages long for the justification of that development, that in there they're talking about the present code, which was just recently tweaked, that it wasn't changed completely, it was just tweaked. And you see that, although they did a lot of good things, the end result is very different than what everybody was anticipating. I think that's very important that we understand that. So, it's not just one side or the other. Now, if you say, well, you know, the amount of high-rise sites that we have here in the City of Coral Gables are very limited. I want to discuss now the mid-rise sites, the four stories, and then you have a bonus of one floor, that's five stories. Then you have another floor; oh, that's six stories. You could conceivably go to seven, if you interpret it the wrong way. I think that's a mistake. But at five or six stories, the Coral Gables Mediterranean architecture can easily be applied, plus other styles too. So, I just want to say that although there's flexibility in design, the original intent was that the cost of construction to do the type of ornamentation that was required and needed to be able to meet that particular type of architecture -- all day it was discussed that it was going to cost 20 percent more. That's how the 20 percent bonus was brought up. That's how it came to be back then. You know, it was an estimate, but at least it was something to encourage someone to do something other than that. I think it would be

a grave mistake, a grave mistake to say, "You know what, we should just reward good architecture regardless of what the style is." This is a Mediterranean bonus. It's not called "any kind of architecture" bonus. So, I do agree -- in my personal opinion -- that once you get into a high-rise situation, just taking a gigantic building and putting a cupola and putting, you know, all these different elements, it's still the 800-pound gorilla, any way you cut it. It doesn't matter how much lipstick you put on it. It's still the 800-pound gorilla. So, the massing and all these things are really important. We have not discussed it all in this committee, the size of the rights-of-way. The size of the -- the rights-of-way, I'm sorry.

Board Member Bermello: Oh, the rights-of-way.

Chairperson Pardo: Rights-of-way. So, the size of the rights-of-way, the size of the streets that are adjacent to any property that's being developed are huge. It just so happens that in the Mediterranean Village PAD, they discussed it in great detail. But I mean, we all understand that. If you have a wide street, some of the biggest high-rises that we have in our commercial districts are on Alhambra. It's one of the widest rights-of-way that we have here. So, you could go up. You could do all sorts of things, and it's in keeping with the scale. But then if you look at Alhambra's right-of-way, and then all of a sudden, you look at the right-of-way -- a 60-foot right-of-way, it's very different on how you treat it. And that's very important because the perception is the key, and the public, as Mitch eloquently said, intuitively, they understand what they expect. So, if you put and pack all of that in a very small right-of-way, you cannot treat the massing the same way, and you can't treat that street scale the same way.

Board Member Behar: But that's where, perhaps, the step backs is appropriate because when you really analyze a European city, I think between 40 and 50 feet is the scale that is acceptable to a 50 right-of-way. It gives you the one-to-one proportion, and it feels like that's the scale. So, that's where today the step back, I think, is addressing and works for a condition. I may not like what it creates, the form-based code, but it's successful at keeping that height to something that is more in keeping with Mediterranean. And it could be a contemporary building, where like, you know,

we're talking about the Regions Bank or the building that my friend here did on Ponce there, that you have a scale and then the building steps back, and it doesn't have to do with the style. It has to do with...

Board Member Bermello: (INAUDIBLE) and establishes the (INAUDIBLE) on that point. If it's 45 feet and everybody would -- regardless of the style, you know, you start to understand that as part of the City streetscape scale, which is what we're getting at.

Board Member Alvarez: But this is where -- I think this is where the concept of the bonuses would really be a very, very potential attraction to improve design. You are going to be able to have a tool to convince your client that you're doing it this way because it has offered you a chance to do a more attractive building without him being penalized and losing ground sellable areas, as they say, rentable square footage. At the same time, you're going to say this building...

Board Member Behar: Mr. Chair.

Board Member Alvarez: Will rent or be occupied or will sell much better than a shoebox in the same location. Realtors sell location, location, location. No, location within character is very much sensitive today than it was before. Location and character go hand in hand, and that's the tool for this type of place. This huge building anyone in abstract sitting right on the edge of the street on a right-of-way, unless you have a 20-foot sidewalk that is the City property, that you can see your property there, it looks horrendous. And if we continue to do that, we're going to have people resenting and arguing against it and opposing them.

Board Member Bermello: Excuse me. Mr. Chair, I'm going to have to -- I have an emergency I have to go to. I'm going to have to leave.

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Behar has asked to be excused. He has a personal emergency. Okay, thank you. Go ahead.

Board Member Alvarez: No, no. I think that -- I love the way this is moving. I mean, I think the arguments you presented, and you presented, and Mr. Behar presented, all of us, we naturally have confronted them at one point or another in the type of project we have done in our history in design. And we feel that it is necessary to bring tools to the designer team to work and negotiate. It just can't be a straitjacket as sometimes the Code imposes, so this is a very prudent conversation that we're having. Clearly, your thought was very honest. You said we should have recognition for excellence in architecture with another category of bonuses -- or flexibilities may be the word, not necessarily bonuses, more than bonuses. Flexibility would be the word because the moment you use bonuses, somebody thinks you're taking away something from somebody, from the City or from the government or whatever. No, but it's necessary to recognize that because we -- although we don't have too many of those sites still waiting for a building, but some will happen in high-rise, but many more will happen in the mid-rise. You're going to see a lot of buy, consolidate, tear down and start from scratch, and that's where this comes in very handy.

Chairperson Pardo: So, you're saying not using the word "bonuses."

Board Member Alvarez: No, no, no. What you're doing is fine. I'm saying besides and beyond that, we should -- as a lateral suggestion happening as a result of these type of conversations, it should be presented candidly to the powers in the political world and the neighbors that there will be modern buildings happening. But if anything is flexible from within the existing application of regulation, it will be based on design quality. It's not going to be in any other manner because of the style of the architecture being Mediterranean or not. Mediterranean should still be treated -- and this is on the table.

Chairperson Pardo: There's another -- following the original agenda, one of the things that is on the agenda is we had a short discussion that right now the Code is written -- the present Code is written in such a way that it's based on a point system. You know, in other words, you check off the boxes. If you have X out of X, you get Y. The -- it was brought up by Mr. Bermello and others

that you can't weigh these things the same. So, a bicycle rack shouldn't be one of the checkoffs, you know, compared to other things. I know that we can go into those items, you know, specifically. We still have not gotten out of the purpose once we started discussing this. And Mr. Bermello brought up directly the fact that the purpose and applicability is very, very important. That being said, I just wanted to...

Board Member Bermello: May I make a comment, Mr. Chair...

Chairperson Pardo: Yes, sir.

Board Member Bermello: On that, just to maybe add a little bit of color and detail to my comment.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: After going through not only here, but in other cities with similar situations, I find that when you do these kinds of prescriptive numerical formulas that are totally arbitrary and have really no sense that you can prove, whether it's five out of ten, or three out of ten, it's really done to facilitate the job of someone with a (INAUDIBLE) that is just simply checking the box, as opposed to saying, "You shall substantially comply with all of these." Now, when you say substantially that introduces flexibility because that's really what I think architects are looking for more because every site is different. Programs are different, and you really want some flexibility when you're trying to strive for greatness and not to be pigeonholed or strapped by some numerical prescriptive when you're doing some things that are much better than anything that can be in that list of things. I'll give you an example. I was involved in a project that Glenn approved, and I know that some people were against the project being done there, but my contribution to the project is the project across from Bill Kerdyk Park, was that I wanted to have a great response to the park across the way, and I wanted the building to have the shape of a crescent, even though I was eating like 40 feet into the property. And I had a developer that was not, you know, like a very generous and forgiving person. And in doing that, I felt -- and maybe incorrectly

-- that in making that grand gesture in the building to create a grand space across from a public space -- as opposed to being right up to the setback, which would have been a straight building with no increased setbacks -- that providing all of that is worth more than providing five bicycle spots. And I would face and look at staff and say how crazy can this be. So, maybe not prescribe it, but letting staff know that they have a responsibility to do the right thing. And when they're seeing someone that's doing something that is really over and beyond, those five bicycle spots may not be as important as other things. So, I think when you introduce this very prescriptive in very menial things, you send a message to the person on the other side, and that is, you know, do menial things and it's fine. You know, you end up with mediocrity. So, I would say if we have a list, try to comply with all of them.

Board Member Salman: Substantial.

Board Member Bermello: Substantially. Do your best.

Board Member Salman: I like it.

Board Member Bermello: And if there's some things that you can't, okay, but you try. But this is just my feeling. Just 50 -- where did that come from? Where did the 50 percent come from? So, that's what I would say is you give the Planning staff -- I think the Planning staff in the City of Coral Gables are -- you got great people. I have no issues with the people that I've met. I think Ramon is wonderful. I think, you know, Devin -- and you know, the people are talented. Let them do their job and motivate people to do great things. So, that's -- so if I were to see you have to substantially comply with 12 items, I'm going to do my best to comply with 12 items, not 5 or 6, because the Code says 6. That would be my -- and introduce flexibility and common sense into the process.

Chairperson Pardo: I think that the only thing, Willy, that I would add to that is that we do have a Planning staff, but at the same time, we have a Board of Architects. And you know, getting that

project -- when the Board of Architects receives the project, the project is completely designed instead of at a schematic or conceptual level. That makes all the difference in the world.

Board Member Pratt: But Willy came to the Board of Architects several times.

Board Member Bermello: Oh, a lot, a lot.

Board Member Pratt: And worked with the Board of Architects and took the suggestions from the Board of Architects, and the Board of Architects supported the concept and the direction that he proposed, and you know, the project turned out very, very well. I think it was -- you know, it's a very nice -- you know, an improvement and a nice amenity to the City and complements the park across the street. And that's a good example of the give and take or the working relationship that the Board of Architects has with most of the architects that present larger projects and comes in and is willing to listen and have -- well, all of the architects that present have great regard for the City and try to do their best. But I think it's always been official to get six or seven different eyes looking at a project and to get input from essentially a board that has no agenda other than to try and suggest improvement. And when the improvement is received and taken, the projects get better. And I think that what was approved was a very, very nice project.

Board Member Bermello: Without a doubt, without a doubt. And I -- that's why when you mentioned early on at our last meeting, early intervention, early meetings with the Board of Architects at the conceptual phase, because I think really the Board of Architects becomes part of, you know, your support group with staff, and I think it sends a strong message to staff. In that element of flexibility, for example, what are the salient points that are, again, using again that example of the bike racks or, you know, it may be a project where, where does that through-block connection happen? What is the real width of that? What is the real vertical clearance? Because right now, it's 10 feet. Ten feet is not very wide. I mean, you do a corridor for a school, it's going to be 12 feet wide. And you know, imagine -- and galleria spaces to be inviting, they have to have the right scale. If not, you're like in a tunnel and you want to get out of there quickly. So, I mean,

those things sometimes, if it's very prescribed, Mr. Chair, I just think that we end up not getting the best public benefits. But if you say substantially comply, what you're -- I think the message is, we want you to try -- do all of them, not just some of them, but don't prescribe it. Let the process play out because there may be good reasons why two or three of these can't be done, and then that person knows that they're not going to be sent back. This is -- it was substantially. Every project is going to be different. There are going to be some projects you should be able to comply with every single one, and they're going to be some that it'll be very tough complying with the majority of them. So, that's what I would say. I -- again, we're blessed with a great staff. But they take the cue from you. And if you say it has to be 50 percent, they're going to hold you to the 50 percent. You say substantially and it's the intent, and that they can weigh the important areas that are being provided in a project, I think at the end, that's what we -- I think what we all are striving for.

Chairperson Pardo: I'd also like to bring up another subject that we haven't touched on yet this evening. And that has to do with the historic properties that we have in the City, which are parts of our cultural treasures here. And I asked Mr. Warren Adams, who is our Director of Historic Resources here in the City, to just look at a few things around the country that are being done today as far as how development affects historic structures. So, Mr. Adams is sitting there, and I wanted to bring up, for example -- he gave us four examples. And one of them has to do with the view shed, which is the concept of how the view of something alters the historic nature of a building. You don't have to touch it. Sometimes you just have to cover it, be next to it, or be within, you know, sight of the thing. Let me read something that Mr. Adams brought. So, setting shall mean the environment in which a historic resource is located, including but not limited to the view shed for streetscape. Now, the view shed shall mean the views to and from a historic resource. And one of the things that they look for is the Certificate of Appropriateness to see whether the proposed work will have a negative impact on other historic resources on the site or on other historic resources within the view shed. So, in other words, if you're -- if you have a building that has existed for many years, the Colonnade building, when Mitchy worked on that, he placed the building carefully on the back side, allowing that enormous, beautiful structure to sit with its majestic colonnade. And his building became the backdrop to that important building, but he did

not block the view of this historic building by going in such a way where he could diminish the importance of this historic structure. Now, you can see that, for example, now in the Plaza project. You see the 2901 building, which was George Merrick's original building for his architects and real estate people, is the little three-story Mediterranean building, which is surrounded by this very, very large project. And the only thing between it and the new project is just the width of those little narrow streets on that triangular parcel. So, I personally believe that if that would have been conceptually looked at by the Board of Architects, and they could have had more of a say in it at a very early (INAUDIBLE), that maybe the development could have stepped down toward this building to try to bring something within the scale of that building, which is a historic building. So, there are other places, for example, even the National Historic Preservation Act, it says that the criteria of adverse effect -- and adverse effect is found when an undertaking may alter directly or indirectly any of these characteristics of a historic property. But just the view of the historic property, the use, what it was intended to do, if you alter that or change it, that's something that we should -- if we pride ourselves in our history -- we should look at very carefully. I'm not saying deny development, but make sure that you don't affect it in a negative way. And the Virginia Department of Historic Resources also describes specifically the adverse visual effects that can be caused by a change in aesthetic values or by the obstruction of use. And therefore, determining why a property is significant and understanding what characteristics make it so essential to assessing the visual effects, that is rarely, if ever done. And we have a historical department. It's kind of ridiculous that you have a Historic Department that will qualify a building as historic and tell you all the reasons why, but then you can put a development right next to it and just diminish some of the characteristics that make it very important. Now, this doesn't -- won't happen all the time, but it's something that I think we should address because this is something that is important in the preservation of what the intention of this planning of this city is. So, I bring this to your attention because it's been addressed by other places that have historic buildings. Now, our history is only 100 years old, but in another hundred years, it's 200 years old. And if we diminish everything, you don't need to knock it down, but we could dwarf everything and make it insignificant. And I think, personally, on Ponce, we have a great example of taking a building that was so important and it's been diminished. Now, I can't blame the developer because no one told

them you had to do that. And our Mediterranean ordinance is silent on that. And I think that this is important, the same as saying, well, you know, you want to have the characters of these seven buildings -- which originally were eight, except the Charade's building burnt down. And the whole point is that that should be a component of this particular section because if we don't tell a developer you can't ignore this, they're going to ignore it because they're going to think that we don't think it's important. I think it's important. I think -- I'm sure all of you think it's important. But I see that as an example of if we don't incorporate that here and having the resources that we have with historic, it is a missed opportunity.

Board Member Alvarez: Right. I think you're right. It should be part of that.

Chairperson Pardo: And by the way, some of Mitchy's buildings in the near future are going to be historic buildings that you want to preserve that meet all these requirements that are a very important part of this city. He did it at Douglas Entrance with one of the original buildings, one of the original gateways. But you just have to turn around. There aren't too many of them. So, the implementation of transfer development rights and things like that was one step for a particular building. Now, what we have to do is make sure that people understand the scale and the relationship to those historic buildings. And that has to be, I think, looked at specifically by the Board of Architects, and with the help of the Historic Department.

Board Member Pratt: If I could -- I'm curious because I feel like I'm defending the Board of Architects to some extent. But -- and all of us have actually, I think -- or some of us have sat on the Board of Architects. And I'm curious about how do you -- in terms of this view shed that -- it's a -- to be honest, I've not heard of that term and I'm not familiar with it. I understand the idea of, you know, providing visibility to try to create enough space around historic or those objects, whether they're fountains or preserve the historic features. But I'm curious, what are you trying - I don't know that I completely understand your direction and what you're trying to say. Are you saying that the Plaza project, yes, it's a large building and it does crowd that existing building. How do you -- other than the builder also -- or the developer has rights. How do you balance those

two? Or do you give concessions in terms of --? Or does the City purchase enough land around the historic structure that they want to preserve to create enough space? Or how does that work?

Chairperson Pardo: I think I could answer your question. I think that, first of all -- and just to read -- a general rule to follow is that if something can be seen from a historic property, obscures the historic property from being seen at a primary location or is visible within the boundary of the historic property, there's a visual effect on the historic property. What I'm saying is not taking away the right from the developer, just saying maybe taking the mass and shifting it to another place to move -- to give it space depending on the orientation of the historic building. There are two examples right now, the building on just north of Alhambra, which is a -- with TDRs, that building was saved. But then there are these enormous buildings right up against it. If some of that massing could have been just stepped back -- in other words, we talk about step backs. And one of the examples that I gave in the first meeting was, for example, when you have a building, let's say across the street from single family and duplexes, that if you take -- and the use, which is part of Chapter 5 and the 20 things that uses are part of it -- that if you take those loud uses that are facing the single family and you simply turn them around, you're not taking the developer's right away, but you're making life a lot better for the people across the street in the single family. Now think of it the same way. Now, let's say it's a historic building. Then all of a sudden, you put this enormous tower right next to it, and then you put the tower here and then you put the tower there, you probably can't even see three of the primary elevations of that historic building anymore. But if it would have been set back a little bit more, or the massing would have been brought down, sunlight probably still hits it, and then you could see the articulation of that historic building. I'm just saying that it won't happen often, but it's going to happen more. And the relationship with the historic building I think is very important as one of the design -- primary design constructs when you have a historic building nearby. I'm just saying that we're all smart enough that we could understand that we're not trying to take away a property right from someone. What we're trying to do is simply recognize the historic building or the historic legacy and still preserve it the best way we can without -- by using imagination and being able to recognize it. So, just imagine, Glenn, if this were a 200-year-old oak tree in your backyard and you wanted to put a swimming

pool in there. And if you go by the setbacks of the Code, you're going to affect that tree in a negative way. Now, you could ask for a variance and say I don't want to -- I don't want on my conscience to hurt that -- I love that tree. That's why I bought my house, but I'd like to have a swimming pool. And I just need another seven or eight, or nine, ten feet to move it over that way, so I could still have my pool -- and I'll make it smaller. I could still have my pool but preserve that oak tree. The City wins and the owner wins. I'm just saying that what I've seen so far in two specific examples, for me, it's almost like blasphemy. How can we do that to a historic building when we have so few of them?

Board Member Bermello: And I think, Mr. Chair, in this case, you're also saying there was plenty of opportunity to work with that canvas to accomplish that.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: So, I just don't know how many more of those kinds of instances do we have that would ever come up beyond that one in the Craft Section. And I don't know, maybe this is more of a question for staff. Again, going through that metaphor of being out in a medical camp right in the middle of a war, are there any projects going on right now that could become the next Gables Station or could become the next Paseo, and that maybe we need to accelerate kind of our tourniquet to make sure that -- I mean, I would hate for six months down the road for someone to stop me down the street and say, "You participated in that blue-ribbon panel and look what just happened down the street. You guys did a great job," you know, sarcastically, obviously. I'm wondering -- because it seems to me that -- I think that's one of the things that I think we were called on to do, which is to say, you know, some of the things that have happened here in the past -- and this is not to look at the Board of Architects because I don't think it's on the Board of Architects -- that maybe some of the things can be -- is there that kind of emergency that we need to, or because there's a moratorium, we don't have to worry about it? Are there projects that are already in the pipeline that would benefit from our thinking?

Chairperson Pardo: That would be for Planning to tell us because, you know, sometimes those projects are in Planning for weeks or even months before...

Board Member Pratt: Before anybody would know, yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: We don't even know. They don't know, they don't know. (INAUDIBLE). They don't even know.

Board Member Pratt: Before the Board of Architects sees any -- that there's -- you know, they're well on their way, and that's why I (INAUDIBLE)...

Board Member Bermello: Yeah. I think it's imperative that they come here before they start doing the workouts of...

Board Member Pratt: So, I think that to have, you know, either Ramon Trias or someone, you know...

Chairperson Pardo: It is -- the reason I bring up...

Board Member Pratt: Imperative.

Chairperson Pardo: The historic is everybody talks about the Plaza project. Everybody talks about the Plaza project, but nobody talks about the historic building that's engulfed by the project. That's why I bring it up now because now is the time to say, "Put a marker on this Code." Put a marker this is one of the factors is one of the things.

Board Member Pratt: But the only thing, Felix, is that -- I mean, with respect to the Plaza and the historic structure, you know, I think that there was a lot of thought and planning. To the extent, I don't know, because that was all done in the Planning Department, and that didn't really -- the

Board of Architects didn't see that until much further down the line. I do know that there were multiple presentations made to the Board of Architects for each of the buildings because the overall project was just so massive that you couldn't really focus on the whole without, you know, looking at each individual piece first. And so, that's why the building has been constructed and approved in a phased manner because of the complexity of the overall. But I know that there was a lot of review and attention that was given both by planning staff and by the Board of Architects and by the Planning and Zoning Board and the City Commission because, ultimately, they were the ones that approved the overall project and the PAD. And I know that there was a lot of talk and consideration about the historic building and having sufficient space around it. But the -- going back to what you were saying in stepping back, Willy and Robert and others that have designed large projects, it's not a simple task to say, you know, let's move the living room from this side of the house to that side of the house. That's easy on a single-family residence. When you start moving components and major, you know, sections that have multiple systems and multiple interconnections and how they work and operate or need to be together in order for the building to function, it's not a simple -- it's not easy to just start moving those components around. And so, I know that -- or at least, I would speculate and guess with a fairly high degree of accuracy, that there was a lot of thought given to just exactly how all those buildings were massed and put together. And if you start shifting the mass to create more open space around the historic, that square footage is going to go someplace else. Either it's going to go up against the residential sector that you were just talking about on the back side, or it's going to have to go in terms of height. Or it's going to have to go increase somewhere else, which is going to create a problem for there. So, it's not a simple idea just to say, well, let's do this. It's a balance. You have to find all of the components that -- and how they work together. It's -- sometimes something may get squeezed a little more than what it should, but it's done at the expense of creating maybe a larger buffer on someplace else. So, it's a balance. It's not...

Chairperson Pardo: And Glenn, I really understand that. And the point -- the reason I bring it up is that right now the Code is 100 percent silent on the topic, 100 percent silent. And it's also 100 percent silent on the actual plan of the City, which was adopted by the Commission just a few

years ago, as historic. How can we now take streets and move them around any way we want without going back to the resolution that was approved by the Commission recognizing Merrick's plan as historic? We could take the plan and just throw it out the window, but since it was recognized, it's recognized. So, we don't have to do that here. The only thing is there's no relationship under the present Code right now as part of the design constructs of any historic building, and that's -- I'm not telling you this is a formula. This is one way to do it, or I'm not saying it's easy, but I just think it's important that we recognize the relationship with historic buildings. And of all the places, this section of the Code is the right place to say that it has to be recognized.

Board Member Alvarez: I think what you're saying has merit. I think it's appropriate to do so and just identify that as a section that is contemplating conditions that merits this analysis, and if necessary, bonuses to grant the option to preserve the views and the general environment around the building that we want to be preserve. That's legitimate. Okay, Mr. Owner, I'll give you this and that -- the example of the swimming pool -- because of your tree, I'm willing to give you this concession because if you exceed (INAUDIBLE) part of your building or your line of construction or whatever, a little further away, 20 feet out or 15, whatever. It's an example of incentive if this is what we're looking at.

Chairperson Pardo: That's all I've asked for.

Board Member Alvarez: Write it down.

Chairperson Pardo: And I -- back to the -- going back to the agenda, I think most of the items that were on the agenda have been discussed. Does any board member -- would any board member want to bring up any other issue at this time at this session?

Board Member Pratt: No, not that I'm aware of.

Chairperson Pardo: And in all fairness, and the hard work that Willy -- and it went through the proper channels to -- you know, through the City Attorney, to get us the markup...

Board Member Alvarez: This touches on your subject, no?

Chairperson Pardo: No, that and historic buildings. That's correct. That was the last subject on that. It's -- that is -- I'm sorry, what Mitch is pointing out is C, which is mitigation of awarded bonuses with adjacent single-family residential, duplex, and existing developments and historic properties. So, none of those things are forgotten.

Board Member Alvarez: No, you addressed it very explicitly touching on that point.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. So...

Board Member Bermello: So, Mr. Chair, if I could later, I'd be more than happy to go back and add a little bit more redline, and I'll send it to the City Attorney. Mr. City Attorney, when I sent it to you and not to my fellow board members, was that the correct procedure? I know in the City of Miami, where I chair a similar board, I don't communicate with my colleagues outside of the dais...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: So, you're...

Board Member Bermello: Because of the Sunshine, so was that the correct procedure? Is it okay for me tonight to send a follow-up redline to everybody on the list, including you and the City Clerk, et cetera?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: In regards to the Sunshine, you can -- if you decide to make further modifications to this document, you can send it to the entire board. What I can't -- what you can't do is have a communication or a dialogue between board members going back and forth,

meaning if Mr. Bermello tonight decides to send an article or something to discuss at a future meeting and you want to send it to me and you want me to pass it on to your board members, you can do that. You can pass it on to your board members directly. You just cannot respond back to Mr. Bermello, and the same goes for the rest of the board members. If Mr. -- you know, if Mitch Alvarez wants to send out some sort of documentation to all the board members before your next meeting for discussion, you can do that. You just cannot engage in a conversation about that subject matter.

Board Member Bermello: Okay, because I did not -- Thank you for the clarification. I didn't want to overstep my boundary. That's why I didn't send it out.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Not a problem.

Board Member Bermello: So, I'm happy you cleared that up for me. So, on the issue of the five or six out of twelve or whatever, I did not touch that. I wanted to have a little bit of kind of conversation, but I'm more than happy to go back and add that because I really do believe that we should strive to greatness. And if somebody felt -- and I really did not see any item that should be eliminated -- that these are good things to be incorporated, but for all of them. I mean, you go for all of them. That's what we tell our kids, right? If there are good things that we need to do in life, you strive for all of them. You don't tell your kids, well, do half of the things. So, I'll go ahead and change that, and I'll put the word substantially comply with all of the below items. And substantially comply, I realize it makes the job of the administrator, of Ramon and Devin and everybody a little tougher, you know. They do -- it's not easy. It's not going to be like, okay, they did five. Okay, pass and go to the next step. But I think at the end, the process is going to be much better. Everybody's going to be much better. Every project. Just imagine if today you only have to do 50 percent and tomorrow everybody's trying to do 100 percent. You do the math. If these items are good, I made an immediate improvement. I mean, if you were running a business and you doubled your revenue, I mean, just think of it. So, I'll -- if I may, I'm going to just do that and send it back. And again, I don't know what the process is going to be. At some point in time, all

of these great ideas, we have to land them -- right? -- formulate them. We need to review them, make sure that we're good with it, and at some point, the Chair is going to present it to the City Commission and say this is the body of our work. We had a number of neighbors that -- and residents that heard us, and you know, some will be support; some will not.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I would just bring up one quick item for the Board to consider as they're going through all this deliberation as we continue to make modifications and strengthen the Mediterranean bonus, which I believe is the intent of this committee. We need to also be mindful that we've discussed about how nobody wants to take property rights of anyone. I know that that's not the intent of the board. We want it to strengthen the Mediterranean bonus. We always have to keep mind, if we strengthen too much or we change too many sections, that we are removing abilities of certain property owners to build what currently they're allowed to. We may have Bert Harris claims filed against the City. So, I'm not saying that we shouldn't go full bore. I'm just saying keep that in mind when we're strengthening the Mediterranean bonus. You have a question?

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Attorney.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: I have an issue with what you just said. The last time I checked, this is a bonus. So, in other words, the bonus can be stricken tomorrow by the Commission and say...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I don't dis...

Chairperson Pardo: No bonuses period.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I understand exactly what you're saying.

Chairperson Pardo: There's no Bert Harris or anything else.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I would disagree. I would just -- I'm simply providing the committee with the notice. At the end of the day, just keep that in mind. I think what you're suggesting is probably accurate, but I'm just -- I'd like the committee to keep that in mind when we're making modifications to any part of our Zoning Code, regardless of what it is.

Chairperson Pardo: And the reason I bring this up is because I don't want to create the illusion that this committee is going to recommend possibly eliminating complete components of what exists today, the same as things were changed before. It doesn't go -- and I'm sorry, but it doesn't go one way. We could reduce. We could ask for more, or we could take them out completely. And then at the end of the day, it's the Commission. Now...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: It's within the purview of the committee to suggest whatever they deem is appropriate.

Chairperson Pardo: Exactly.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I was just...

Chairperson Pardo: But...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I'm just doing my due diligence and reminding the Board. That's it.

Chairperson Pardo: And Mr. Attorney, I appreciate that very much. And I'm not trying to debate what you're saying, but what I'm saying is very, very specific. It is very different in Bert Harris, very, very different to say we're going to take away your zoning right compared to we're going to take away a bonus for you to build above and beyond the Code. That makes no sense. And that's

my opinion based on my years of experience, not as a lawyer, but as being involved in all sorts of things, which include changes of zoning, changes of master plan, all sorts of things, the same as the moratorium that is in today, which is completely legal. It's a time of pause. And this time of pause is specifically because there is a real or perceived issue. And it's for the benefit of the citizens of the City of Coral Gables, which include every person that owns land in the City of Coral Gables. So, by trying to make this better, whether it's taking something away or making something more difficult to achieve, you know, I don't think that we're putting the City in any harm's way. But you know, I think understanding the intent of Bert Harris is that everybody has to know you have to treat everyone equally, and you can't take away property rights away from people.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: You just can't have a disproportionate effect on individuals.

Chairperson Pardo: That's correct.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: But if the Commission chose tomorrow that based on what they see and what they perceive and what they hear from their constituents, and they say, "We're going to take all the bonuses and throw them out the window," so be it. That's up to them. The only thing we're doing is providing a recommendation, and we're not trying to take away these bonuses. We're trying to make greater architecture, greater planning in the City of Coral Gables to maintain the City Beautiful and try to straighten out our path based on some of the projects that we're not all that happy with.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Understood.

Chairperson Pardo: And I think that's what we're trying to do.

Board Member Bermello: And Mr. Chair, if I could clarify. Because I did send this to the City Attorney. I don't believe that in any of -- and there were numerous comments. I don't believe that there's any of those comments that really infringe on the right of any property owner to be able to do what they should be able to do. The thrust of my comments had to do with the issue of encroachments and reductions of setbacks. And I will be more than happy to stand in front of the Commission to support in that kind of -- and that should not in any way inhibit anybody from developing their right. I'm all for property rights and protect them. That's America. That's United States of America, and I'll support that 100 percent. But my comments did not have to do with that. I did include an item, which just like people -- there's a concept in financing of a reverse mortgage, when you get a lot of white hair like I have. I included something that you could describe as a reverse bonus in there, although I don't call it that. And it's really an incentive for developers to build less units, to provide more setback, and not to take advantage of all the building height that they can take advantage right now. So, build lower, build fewer units, and provide more setback. Now, you could say, "How can a developer do that and still make money?" Well, because he's building larger units. Right now, our Code, I believe, has two important fallacies. Number one, it really pushes development to providing as many doors -- and that's how people in the real estate world, they look at this. It has as many doors as possible; small units, as many as you can squeeze in. And that's why we end up with all the traffic and et cetera, and what we're seeing, okay. And number two, and Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk understood this. City staff understood it, and it was about to get passed, and at the last moment, the City Commission voted it down. But FAR has no business in residential zoning. FAR is an issue for mixed-use zoning and for commercial zoning, not residential. And that's a lot of the ills that we have is that. Residential density is based on the Comprehensive Plan and the setbacks and the building height in the district. That determines bulk in a residential format. It's not FAR. FAR was created for commercial properties and mixed use. And we end up with a dichotomy because if some -- if the developer tells you I bought a one-acre property and I have up to 50 dwelling units per acre, any one of us should say, one times 50, you got 50 units. And if it tells you that in that property you should be able to go to 75 feet in height, and you got setbacks of 10 feet on three sides and 20 on one side, you know immediately the bulk and the height and the width and the length of that

property. You don't have to be a mathematician. But once you introduce FAR, you introduce a whole hornet's nest, and that's what we're living with. And we were one step away from cleaning that up and we didn't. Hopefully, when they go back -- and you -- Mr. Chair, you said it correctly -- they tweaked the Code. They -- you know, the pandemic got in the way. That delayed it further, and then they, you know -- hopefully, we can go back. But I included in the write-up towards the end what I would refer to as a reverse bonus that I think some developers would obviously take advantage of today. If you look at what Armando Codina's doing, where the old police building is, building larger units, building fewer units, family units, less cars. I would guarantee you that you do those projects when you have a guy like David Plummer or Tim Plummer here, they'll present negative traffic counts. So, I'm introducing that for discussion. I know you guys haven't had a chance to -- because you just got it today from staff. But maybe that's something we can discuss. But I agree with you, Mr. Chair. I don't -- you know, at the end of the day, the Commission's going to do what they think is the right thing, and I'm happy to be serving with all of you here. As I read through it, there's things that need to be tweaked, but I'm not here, Mr. City Attorney, to take anybody's rights away, and I'm very protective of that. But there were some things that I just felt are the reasons that we're here. And the encroachments and the setbacks...

Board Member Salman: I agree.

Board Member Bermello: You know, that's the first thing. You know, each of us -- you know, we get a client, we get the survey. The first thing we look at, what is the zoning district, what are the setbacks, what is the building height, what is -- and really, in residential, you really don't need the FAR. If you can meet all the setbacks and you have your lot coverage, you know, you're done. And you have your height, you're done. Go do a design, you know. And the City staff, if they have flexibility, they should work with you. I'll give you an example. I'm just doing a single-family house for myself now. At age 71, I never thought I'd be doing that, but I'm doing it. And the property had two beautiful live oak trees, and I wanted to make sure I could design them and not touch them. And by golly, I'm doing that. I have to do a bunch of things design-wise to accommodate that, but staff recognized what I was trying to do, and they work with you. And I

think if we get rid of all these prescriptions and let staff do their work and let architects do their work and subscribe to greatness -- if there are ten items, let's shoot for the ten items, not five. It's crazy, you know.

Chairperson Pardo: On the setbacks that you're mentioning, it's funny, as a single family residential, most lots residential -- single family residential lots are platted -- most of them are platted 50 by 100. So, if you take a 50 by 100, your side setbacks are five feet on each side. But if you have two lots, which a lot of people have, a double lot, you execute a unity of title, et cetera, now your side setback, you could go five feet on one side, but the other side has to be at least 15 feet because it still has to maintain 20 percent of the total width. Now, funny thing, that's for a single-family home. So, if you have a bigger home, you still have exactly the same amount of setback as if you had two 50-foot lots. But when we're talking about development like this, there's no setback, so you could accumulate the entire block and you have no setback. How does that work? We force the resident to provide the same exact setback for a 100 by 100-foot lot as two 50 by 50, but now all of a sudden, if you take a bunch of lots and you take up an entire City block, you could have zero setback, when before there were setbacks at each property. Not only does it change the dynamics from a planning standpoint, but there's no incentive to create any setback. So, the setbacks, I think, are something that we can't ignore, but keep that example that we're telling the single-family residential homeowner that if you build on a 100 by 100-foot lot, two of them, you have to provide at least the same amount of setback as what you started off with. But if you're developing and putting -- amassing the blocks together, now you get to go to zero and there's nothing for the pedestrian in the front because it's zero. And the only place in mixed use that has a setback is in the rear, which is ten foot. How does that work? Is that to get a bigger garbage truck in through the alley? It makes no sense. And every time we say staff -- and pardon me, for me -- these nice people here are staff, the City architect, and the Board of Architects. They have to be at the very beginning involved in the design, with all due respect to the rest of staff in Planning. So, that, in my opinion, I think is something that we should look at, take a look at the comments for the next meeting, and see if we could start going straight at the first section and go

through it and see how could alter it. Now, I know there are people from the -- in the public. Unless someone has some burning desire to say something -- okay.

Unidentified Speaker: Thank you all.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you for coming. Appreciate it.

Unidentified Speaker: Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: I would not open it up for public comment right now unless -- Mr. Clerk, have you received anything from anyone watching on Zoom or maybe we put everybody to sleep?

City Clerk Urquia: There are members of the public on Zoom. However, no one has requested to speak, and we -- I did receive two speaker cards earlier...

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

City Clerk Urquia: But those people have left already.

Chairperson Pardo: I'll entertain a motion to...

Board Member Bermello: Motion to adjourn, Mr. Chairman.

Chairperson Pardo: Adjourn.

Board Member Salman: Second.

Board Member Pratt: Second.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright. All those in favor?

The Board Members (Collectively): Aye.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you, Mr. Clerk.

Board Member Bermello: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Board Member Pratt: Thank you.

City of Coral Gables Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting
August 5, 2021
City Commission Chambers
405 Biltmore Way, Coral Gables, FL

Blue Ribbon Committee Members

Chairperson Felix Pardo

Board Member Aramis "Mitch" Alvarez

Board Member Robert Behar

Board Member Willy Bermello

Board Member Glenn Pratt

Board Member Javier Salman

City Staff

Assistant City Attorney, Gustavo Ceballos

City Clerk, Billy Urquia

City Architect, Juan Riesco

Assistant Development Services Director, Devin Cejas

Planning and Zoning Director, Ramon Trias

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director, Warren Adams

Public Speaker(s)

Sue Kawalerski

Adan Quesada

Samuel Lawson

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Clerk, could we start?

City Clerk Urquia: You have a quorum, Mr. Chair. You're welcome to start.

Chairperson Pardo: I'd like to call the Med Bonus Blue-Ribbon Committee to order. Mr. Clerk, can you call the roll, please?

City Clerk Urquia: Chairperson Pardo?

Chairperson Pardo: Here.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Alvarez?

Board Member Alvarez: Here.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Behar?

Board Member Behar: Present.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Bermello?

Board Member Bermello: Present.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Pratt?

Board Member Pratt: Present.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Salman?

Board Member Salman: Present.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Riesco?

City Architect Riesco: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you. Approval of the minutes. We received it recently. They are verbatim, correct, Mr. Clerk?

City Clerk Urquia: Yes, sir, they are.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Behar: I'll make a motion to approve.

Board Member Salman: I'll second.

Chairperson Pardo: Made by Mr. Behar. Who seconded? Mr. Salman.

City Clerk Urquia: All in favor?

The Board Members (Collectively): Aye.

City Clerk Urquia: Opposed?

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. So, we have been reviewing, and we have been analyzing the issues before this committee. And as far as the order of things, this will be our third meeting, and today we're going to discuss specific changes to Section 5-201. I'd like to be able -- with the indulgence of the board -- what we have here is that since this meeting is open to the public, both here physically and also on Zoom and is being recorded, we thought that it would be a good idea to bring up the documents where everyone can see it and follow it. And then that way, it's easier, I think, for the board members to also discuss it, and then we'll start at the top of the section and then work our way through it. Everybody's okay with that? Okay.

Board Member Behar: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: Yes.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Mr. Chair, if I may. Assistant City Attorney Gus Ceballos. Just to provide some, I guess, general timeline, I believe we have one meeting subsequent to this.

Chairperson Pardo: Correct.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: If we were to try to get this on the August 24th meeting, which is the desire of the Commission, we need to have something by next meeting to kind of -- to discuss and finalize and make our final recommendation. So, I would just keep that in mind that we are in a bit of a time crunch. And as we wrap up today, hopefully, we have some sense of where we want to go, so that we can make a motion next meeting and have this on the 24th. If not, we'd probably have to delay it to the September meeting.

Chairperson Pardo: The --

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chair, could I make a comment or a suggestion? You -- three versions of redlines have been circulated to date. I circulated, I guess, the first; you circulated one a couple days ago, and we just got from Mr. Behar, one today. Obviously, you know, the one today and the others at some point should be discussed. I would suggest that -- we have a very talented staff with the City Attorney's Office -- we try to consolidate all the comments received to date, not eliminate anything, so that we have everything to review and discuss, but that we get it all in advance so that we have like four or five days, so that when we come at the next meeting, we -- I'd like to be able to go line item by line item, knowing that we've had an opportunity to review, consider, discuss, properly vet every comment from any of our board members, including those that may be made on the spot because those are as good as any that have been made with

prior time. So, I would just consider that because I'd like to read Mr. Behar's. We could do it today and go through it, but I think at some point I'd like to see it all combined so that we look at it in one place and there may be areas of commonality where we both agree with adding the same thing or striking the same language. I'm sure we do. I think there's a lot of commonality in what we all see, and there may be some areas that some of us see that others don't. And those are the ones that I think we then discuss whether they're included or excluded. But I would just recommend that at some point, and I think it should come from the City Attorney Office that we get a -- I don't know -- a combined that we can still see the comments in there and then make some discussion. Because if not, it's going to be still tough, I think, to try to go through everything in one sitting.

Board Member Behar: If I may, just to elaborate on that point a second. I agree that we should discuss this because there are some complete differences of opinion between some of us. And I think that in some cases, you know, the one that Felix circulated was taking out some of the items there that, in my opinion, should be kept. So, I think it would be most beneficial for all of us and for the public, if we went perhaps one by one, and then we could discuss which we agree, which we don't agree to take out or leave it in or add or clarify. So, I think that if we were going through -- before it went to the City Attorney's Office, so when we send it to the City Attorney with the minutes, it's clear for them what to follow.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. And that was exactly the purpose of trying to do it this way, so we could go line item by line item, discuss it, see where we have consensus, and we see where we have differences of opinion. And then we can consolidate it, you know, basically by this meeting and then be able to have a consolidated draft that reflects exactly what our opinions are. And hopefully, we can get consensus on most of them and see which ones we don't, and we go from there. So, I think that is what we're trying to do.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, I think the only thing I want to make sure is we discuss everybody's comments, not just one set of comments.

Chairperson Pardo: No, no, no.

Board Member Bermello: That's my only point, you know.

Chairperson Pardo: Willy, I think the -- what we're trying to do is put something up there on the wall, and we got something to try -- a target to try to hit, and then we can go from there, and then we can express, you know, our -- either our agreement or disagreement and discuss that here. And then go -- you know, because now we're really getting into the technical end of it. We've already discussed the philosophical component. We've discussed the drawbacks, and we've discussed also other things that weren't reflected in the ordinance to -- in this section of the Code to begin with. So, that being said, okay, let me see if I don't knock out the power in the city here. Hold on. Alright. We're going to start. And so, the public understands what they're looking at, is this is a portion of the Zoning Code, which is what regulates the limitations of development and the performance standards for that. Everything that is in black on this particular document that everyone is looking at is specifically as it is written in the Code now. And this particular example that you have up here now, everything that is crossed out in red is taking out an existing word or group of words. And then everything that is underlined in red are new words that are being -- been inserted. So, you could see basically what the original sentence or paragraph said, and then you can then proceed and see what the proposed changes are. And these changes, of course, are going to be subject to the committee -- because this is a committee -- the committee's recommendations and consensus. So, starting off with Section 5-201, in Article 5, there are two sections. And this is for the Mediterranean standards, which is Section 5-200. Section 5-201 are the Coral Gables Mediterranean style design standards. So, under the purpose and applicability, you could see that originally -- sorry about that -- it said "bonuses." I am suggesting adding the word "development" because these are development bonuses. And it said before "incentives," and I am suggesting that we change the word from "incentives" to "special allowances." The special allowances are described specifically, and these special allowances are different than variances and other legal words. So, under the purpose, the other suggestion that I made on this document is to strike out

the words "the various architectural styles and association with." So, reading the entire paragraph, it's "provide development bonuses and special allowances to property owners to encourage and expand the creative use of promoting public realm improvements." Now, Mr. Bermello made the suggestion of changing the word "promoting." And I would suggest the word "encouraging," so it would be "to property owners encouraging public realm improvements."

Board Member Bermello: Yeah. But I think the word encourage is already there. To me, it was just grammar, not -- so it's more -- this is a stylistic change. This is not a substantive change. I think if it would read "the creative use of public realm improvements" -- you already discuss "encourage." You already say "expand," so I think that -- it's just a little cleaner, but that same. Not change of substance, it's just --

Board Member Salman: Just to remove the second "promoting."

Board Member Bermello: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Salman: Through the Chair, I think that the inclusion of an ambiguous term, such "special allowances" actually detracts from the goal of the whole section. If you were just to say, "provide development bonuses to property owners to encourage and expand the creative use of public realm improvements."

Chairperson Pardo: Well, the reason that there's a distinction between the two is the development bonus is normally referred to FAR and the special allowances would probably have more to do with height and other things. So, there's like a distinction between the two.

Board Member Salman: Well, height is defined later on in the Code under the different tables as to how much you can add.

Chairperson Pardo: Correct.

Board Member Salman: So, if that's what you mean, well, that's also part of a bonus. I'm just trying to remove weasel words out as much as we can.

Board Member Bermello: Is special allowance a defined term in the Code?

Board Member Salman: Special allowance is...

Board Member Bermello: Because that's one way to resolve it, that you recommend it in the glossary or the definition of terms that be added, but then we got to have a definition of what that means. Otherwise, you get the legal profession making a heyday out of...

Board Member Salman: And that's exactly what...

Board Member Bermello: What it is.

Board Member Salman: We're facing here today, okay, is people making hay out of what was the original intent of a code and transforming it from a bonus to an as of right development opportunity, and that was never the intent.

Board Member Bermello: Right.

Board Member Salman: And I have just a general objection to the disassembly of the general intent and the following, you know, A through I breakdown of that without some sort of a preamble that would begin with, you know, the Mediterranean bonuses are designed to protect, promote, and enhance the unique character of the City of Coral Gables as follows: By -- and then you could go providing dah, dah, dah, dah, dah.

Chairperson Pardo: I did not change the order of the letters that are there, but what you're discussing is C, provide development bonuses for Coral Gables Mediterranean architecture design to continue to support George Merrick's vision, consistent with the established historic building fabric of the city. Then D, enhance the image of the city by providing a visual linkage between the contemporary development and City's unique historic thematic appearance. And then you go to A -- I would think -- which would be C, and then B, provide for a two-level bonus program, architectural style, and public amenities that provides architectural features and amenities typically provided in Mediterranean style buildings. So, what this does is it's showing you that you have two different things going on for the development bonuses and the special allowances, and that would be architectural style, and then the other one would be public amenities.

Board Member Salman: Correct.

Chairperson Pardo: And what is awkward about this is I did not change the original order...

Board Member Salman: And what I'm suggesting -- through the Chair -- is that we put some of these sections -- and they would be specifically D, C, E, and H, as part of a preamble that sets out what the whole goal of the ordinance is, and then go into the specifics rather than -- it's...

Board Member Behar: But I think...

Board Member Salman: It just makes it more difficult.

Board Member Behar: Javier, the purpose -- (INAUDIBLE) intent to comply with the purpose. And I think those A, B, and C and D, okay. Then when you get into more detail is when you're going to start seeing more defined requirements, I think.

Board Member Salman: I understand, but I keep saying that we're burying the lead. What is the purpose of this? It is to enhance, promote and protect the unique character that is Coral Gables by incentivizing the creation of a higher standard of architecture beyond that which is allowed in the Code.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, it's two things. First of all, it's promoting a style and promoting public amenities, and that's a way...

Board Member Salman: Through the use of an architectural style and the enhancement of...

Board Member Behar: But let's not lose...

Board Member Salman: I'm not saying...

Board Member Behar: The fact that...

Board Member Salman: I'm not taking anything out.

Board Member Behar: The style...

Board Member Salman: I'm just saying this is the logic of it all.

Board Member Behar: The style is only one of various. You've got other public benefits that are just as important if you do a contemporary building, or you do a Coral Gables style building.

Board Member Salman: I agree. And I agree.

Board Member Behar: Because what I -- what you're going to see from my document, even though it's not reflected on B, I'm suggesting that -- I'm proposing that we go to a three-level bonus; that

you have in Table 1 what you get, Table 2, and then if you want to get your full 0.5, then you do the style. Because I think the way we're seeing the development throughout the city, you could get some very good projects that may not be the, you know, Mediterranean style building. So, you may not get the full benefit, but yet you could get to a level that are -- they incorporate and provide public benefits.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. And that's why I separated the public pedestrian amenities, purpose and applicability separate from -- if you look at the top again -- where its purpose and applicability, it's purpose and applicability of the Coral Gables Mediterranean style design standards. But when you go down to the next section, which would be B, which like I said before, I did not re-enumerate everything, public pedestrian amenities would be B, purpose and applicability. And then E would be A under that section. So, what you have there is: A, promote an assortment of street level public realm and pedestrian amenities in order to earn development bonuses and special allowances through a structured discretionary review process and subject to compatibility with the surrounding neighborhoods. Now, what is very important, I think, in this particular sentence, going back to what Robert said just now, is that it is saying that the public realm and pedestrian amenities are extremely important, and that through this review process, the development bonuses and special allowances would be granted and it's subject to all of these different things. But what you're saying is promoting an assortment of the street level (INAUDIBLE) is separate from the style. So, you have, as Robert said, the style with a certain thing. Now, you have the public realm things that we all talked about and are rewarding them. And that's why it is so important to understand that the word "earn" makes a difference and words mean things. You have to earn these bonuses. You have to earn these special allowances. It's not being diluted. And the key is that you earn them through great design. So, if you look at F, which would be B, provide the ability to provide special allowances by the Board of Architects to promote public open space improvements. G, which would be C, promote and require architectural design elements focused to a pedestrian scale. When you go to...

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chair, do you see the use of the word "structured discretionary"...

Chairperson Pardo: Right. The reason...

Board Member Bermello: To create any kind of potential confusion in somebody's mind? If the Board of Architects is being given discretionary powers to provide those special allowances through the dialogue with the architect and the developer, which I think is something that -- I mean, I think the Board of Architects does a great job. And I think giving that authority, I have no problem. I just don't know what it means when you say structured.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. Well...

Board Member Bermello: Because I -- the last thing I want to do is kind of tie their hands, because the idea of having -- I don't know, it's a seven-member board -- is that you have a lot of talent and they can see something good, and they can see what we can't see because we're not seeing the specifics. They'll be seeing the specifics of a site, of the response of a neighborhood condition that we're not -- we're talking in theory. So, I like the idea of discretionary. I like the idea of putting that onus, that responsibility, which is a great responsibility, on the Board of Architects. But when I saw the word discretion -- "structured," which again, by itself, you know, I put a lot of structure in my life and my business. But I would ask myself, "Well, what does that really mean," if I'm telling here that my fellow colleagues on the Board of Architects will have discretion not to give these allowances.

Chairperson Pardo: They have the discretion because it's a discretionary review. But the reason that the word "structured" -- the reason I placed the word "structured" in was not to create confusion, but the reason that I provided structured is that when you read what the text said before, it just said a discretionary review process. The structured discretionary review includes the Board of Architects, includes the City Architect. It includes the Planning Department. So, that's all part of a structure.

Board Member Bermello: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: And if you keep reading down the...

Board Member Bermello: Okay, so by "structured," you mean that it's part of a structured...

Chairperson Pardo: That's correct.

Board Member Bermello: Review process...

Chairperson Pardo: That's correct.

Board Member Bermello: That is beyond the Board of Architects, but it maybe starts with the Board of Architects, but there are other -- there's other input that'll be...

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: Coming in too.

Chairperson Pardo: And the reason, Willy, that I did that specifically was because there was a loss of, you know -- as far as in the process of being inclusionary, as far as that is concerned. The word is not intended in any way, shape, or form to limit what the Board of Architects can review, can opine on, or the City Architect, or the Planning Department for that purpose. But the whole point is to understand that the review process is not up to one person. It's not up to one board, but it's up to several of these to keep everything compatible and in check in the city. So, therefore, once you keep reading and going down the sections, you'll see, I think you may agree, and if you all want to take the word "structured" out, that's...

Board Member Pratt: Well, yeah.

Board Member Bermello: Well, I wasn't...

Board Member Pratt: Willy, if I could just...

Board Member Bermello: Suggesting that. I just wanted to ask the...

Chairperson Pardo: The intent.

Board Member Bermello: Thinking behind the -- the intent...

Chairperson Pardo: The intent.

Board Member Bermello: Behind the word. It's not...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah. And Willy, to your -- I agree with you. When words start being interjected into the -- I mean, as you said, Felix, before, words have meaning. And I think that it's -- if we don't have to add unnecessary words in -- the process is already identified in the Zoning Code for the projects as they go through the development process. And so, -- and going back to another question that Willy had is that is that structured -- is that in the definition section? Or you know, we're adding words that are not defined.

Chairperson Pardo: Well...

Board Member Pratt: And I think, you know, we need to be careful in terms of...

Chairperson Pardo: Well, discretionary review is not in any of the -- in the glossary in the Zoning Code either. But when you say discretionary review, it can mean one thing one day and another thing another way. But when you explain that it's a structured discretionary review, it basically is telling you, well, for example, the Board of Architects, the City architect, the Planning Board, all these different entities are part of a, in my mind, structured review process. And it's discretionary in the sense of you're looking at something that is very difficult to put in words when you're reviewing a design, but it is structured in such a way that it's referred to in other parts of the section.

Board Member Behar: When you explain it that way, it makes sense, but it's when you read it, you don't get that same definition.

Board Member Pratt: Right.

Board Member Bermello: That's why I asked the question.

Board Member Behar: You know, I don't know...

Board Member Bermello: As the Chair explains it, I'm good with the explanation, which basically says that discretion is within the structure of a methodology or a process or a sequencing that involve departments and other things. I get it. I think that's...

Board Member Salman: I think if you just change structure to define multi-leveled review, you're fine because that's what the Code is.

Chairperson Pardo: Very good. Alright, so noted. The next one is providing for the ability to provide special allowances by the Board of Architects to promote public open space improvements. Because, you know, up to now, Mr. City Architect, you usually don't do that -- right? -- as far as the Board of Architects and yourself? In other words, as far as you providing the recommendations for public open space improvements in your review process, is that correct?

City Architect Riesco: Yes, based on the Planning and Zoning report and things of that nature.

Chairperson Pardo: Right, so in other words, what I'm trying to do is see, you know, the Board of Architects and the City architect being able to provide input on the these very important public open space improvements. So, I thought that that (INAUDIBLE) because...

Board Member Pratt: No. And generally, the Board of Architects does opine on, you know, projects and for the public realm finishes, you know, pavement treatments...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Pratt: The street furniture...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Pratt: You know, all of those things, lighting. Those are all things that the BOA does review and...

Chairperson Pardo: Right. And you're talking, Glenn, specifically, I think, about the finished materials and maybe the lighting and the -- but normally, you don't get into actually providing comment on the design as far as why don't you open this up to, you know, create a space here or there because...

Board Member Pratt: No, I think that...

City Architect Riesco: That happens...

Board Member Pratt: Yeah.

City Architect Riesco: At the Board of Architects all the time.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah.

City Architect Riesco: We do make recommendations...

Board Member Pratt: Yes.

City Architect Riesco: Based on that.

Board Member Pratt: Yes, the board does.

Chairperson Pardo: The only thing that has been added here is to add specifically that the Board of Architect has the ability to provide those special allowances, so I think it reinforces...

Board Member Salman: May I -- through the Chair -- just make a scrivener's suggestion so it would help clarify a whole lot. Change it to read "provide for the ability by the Board of Architects to promote public open space improvements," and then strike the rest.

Board Member Bermello: So, Mr. Chair, I had recommended adding some language to that only because I've been in situations where there is a definition of open space and you're going to have a lousy open space and you can have a great open space. And so -- and I think it goes beyond the space, so I think some wording with respect to the amenities and the features that go into making a great space, without defining them. I think the Board of Architects would, but I think it's more than just open space. And because I can see someone getting cute and just defining open space as a footprint, and say, that's open space. And then you get into arguments. I think the intent here is that we're trying to make sure that there's consistency of greatness and the quality of our built

environment in the public realm particularly. I thought a little bit of additional wards because the word open space is throughout our Code.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. But you don't disagree as far as inserting the Board of Architects?

Board Member Bermello: Oh, no, no.

Board Member Behar: No, no, I agree.

Board Member Bermello: No, totally.

Board Member Behar: Not at all.

Board Member Bermello: I'm in agreement totally.

Board Member Behar: And Willy, I saw your comment. And in my draft, I did include design amenities and features that benefit the public realm.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah.

Board Member Behar: Because I think that makes a lot of sense.

Board Member Bermello: We're saying the same thing.

Board Member Behar: The same thing.

Board Member Bermello: So...

Board Member Behar: It makes it a little bit more detailed of what is expected.

Board Member Bermello: I think it describes the intent with a little more detail than just providing footprint area to meet a code requirement.

Chairperson Pardo: No, no. And the only thing I changed on your comment, which I didn't have time to put it in here, was that I changed the word embellish to enhance.

Board Member Bermello: That's fine.

Board Member Behar: I did benefit or something, but yes.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah, they're all...

Board Member Behar: They're all the same thing.

Chairperson Pardo: We're all on the same page.

Board Member Bermello: They're first cousins.

Board Member Salman: So, are we in agreement that we're going to add design amenities and features as part of the description of public open spaces?

Board Member Behar: I think...

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah, amenities and features.

Board Member Behar: I agree with Willy.

Chairperson Pardo: Let me read it into the record. It would say design -- add at the end of improvements, add design amenities and features that enhance the public realm.

Board Member Salman: Are we in agreement?

Board Member Behar: Yes.

Board Member Pratt: Yes.

Board Member Salman: Sorry. That's the Chair's job.

Chairperson Pardo: Then the next one is promote required -- that did not change. The next one I grappled with because it says encourage landmark opportunities, including physically designed -- defined squares, plazas, urban passages, parks. And then I added pedestrian compatible driveway, public open spaces, and space.

Board Member Bermello: I think that's a great one.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah, because...

Board Member Bermello: If anything, it helps you or helps all the architects with their clients as to why they should be spending something other than asphalt in a driveway. And to realize that even your entry driveway -- and I know that the code -- and I think rightfully so -- tries to limit the number of driveways onto any property from multiple entries to, you know, limiting the curb cuts where you do have that curb cut, I think the underlying theme is a return and a recapture of that public realm to the pedestrian, even in areas where cars go through, to treat them with a sense of elegance and pedestrian quality. And so, I think having it there -- Mr. Chair, you have it. I had it in my comments. If anything, it underlines kind of the intent of where we're heading here.

Board Member Behar: I think it's good.

Board Member Bermello: And it's good.

Board Member Behar: I'm in agreement. And I think...

Board Member Bermello: I think it completes your first page.

Board Member Alvarez: I think you guys are doing fantastic. But when you look at it, all of a sudden, you're sitting presenting a case and there's a board interpreting your case, and they all agree with it, and okay, how much square footage do I get for this? Or is there a measurable guide in determining what do you get tit for tat in terms of area or, you know, any measurable manner? And I don't know how to deal with that.

Chairperson Pardo: Mitch, this -- up to now, this is all part of the...

Board Member Pratt: Introduction.

Chairperson Pardo: The intent of the design, not part of the table for where you get square footage.

Board Member Alvarez: So, you get to that in the tables?

Chairperson Pardo: Later, correct. And then the problem that has occurred is that, in the last few years, we've seen more and more buildings where the pedestrian versus driveway vehicular portion is almost as nice as picking someone up at Miami International Airport, you know, where you have the overpass above it, and you have the cars zooming by and you have the side -- that's not what we're looking for. We're looking for a better experience for the pedestrian and the driveway. And it's not, you know, necessarily just separation, but how you design it and how you open up the spaces, instead of just squeezing something in.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chair, can I make a comment that has nothing to do with this, but it's something that the attorney -- the City Attorney mentioned at the beginning? And it has to do with time and date of competition. I submit to my fellow board members that what we're doing right now is the correct thing. We're taking the time to look at every word, every comma, every sentence, because what we do here will transcend all of us for years and years to come. I think -- even though I live in a world of deadlines, I really do, but in this world, where we're trying to properly vet and give the public also a chance to give opinions, I think that the schedule of trying to get this in time for the August Commission is unrealistic. And I don't want this to be something that happens later personally from my side. I would rather tell the City Attorney, "Listen, we're going to take as long as it takes, and it may take six sittings, if we take two or three pages a day, every time we meet." Because this is -- you know, we got like 10 pages to go. This could be three meetings just to go through the whole thing, so it won't be in August before we get back to the Commission. And I hope that's not a problem, but to work it backwards, I don't think -- I mean, I don't know. I think it'll be unrealistic.

Board Member Behar: Unfortunately, I will agree with you. As much as we want to -- we've been going at it for like 40 minutes and we only covered seven, eight-line items.

Board Member Bermello: And we haven't covered any of the difficult stuff.

Board Member Behar: Yeah, so we should try to do it as soon as possible, but it may not be doable.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah. I just wanted the City Attorney to hear that because I'm sure you report back and...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I was just trying to provide some guidance. At the end of the day, the City Attorney's Office will be here however many meetings you deem it inappropriate. It's just that the Commission did want to have an item in August, but I can report to them that the

committee just could not turn around a completed product, and that you requested more time. That's basically it.

Board Member Bermello: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright. We'll continue then. Provide a strong emphasis on the aesthetics and architectural design in these regulations to plan the mixing of uses to establish identity, diversity, and focus to promote a pedestrian friendly environment subject to compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods. So, the compatibility issue is one of the reasons that we're here. And one of the things that we have to make sure is that on the compatibility and surrounding neighborhoods, that we have to be aware of not just the height, but the uses. And for example, if you have a building that is near a residential area, you have a commercial side, maybe the commercial side should be flipped to the other side of the building for more compatibility with that particular project in that particular neighborhood. So, what has happened is that it's not just strict zoning. It's more of understanding the compatibility with the surrounding neighborhoods that that is part of what we should all be striving for. Let's continue.

Board Member Salman: Through the Chair. Whenever we read something that we come to more or less consensus, do you want to just say, hey, this is it, and that way we can log it and move on? I think it would help the City Attorney quite a bit. For example, your last one, I don't think there was an objection to it. Just call the question and see if we have a consensus to move forward.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, you've been making notes. We're taping this. There's going to be a verbatim record of it.

Board Member Salman: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: And then hopefully, Mr. Clerk, as soon as we can on this, I think it would be very helpful that we get that as soon as we can to be able to then incorporate any additional comments.

Board Member Bermello: I think Mr. Salman makes a good point though. And just for the record, for example, when we finished that first page, like, I don't have any other comments personally, and I will be ready to say we move first page with all the comments that we have agreed upon. I don't know if the City Attorney is like keeping tabs, or is he going to have to go back to the meeting minutes at the end and reconcile the two? I mean, if we were negotiating a contract, you'd have the attorneys with the documents live and they'd be clicking and saying accept, and we go to the next page. I realized this is not that kind of setting...

Board Member Behar: But I don't think the first page...

Board Member Bermello: How is it going to be?

Board Member Behar: I think you got to go by items.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, well, I think we've gotten all the items on the first page, on page 51.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: And I think Mr. Salman's point was, are we officially, I guess, adopting for page one with the modifications discussed, and then now we move to page...

Chairperson Pardo: That's the way I'm...

Board Member Bermello: I mean, that's...

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Bermello: That'd be the best thing, so we know when we come next time, we're not going to be addressing page 51.

Chairperson Pardo: Correct.

Board Member Bermello: That's already done, right?

Chairperson Pardo: Correct. Alright.

Board Member Bermello: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: So, going to the next page, the site-specific zoning.

Board Member Behar: On the -- under 4 on there, after site specific Coral Gables Mediterranean architectural style, I think that we should include new construction because I think that something was taken out under four, right? Do I have the same document that you do? Because under where it says Coral Gables Mediterranean architectural style...

Chairperson Pardo: That should have stayed in, and then conversions would have been added.

Board Member Behar: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: Applications for new and additions, restorations and/or renovations of existing buildings as...

Board Member Behar: But you had taken out applications for new construction, right?

Chairperson Pardo: No, it is. We should leave it in there.

Board Member Behar: We should leave it in there.

Chairperson Pardo: Correct, right.

Board Member Bermello: So, you're agreeing with my comment?

Chairperson Pardo: Right. And Willy made that comment also.

Board Member Behar: I'm okay with the language that was added on number 3.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Behar: And taking out Tables 1, 2 and 3 on that, I think. But under the other one, yes, we should...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Behar: You took out number 4...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Behar: Which I was okay with that personally.

Chairperson Pardo: Right, and then just add the conversion.

Board Member Behar: If we -- if you go back to the number 4, the bonus height should not apply to MF -- I can't see that far. MF3? Is that what you have there?

Chairperson Pardo: That's a 4.

Board Member Behar: MF3. Why will it not apply to MF3?

Board Member Bermello: Well, it does apply. I think he's just taking that paragraph out.

Board Member Behar: Oh, but it was taken out. But I think it should not be taken out, right?

Board Member Bermello: I thought you took it out maybe because of redundancy because it's -- you're not talking about specific districts, and I thought you were taking it out there because you're not making reference to all the other districts where that would apply also. So, I thought you were just cleaning it up.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: So, I wasn't seeing it as an exclusion. I was seeing it as a clean-up...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: Where there's a comment about a couple of districts, but there are a bunch of others that it applies also that are not being mentioned, so let's not mention any of them.

Board Member Behar: So, it's clarification only.

Board Member Bermello: Because -- yeah, it's clarification because...

Chairperson Pardo: And on top of that, there's also a conflict on the amount of one and the other. When you go back to the tables, there's a conflict there also, so I just took it out completely because they shouldn't be there.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah. They're covered in the table, and you know...

Chairperson Pardo: They're covered in the table clearly.

Board Member Bermello: Right. So, we agree on this page that we're consistent with everything, except we're adding the word "new construction" back.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: Leaving that (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Bermello: Does that mean that 52 is approved also?

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: We're moving at a fast clip. We may have to...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Pardon me. Where did you want to leave the word "construction"?

Board Member Bermello: It's new construction. It was deleted, and then we're putting it back in on what used to be...

Chairperson Pardo: Five, now four.

Board Member Behar: It's now four, right.

(COMMENTS MADE OFF THE RECORD)

Chairperson Pardo: There will be, depending on how we do with time.

(COMMENTS MADE OFF THE RECORD)

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I'm sorry. If the Chair is going to allow public comment, I would ask that everyone come up to the mic.

Chairperson Pardo: No, we're going to hold off on that.

Board Member Bermello: At the end.

Chairperson Pardo: We're going to see how far we get on this comment.

Board Member Pratt: Felix, just a question. The MF3 and the MF4 were created from the old MFSA area, and the MFSA districts are in a much more established residential character neighborhoods. And I think that, you know, originally that those additional requirements were put into place, you know, because of the existing character and the fact that they were areas that were in very established neighborhoods.

Chairperson Pardo: You're talking about number 4, Glenn?

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, I'm going back to number 4.

Chairperson Pardo: What we're saying is that that's reflected already in the table. And as you see, it says...

Board Member Bermello: It's kind of redundant.

Chairperson Pardo: And it says, "and five of ten standards in Table 2," and when you look at that, there's a discrepancy in the table on the amount of items -- there are 12 items...

Board Member Pratt: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: And it says 10. So, nowhere else do you have any of these in this first section.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, it's cleanup. It's not...

Chairperson Pardo: It's a cleanup (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Bermello: It's not...

Chairperson Pardo: They're reflected. Nothing has been taken away.

Board Member Bermello: Nothing's been taken out.

Board Member Pratt: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: It's like repeating a sentence twice and you're just deleting it.

Chairperson Pardo: Correct.

Board Member Bermello: So, 52, are we good with the changes?

Chairperson Pardo: I think 2 is fine.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I'm just trying to make sure we follow along and that I can track it.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: So, 54 is the only part of the deleted language that's going to be included as construction or new construction?

Board Member Behar: New construction.

Chairperson Pardo: New construction.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I'm sorry?

Board Member Salman: Read the whole paragraph so that it makes sense.

Chairperson Pardo: Applications for new construction and conversions of existing non-Coral Gables Mediterranean style...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Understood.

Board Member Bermello: Okay.

Unidentified Speaker: There you go.

Board Member Salman: Got it, Mr. Attorney?

Chairperson Pardo: Alright.

Board Member Behar: Okay, in the -- here, hold on second, Mr. Chairman. Number 7 or number 6, special location site plan review, where it says properties in the MF2, 3, 4, MX1, 2, 3 District, which are adjacent to or across public rights-of-way or waterfront from an SFR district. Should we do that instead of across -- adjacent, across -- should we say abut?

Board Member Bermello: Above?

Board Member Behar: Abut, abut it.

Unidentified Speaker: Abut.

Chairperson Pardo: Adjacent.

Board Member Behar: Take out are adjacent to or across public rights-of-way or waterway from and just simply say abut.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I will defer to the Planning and Zoning Directors that are both present in the room. But I believe abut is a defined term, so...

Board Member Bermello: So, let me just give you my feeling. And I used to live on (INAUDIBLE) on the water. And if someone was on the other side where they're not really abutting me, but they're definitely across from me and kind of imposing, I think I want to be able to, you know, receive some notification. So, I'm thinking about a single-family home, and if you're in a waterway or in a golf way, you spent a lot of money. And I think this kind of highlights the fact that those public rights-of-ways, whether it's a greenway or a waterway, they're important.

And the level of care should be, frankly, of a higher degree because those waterways and those open ways are really for everybody's enjoyment, you know.

Chairperson Pardo: And that's the specific intent of this paragraph. (INAUDIBLE) leave it in.

Board Member Bermello: That's what's -- I mean, if you live in North Greenway or South Greenway Drive and you jog there in that area, you know that's special. That's really special. So, that's the only thing. I think, legally, you're correct, it's about -- across. But I think leaving those there, I think just highlight a sense of maybe of care.

Board Member Behar: Okay, that's fine. I mean...

Board Member Bermello: I had more of a comment that I thought that Paragraph B was quite redundant. So, it's, again, not substance. I'm not looking at the substance, more of the style. It looks like we're saying the same thing like three times in the same paragraph.

Chairperson Pardo: No, the difference...

Board Member Bermello: But I'm -- listen, I'm fine with the wording. I just thought it was a little redundant.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. The -- one of the things that seems to be missing from the Board of Architects, in my opinion -- from the Board of Architects tools that -- for their review is the conceptual type -- in other words, when you're going through a review process or something that has to do with a special location site plan review, it's a different animal altogether. And it's very rare that the Board of Architects gets to opine on the site plan itself. In other words, it's left to Planning and only Planning. So, the difference is to obtain a conceptual site plan review approval from the Board of Architects, which the only reason that you would do this is because this section has to do with special location site plan review. So, therefore, the Board of Architects, by them

reviewing the conceptual site plan, has the ability then to see the big picture of the site plan because this is not a normal site plan. This is a special location site plan review.

Board Member Bermello: Are you suggesting that as a different step than their preliminary approval by the BOA?

Chairperson Pardo: Correct, yes. It would be almost like three steps, and that's why they obtain conceptual site plan review approval from the Board of Architects. Then you still obtain a preliminary review for the building -- the buildings on the site, and then you still obtain the final review for the...

Board Member Bermello: I mean, it would seem to me that it'd be more of a -- I mean, I would not add a layer of reviews and expense and time. What I would simply say -- I mean, again, I'm sure that everybody here -- I mean, when we are doing a project, we look at the overall context. We go well beyond our property boundaries to see how we relate to the surrounding area in scale, et cetera. I don't know if that is like one of the -- if you go online and you get the requirements for the BOA and you have to get the letter from the architect and a survey, if maybe this kind of recommendation is one that goes there that says, "Add a urban context analysis," for example, for lack of -- that then the architect knows, as part of the package, that's what you expect. I know in the City of Miami, the UDRB, we require that. And if they come in without it, you know, well, staff won't allow the application to be presented. Maybe that's where that happens, Mr. Chair, as opposed to here.

Chairperson Pardo: What makes this so different, in my opinion, is because it's a special location site plan review, normally what happens in these mixed family areas, 2 and 3, normally what happens is it's a special -- they're basically looking at multiple properties that have always been individual properties. Then they're being consolidated into a much larger project. If the Board of Architects is involved -- because not taking out the Planning Department. The Planning Department is involved, the Board of Architects is involved in the site plan review, but this is a

very special location site plan, and therefore, you're able to opine early on in what direction the design of that new space is. So, just imagine you've got a block, it's got 20 separate lots. It's been like that for ages. Now, it's all being consolidated. Now, it becomes one block. If the Board of Architects is involved at the beginning, you know, of the site plan review, it's, I think, a great tool that can be used by the city, you know, to be able to understand that instead of it simply going only to the Planning Department and then coming out already completely site-planned where there's very little discussion.

Board Member Behar: But Mr. Chair, currently, I think there's new requirements to go through a DRC approval, right?

Chairperson Pardo: The DRC...

Board Member Behar: And the DRC pretty much is -- I think does some of that work.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, let's ask the...

Board Member Behar: And maybe we could ask...

Chairperson Pardo: No, let's ask the City Architect. He's the one that represents the Board of Architects at the DRC.

City Architect Riesco: Okay. On the DRC reviews, we are looking at design issues, but we're looking a lot at the materiality, the mass, the compatibility. We look at the context. We look at those things in general, and we provide comments on the project regarding completeness, informational items that are missing. And so, we give the developer responses of things that may not be complete for proceeding with the project.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

City Architect Riesco: But we do -- of course, we look at the project as an overall. Now, you don't have the full board...

Chairperson Pardo: Exactly.

City Architect Riesco: Responding to that. It's only myself. And so, that's the purpose of the City Architect's position on the DRC.

Chairperson Pardo: And the problem that I see with the DRC review, it's a general review to help expedite, you know, the overall look. It's a very quick review.

Board Member Behar: Not anymore, not anymore.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah. And I would -- Felix, you know, just speaking from the other side of the table as a practicing architect, not for the Board of Architects, when we -- in fact, we're doing a project right now that required conditional site plan approval using the RIR, the Residential Infill Regulations. And we started the process way before the DRC in meeting with Mr. Trias and trying to set up, you know, appropriate siting for the building and creating green zones, buffer areas that would enhance the overall urban character and context, as well as also for the possibility for, you know, future projects that could link up and create these green -- with additional green buffers that would be created. So, there's a lot of pre-planning that goes into that, as well as also the Board of Architects -- that's something that the Board of Architects does review in their preliminary review.

Chairperson Pardo: So, if you're working, for example, with the Planning Board, with Mr. Trias, and you're working for weeks or months on that, by the time you go to the Board of Architects, how much input can they have on the project in itself?

Assistant Development Services Director Cejas: If I may add something? Devin Cejas, Assistant Director...

Chairperson Pardo: The Chair recognizes...

Assistant Development Services Director Cejas: For Development Services.

Chairperson Pardo: Devin Cejas.

Assistant Development Services Director Cejas: Thank you, Chair. Hello, all. Just some brief clarification with regards to DRC. There are no approvals granted in DRC. DRC is solely technical and is there to provide guidance for large projects or any project that the Code deems necessary to go to DRC in preparation for the rest of the process, which may require Board of Architects, Planning and Zoning Board hearings, as well as City Commission. So, it's just a way of all departments to gather together to make certain once a project is deemed appropriate to go to DRC, to make certain that all disciplines get to chime in and prepare an applicant as they proceed further. I just want to be clear. No approvals are granted in DRC.

Board Member Pratt: Correct.

Chairperson Pardo: And Mr. Cejas, would you object for the Board of Architects to be involved in the conceptual site planning of the special location site plan review?

Assistant Development Services Director Cejas: My understanding is -- again, chiming in -- the Board of Architects already has certain purview over the massing and the overall project. Site plan reviews are a conditional use, and that is also a part of a process. And the BOA has every right to chime in on that as well, so -- as well as anything under that purview. And again, for further clarity, that's all on -- that's up to this board, and we're here to answer any questions you may have.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, thank you, sir. Alright, so...

Board Member Bermello: I have a question for Mr. Cejas because there were comments, Devin, I think at the last meeting, or maybe the first meeting, which -- I mean, I didn't comment on because I believe that it's not the case. But the comment was that there was a feeling that when projects go before the DRC and then they land at the Board of Architects, that at that point, the project is kind of like straitjacketed. Could you elaborate a little bit on the process when an applicant comes before you and the different departments gather and that coordinating committee and review and provide guidance? Are you a gatekeeper, or are you --? Do you funnel the project in a different direction than maybe what the Board of Architects would opine? I think that was kind of maybe the concern.

Assistant Development Services Director Cejas: Well, nothing -- yeah, I'll try to answer it the best I can, just applying what the Code dictates. At that level, there's nothing finalized. Obviously, the way the Code is designed is to continue to receive input until its final destination to make certain that we get the best possible product, best possible projects possible. When projects are deemed ready to proceed to DRC, what is generally done on that end is pre-application meetings with applicants to see where they're at with the project, and at the very least, go over the zoning technical issues that the project may have. Right, so if the building is being built outside of a setback, well, that's going to be an issue. The project may not be ready to proceed to DRC. Let's make certain to get that building within the envelope -- right? -- technical issues.

Board Member Bermello: Right.

Assistant Development Services Director Cejas: Sometimes there's things that they might not exactly fit yet. If we see them as ready -- if we feel that it's really to go to the DRC, it's a comment on that report, and they're going to be identified and made aware of that concern to correct it as they proceed to the Board of Architects. Once it leaves DRC, then it goes to the Board of Architects, and then we could start having the discussion of how do you refine the aesthetics, how

do you refine the application. Is the project compatible with the tables if a Med bonus is being requested, so on and so forth? If no Med bonuses are being requested, at that level, the Board of Architects is recommending the project on its aesthetic to Planning and Zoning. If there is Med bonuses, they have to do a vote on that.

Board Member Bermello: I think maybe some of the comments had to do a lot with massing, and that maybe some applicants, after they go through the DRC, they may go to the Board of Architects already maybe with the feeling that, you know, they passed go, they've cleared it, and the project is approved. And you're clarifying that you kind of just look at kind of the fatal flaw analysis of things that you must comply with and that you're not an approval process. You're just a technical support process.

Assistant Development Services Director Cejas: In the last two years that I've been here, I know we've been really working hard to make certain when the project's go to the BOA, that there's a clear understanding on what the request is for, so the Board of Architects is best equipped to make the best possible decision when that project gets to them.

Chairperson Pardo: Devin, my concern, you know, again, goes to the hypothetical example of you have basically a city block in a residential area that's got multiple little two-story apartments there forever. Go from one side to the other, it's lots. Now, it's not 20 lots anymore. It's one lot. Then what I'm hoping to do is see that the Board of Architects, who are very qualified, are able to opine on it at the Board of Architects level, not at the DRC level. Because as you explained clearly, it's more of a technical, you know, component. And the thing is to be able to express at that conceptual level whether, like Glenn said, he's meeting with Mr. Trias, and then, you know, they're going back and forth on all these different things. But the Board of Architects, I think, would be helpful in expressing, you know, at a very early stage, while the project is still very plastic, their concerns to be able to make sure that the compatibility issue is there, from a site planning standpoint, not from a -- not even from a use standpoint. Because most of these things that I see going up are a compatibility issue. And again, one of the reasons that we're here is because some of these projects

just haven't been very compatible. So, I'm just trying to -- I've recommended to the board members inserting just a conceptual -- it's called a conceptual site plan review on the Board of Architects just to say, you know, we're good with the site plan, with the concept of the project. And that's before the preliminary of the architecture of the -- even the detailed massing, et cetera. It's more of a conceptual where you're looking at, you know, the whole thing. And like Willy said, City of Miami has something similar with massing studies, et cetera.

Board Member Behar: No, Willy -- but we both sit on that UDRB. We don't have that requirement. The applicant has to comply with certain requirements, but I think that what Felix is saying here is different from what the City of Miami requires.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah. What I meant by the City of Miami is that we have a requirement where the urban context has to be explained...

Board Member Behar: Correct.

Board Member Bermello: In a great sense of detail as part of the submission, but there isn't a second layer. You know, as a matter fact, there's just one. They don't go through a preliminary and a final. They just go through us one time.

Board Member Behar: Once.

Board Member Bermello: But a lot of detail is provided by the architects on an explanation of the urban fabric and the context in which the project sits, which I thought is what you're trying to get at where you're seeing or referring to a project -- I don't know which one it is. But it seems that it's a project that is changing the fabric of the area. And I think to me, that's, you know, something that needs special attention. But I think if that becomes -- it may not apply to a single-family home in a single-family district, but it may apply to other projects that the context analysis maybe is part

of the submission. In some cities, you have to submit sun studies to see how your project could cast shadows on your neighbors, and they make it as one of the submission requirements.

Chairperson Pardo: And the point that I was trying to -- that I am making is specifically with a special location site plan. It is a special location site plan. So, therefore, it's one of the rare opportunities that you have for the BOA to come in and express, you know, early on, are you doing this or that because there is no procedure like that for the massing, like they have at the city. That's why I thought that by adding that, it's not taking away from the normal Board of Architects approval, you know, and...

Board Member Behar: What I see here, as a practicing architect, right, what I see here is a contradiction because if we're going to request or require that the applicants submit for a conceptual site plan, the board is going to have -- is going to need -- the Board of Architects is going to need a massing study and more elaborate submission to be able to really compare, not as a -- just a site plan. And you know, if I want to compare the surrounding neighborhood, I need a little bit more in order to do that. And that is already a requirement that you need to submit to the Board of Architects.

Board Member Bermello: Not only that, but to make a comment on the site plan, you're going to need to understand the program that the architect is working with and what were the relationships that he was -- or she was trying to manipulate in terms of access, program requirements, parking, setbacks, et cetera. I mean, you're not just going to look at a...

Board Member Behar: A site plan.

Board Member Bermello: A roof plan and say...

Board Member Behar: Just one layer.

Board Member Bermello: Yes, it's good; no, it's not.

Board Member Behar: One dimensional plan, yeah.

Board Member Bermello: So, it's -- I really think, again, Mr. Chair, I think that's part of the overall process. And I think maybe it's more of an item that you deal with in that form that any resident can go online and pick that says, "These are the requirements for preliminary review and approval by the Board of Architects," and tells you how much you got to pay and the plans you got to submit and how many -- all of that, that that is included. It may not be included there today. I think that's where I would do it. I would not...

Chairperson Pardo: The reason that the word "site plan" is there -- and it could be stricken -- is because the line above it says, "Submit an application with the Planning and Zoning for special location site plan review," so you could delete the word "site plan" and say, "Obtain conceptual review approval from the Board of Architects." You could then add massing, shadows.

Board Member Behar: So, if you -- what you're saying is you're going to get -- before you go to DRC, you're going to get a conceptual approval from the Board of Architects. From there, you're going to submit to the DRC, and then you're going to come back for a preliminary approval of the Board of Architects.

Chairperson Pardo: Correct. And the only reason you would do that, Robert, is -- and you know, my estimation is these are not small projects. If you take up a city block in an existing neighborhood, that's not a small project. It may not be vertical, but it sure as hell would change the fabric of that entire neighborhood. That's why I think -- I just want the Board of Architects to look at it to protect the neighborhood.

Board Member Bermello: Again, I don't sit on the board. Maybe this is more for Glenn. Don't you do that now?

Board Member Pratt: Well, we do. And you know, I certainly wouldn't be opposed, or I don't know, you know, from the Administration what their feelings are. But I think speaking as a board member, you know, we would be happy to see something at an early stage and make recommendations. My only -- I guess what I would take out is the approval, the word "approval." I think that to have a conceptual site plan review by the Board of Architects and let the Board of Architects give their comments and directives, and...

Chairperson Pardo: That's fine.

Board Member Pratt: You know, that would be something -- because the DRC meets once a month. I think that, you know, the number of applicants that are applying to the DRC could be something that the Board of Architects could review. The Board of Architects meets weekly. And let that be something that they review.

Chairperson Pardo: Glenn, I think that's a great idea. I don't have a problem omitting the word "approval." I just want the eyes on it.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: I want the eyes on it.

Unidentified Speaker: But it would be beyond the site plan, correct? It wouldn't just be a site plan. I think...

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Unidentified Speaker: Massing study.

Board Member Pratt: To Willy's point, it would be massing studies.

Chairperson Pardo: It's a (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Behar: You have to do a massing study.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, you kind of have some...

Chairperson Pardo: The only thing -- the point I'm trying to make is these projects affect a lot of people.

Board Member Pratt: Right.

Chairperson Pardo: And it affects the compatibility a lot of times. And the point is that the more eyes -- that's trained eyes that see it. I believe a lot in the Board of Architects. I've chaired the Board of Architects. I believe a lot in the Board of Architects. And the ability for the architects to say, you know, there's something wrong with this, that it's not compatible with the neighborhood, I think it's extremely important. So, if you want to remove the word "approval," I have no objection with that.

Board Member Pratt: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: And if you want to just leave...

Board Member Pratt: And I believe -- no, I believe getting a conceptual site plan review would be very helpful both to the Board of Architects and the City and the applicant to get...

Board Member Bermello: Just how is that different from the preliminary approval?

Chairperson Pardo: Because the preliminary...

Board Member Bermello: Isn't that conceptual also? I mean, that's...

Chairperson Pardo: Normally, the building is already...

Unidentified Speaker: Designed.

Chairperson Pardo: Completely designed by the time they see the preliminary.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, but you know, if I want to get a conceptual site plan approval...

Unidentified Speaker: That's the risk the developer takes.

Board Member Bermello: I'm going to...

Unidentified Speaker: And it's a schematic level design, with elevations, mass, roof, floor plans. And if the board deems it inappropriate, the board states it.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah.

Unidentified Speaker: If the board is in agreement with the design and the concept, it continues. But it is reviewed, it is scrutinized. It is assessed. We -- the board typically requires massing studies. They typically require renderings, so we don't -- we're not just looking at two-dimensional drawings. We're looking at three-dimensional drawings that give us that overall concept. So, that does happen at the Board of Architects. Now, can it happen earlier? Sure.

Chairperson Pardo: And again...

Unidentified Speaker: Would that be something that we would entertain? I, you know...

Chairperson Pardo: And again, this has to do with special location site plans only.

Board Member Behar: But what is the difference between special location and every project of any significant size? They're all special location.

Chairperson Pardo: No, the...

Board Member Behar: They all have to go through the process.

Chairperson Pardo: No, these are...

Board Member Behar: Unless you say, you know, a PAD or something that, you know -- but any project that goes through the process has to go through the site plan approval.

Board Member Bermello: Or a project in a very landmarked location or adjacent to a historic property or the size...

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Trias, can you come up here, please?

Board Member Bermello: Or the size of the property. You know, a lot of the projects that we have reacted, and people have reacted negatively to are in kind of inhospitable places on US 1, you know. I mean, really, are you kidding me, US 1? I mean, remember what those living conditions were before some of these projects, and you have automobile dealerships, you know. So, those are not landmark, I think, locations, but they're just huge projects. So, I wouldn't say those are special locations. They're just big projects, big parcels of land. And when you have a big parcel of land, you're going to have a big project. When you have a big project, there should be special attention, I think, very different than doing a single-family home on a 50 by 100-foot

lot. And you know -- I know that there's other conversations here regarding historic preservation, but this is not Boston. And the number of historically designated -- and we did the Merrick house back in the 1980s. So, this is something dear to me. But the number of historically designated properties in the Gables, you know, it's not like something's going to come up at every meeting. What I agree with Mr. Behar, I think the concept of urban compatibility is important on every project. And if the City Architect is saying, you know, this is the appropriate place to have it, I mean, I'd tell you, as a businessperson, as an architect, I would tell you that I would love to have a quick look at some point when we're developing a sketch, and maybe not all the ideas are just solid. I just don't know how you do that with a board that this is going to have a series of requirements. You know, I know how you do it collegially. Or you know, I could call Ramon Trias and say, "Ramon, what do you think of this idea?" You know, and he'll give me his unofficial opinion, and you could do that. But once you get it into a process, I can tell you, when I sit in the UDRB -- and Robert knows this -- and an architect comes and they come ill-prepared, we let them have it. We, you know, cut them up in little pieces. And somebody comes up with just a little four lines and saying, "This is my site plan." I'm going to send them back. I want more information. I want to see how they got there, why they got there, you know, and where they're going. And so, when you do the preliminary approval or submission package, I think at that time you have all those -- or should have all of those issues answered. I think that's the right time. So, I mean, I agree totally with the focus on the public realm, compatibility with the neighborhood, the studies on height, on shade, traffic, all of that. But I think I would work through the current process that we have and just -- if we got to...

Chairperson Pardo: Well, the problem is...

Board Member Bermello: You know, take some screws, and put them a little tighter, and add a couple of items that this board should have for projects, say a project over a hundred thousand square feet or over \$10 million...

Board Member Behar: Or a PAD.

Board Member Bermello: Or a PAD.

Board Member Behar: A PAD, which is any site over 43 -- you know, an acre. Well, those are the projects that do need that special...

Board Member Bermello: Sure, absolutely.

Chairperson Pardo: Why don't we hear from Mr. Trias about what the special location site plan is? Mr. Ramon Trias from Planning.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As you know, I am an architect registered in Florida. I'm also an (INAUDIBLE) certificate, and I'm a member of the American Institute of Architects, like many of you, so I take this very seriously. And I think that the comment from Mr. Behar actually was right on the point. I think that you're thinking of the PADs more than the special location site plan. Special location site plan -- if you look at the definition, I think it was in that page -- deals with projects that have single family next to them, not necessarily the very large projects that are one acre or so, which have been the ones that Mr. Bermello was mentioning. I think that you're probably think in terms of the PAD, and I agree with Mr. Behar. I think that the idea of having a conceptual discussion is very good. And I think it takes place right now, and if you want to formalize it, I think that's a very good idea.

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Trias, what do you think as far as the special location site plan, if it's one square foot under what qualifies for a PAD would be? What would be the difference between the two?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: The size, just the area.

Chairperson Pardo: So, can you tell us what the minimum size for a PAD is?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: One acre.

Chairperson Pardo: One acre.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: 43,560 square feet. So, if it's got 43,559 square feet, it would simply be a special location site plan?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: If it is next to single-family, very important point.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, so the special location site plan is next to a single family?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I think if you look -- you might want to read the Code exactly what it says because it may include duplex. I don't remember exactly.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, so -- but you don't have any objection for having a conceptual meeting, review meeting for the Board of Architects?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No. No, actually, it's a very good idea.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, thank you, Mr. Trias. Does anybody have any questions?

Board Member Bermello: Will that be as part of the application same cost, or are we going to add the application cost to go through the city with that? Because we're certainly going to add a timeline.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Well, we'd have to come up with a process, obviously, yeah.

Board Member Behar: And that's the other concern, the time. Because you submit today to go to -- after you go to the DRC, to the Board of Architects, Planning has to review it. And that process is -- unfortunately because they're very busy, it's not a quick process. So, if you have another...

Chairperson Pardo: Well, what if -- Mr. Trias, an idea based on what Mr. Behar was saying, why can't -- because it says, "Submit an application with the Planning and Zoning divisions for special locational site plan review," why couldn't that be part of including the Board of Architects for this conceptual review? In other words, you're looking at it with the applicant, and then you bring it to the -- with the applicant to the Board of Architects. What would be wrong with that?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: It could be done like that, sure.

Chairperson Pardo: And it shouldn't add time or money.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: The concern that I hear from you is that projects are fully designed when they're submitted, and that is true, but that is the choice of the architect. That is not the opinion of staff. I mean, staff is in agreement with what you're saying.

Chairperson Pardo: You know, I just think -- and maybe I'm wrong, but I just think that, you know, when you have almost an acre, it can change the fabric of that neighborhood forever, and that's the concern. You know, it's all about the compatibility. And some architects do a great job, and some don't. And unfortunately, it would be great to be able to have the Board of Architects early on, with the Planning Department, to do that. So, in the proposal was to include the Board of Architects in this conceptual site planning, the same as applicants when they come see you. And that way it's just not only you, but it's also the Board of Architects, and I don't think that you would have much of an issue because you rely on their opinion.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah, and the idea that, somehow, we have a broken process, I don't think we do. And in fact, we can enhance it by doing the things that we do well. I mean, I want to thank all of you for donating your time right now. The same idea goes for the members of the Board of Architects. Every other week, they spend hours trying to help the community be a more beautiful city. So, I think whatever we can do is fine. The one thing I would warn you is that it's better to do it in a more informal way, like Mr. Bermello was saying than trying to come up with the perfect zoning language. I think you're doing a great job coming up with the different strike-through and underline. However, you're coming up with some words and some terms that do not exist in the Code right now. That may be a problem, so I would not encourage you to do that. I would encourage you to think more in terms of a more collegial, like you were saying, approach to the process.

Chairperson Pardo: So, obtain conceptual review from the Board of Architects would be better than...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: That would be fine.

Chairperson Pardo: Conceptual site plan review approval from the Board of Architects.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah. And that is something that I've tried to do in the past, because a project was not ready to be approved, but it was ready to be reviewed by the Board of Architects. I think it's a good idea. I don't think it should be only for this type of special site plan. I think it should be a general option, and it probably should be an option. If an architect wants to do it, they should be able to do it.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, so we'll strike out "site plan approval" from that, and it would say "obtain conceptual review from the Board of Architects."

Board Member Pratt: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: I mean, that's a good compromise.

Chairperson Pardo: That's all we're looking.

Board Member Bermello: That's a good compromise.

Board Member Behar: Now, we need to find a mechanism to expedite the process to get there, because the fact that when you submit a project to the Planning Department first, and we know, Glenn, that you're -- it takes a little bit of time for them to just -- before it goes to the Board of Architects. So, that to me, that adds a little bit more of...

Board Member Pratt: Yeah. The other thing too, Robert, is that -- I know most things have to be really figured out in order to get to the DRC level with services and parking and -- where all of the access is going to be. And so that -- you know, that has a lot of development and information that needs to be processed in order just to get to that DRC level. It may be helpful that even before it goes to the DRC, that maybe there could be some...

Board Member Behar: That's exactly...

Chairperson Pardo: That was always my intent.

Board Member Bermello: That's a conceptual review.

Board Member Behar: That would be the way.

Board Member Pratt: That's very conceptual.

Board Member Bermello: Very conceptual review.

Board Member Pratt: That's the point where you've identified...

Chairperson Pardo: Glenn, that was always my intent.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: In other words, the whole point is that this thing is -- by the time it goes to the DRC, Planning and the BOA have conceptually looked at this thing.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: The only thing I would say is that DRC is the time when staff can tell you, "Oh, you need to do a re-plat, you forgot that" or "Oh, wait a second, you have to do certain things."

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: DRC is really very preliminary, and it doesn't approve or deny, like Mr. Cejas explained. But it does give you the opportunity to make corrections in the process or give you some better ways or better tools to do the project. I think DRC is always at the beginning. I think to think that you can go to Board of Architects prior to DRC may lead to some assumptions that are incorrect by the part of the applicant.

Board Member Bermello: I think, for example, when you go to the DRC -- Glenn is correct. You want to go with all your parking laid, your mechanical spaces on the ground level worked out, everything tied down. But I think what the Chair may be talking about is well before then, where you haven't gotten your mechanical engineers giving you the final sizes of your vault or any of your spaces. But you have a parti. You have an initial design idea. And before you spend a lot of money, I think on renderings, on a lot of drawings that you've spent -- that you come with a very series of generalized drawings. I would not even specify how many or what kind. I would

leave it up to the architect to determine what he or she may think. And I think it's great actually that there will be some face time. There will be a discussion. You take those comments, you finalize your work, and then you go to the DRC. And you can talk about, well, the massing was reviewed conceptually, and no one seemed to object. As a matter of fact, people liked -- so, I think it'd be good as long as it's kept flexible, not rigid. And it may not apply in certain cases, but in others, it's a -- I would say...

Unidentified Speaker: I would use it.

Board Member Bermello: I would definitely use it.

Chairperson Pardo: So, we're all in agreement, we're going to leave obtain conceptual...

Board Member Pratt: Review.

Chairperson Pardo: Review of the Board of Architects. And the reason conceptual is that's before preliminary review, which is the normal...

Board Member Pratt: Right.

Unidentified Speaker: I think that'll be good because it gives everybody a heads up on the board of what's coming, and gives them the chance to opine prior to coming in with a preliminary...

Chairperson Pardo: And I think also...

Unidentified Speaker: And I think it's part of the normal conversations we as architects tend to have with staff prior to actually submittal of the preliminary. So, this just allows the board to act as part of that preliminary preparation in the conceptual stage to then opine on it. I think that's

perfectly fine, and I'm very good with the language to just say "obtain conceptual review from the Board of Architects."

Chairperson Pardo: Very good. Alright, so we'll move on. So, thank you very much for indulging me on that special location site plan. And you could see that item 4, underneath it says, "preliminary approval" -- you know, "secure Board of Architects preliminary approval," and then obtain final approval, which is the normal process. In the review criterion, applications considered pursuant to the regulations must demonstrate that they have satisfied all the below-listed criterion. The Planning and Zoning Division shall evaluate the application and reference to each of the following criteria and provide a recommendation to the Board of Architects. So, the only words that were added there was Board of Architects. And the reason is because this -- at this time, we're talking about a special location site plan, which is very sensitive to the residential areas around it. If you go to I below there, where it says, "To the extent which the proposed plan complies with," right now, I found it curious that the words that are there is "departs from the Zoning Code." And if you read this carefully, the extent to which the proposed plan complies with the Zoning Code and subdivision regulations otherwise applicable to the subject property, including but not limited to density, size, area, bulk, and use, and added the words "compatibility with the zoning regulations, which will be deemed to be in the public interest." And in the review criterion, by doing that, I think it gives you the ability to understand that the compatibility with the zoning regulations is extremely important. When you go down to three, added the -- and adjacent properties and neighborhoods -- "contiguous and adjacent properties and neighborhoods," which goes back to what Willy mentioned before on the waterways. And then Article 6 below it, those actions, designs, construction, or other solutions of the site plan, if not literally in accord with these special regulations, satisfy public purposes and provide -- that, to at least an equivalent degree, I thought it was redundant, so I requested that we strike that out.

Board Member Behar: Which one? Where are you at now? I'm sorry.

Chairperson Pardo: Right at D.

Board Member Behar: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Salman: And your purpose for striking that last section?

Chairperson Pardo: Let me get this up on the screen. Actions, designs, construction, or other solutions of the site plan, if not literally in accord with these special regulations, satisfy public purposes, provide -- I think that it's -- if you look up above compatibility with the zoning regulations, you know, it's almost redundant. I thought striking it out would just keep it a little clearer.

Unidentified Speaker: I'm not in agreement.

Board Member Salman: I think it's there for the purpose of granting a certain amount of flexibility to allow for especially odd and special conditions where you're required to do something and you can't quite get it to work within the specific guidelines, but you still want to have it included. It's one of those -- a little bit of wiggle room you want to leave to allow for the imperfection of reality.

Chairperson Pardo: I think it's leading a person to basically say, "We don't have to comply with the Code." That's -- there's a process...

Board Member Salman: No, it's saying that it has to meet the -- at least to an equivalent degree.

Board Member Pratt: Who would be the deciding factor of the -- or who would be the -- or what would be the entity to decide if it's an equivalent degree?

Board Member Salman: I think it'd have to be in compliance with all the review people involved, Planning, Zoning, and the Board of Architects.

Board Member Bermello: I don't know. I got a really bad feeling when I read this paragraph. I'll be very honest with you. I've never seen in a code something like this, where it opens the door -- it says, "If you don't fully comply." I mean, are you kidding me?

Chairperson Pardo: But you can provide some...

Board Member Bermello: I mean, can you imagine that?

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE) degree.

Board Member Bermello: You know...

Chairperson Pardo: That's where I got the heebie-jeebies.

Board Member Bermello: So, I think it's -- again, I don't know who wrote this, where they were going with it. I didn't -- no disrespect intended, but I think it just opens up a can of worms. It gives you the feeling that you don't have to be compliant, and when you're not, let us show you some of the things that you can do. And I think where you have discretionary -- where you use the word discretionary without spelling it out, that's where you're giving the Board of Architects a lot of power where they're looking at specific things, and they're seeing how you're reacting and you're offering something that's special. And then there's some areas where you're probably a little bit short, but the special part really over -- more than justifies where you're short, but you're not short intentionally. This is almost like saying, you know, you don't have to comply with everything here.

Chairperson Pardo: We'll give you a mulligan.

Board Member Bermello: And so, I -- when you struck it out, I was good with that.

Board Member Behar: I was okay with that too.

Board Member Bermello: You know because I can't...

Board Member Behar: Personally, I was okay with it.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah. That's where you go back to that structured discretionary, which is the Board of Architects and everyone else. And you know, this just kind of opens the back door there. And you know, the...

Board Member Salman: Well, we opened the front door when we said special allowances.

Chairperson Pardo: Again, the...

Board Member Salman: Sorry. We either take one and not the other -- we either take one and the other or get rid of both.

Chairperson Pardo: No, the -- well, we'll get to that.

Board Member Salman: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: So, is everyone in agreement with that?

Board Member Pratt: Yeah. No, I'm okay with eliminating that.

Chairperson Pardo: Glenn, you're good.

Board Member Salman: (INAUDIBLE) with the majority.

Board Member Behar: I'm good with that.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Behar: The next one is the one I have a little bit of hiccups here.

Chairperson Pardo: Compatibility of designated historic landmarks. The historic city plan adopted by Coral Gables Commission and building assessment.

Unidentified Speaker: Before you get into it, give me an opportunity.

Unidentified Speaker: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Warren Adams is here, who is the department head for Historical Resources. Mr. Adams, can you approach for a minute?

Board Member Bermello: I just have one question for him. One after you finish, though.

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Adams, you know, since some of us have got a little bit of a -- I want to make sure, clearly, clearly, both Mr. Behar and Mr. Bermello both have expressed their concerns with the phrase "assessed to be of historic value and not designated." Do me a favor and explain to us when you have a designated historical building in Coral Gables, what do you show to say that's a historically designated building? You obtain a certificate through what process?

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Warren: And there are two ways something could be classed as historic, either individually designated as an individual site or as part of a historic

district, so there are really two ways we can do it. All of the historic properties, either individual or the districts are shown on a map on the City website. Any alterations to any of these properties either require staff review or the board review, so that's for our designated properties. For buildings that are assessed to be of historic value but not yet designated, that's a tricky one. Ideally, the way that everyone should do a historic inventory is actually do a survey of all the different sections of the city that potentially contain historic buildings. However, that's a big job, especially when you consider anything over 50 years old really potentially is eligible to be designated as historic as a starting point. So, the only way we really at the moment identify or designate buildings that are not designated would either be if the owner approaches us or if someone was either wanting to demolish a building or do substantial alterations to it. We would then request -- or the Board of Architects could request that they actually apply for a determination of historic significance, where we would review it. But the issue at the moment is we really don't have the staffing to survey every single eligible building in the City. So, buildings assessed to be a historic value but designated is a difficult thing to gauge.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, let me ask you...

Board Member Bermello: So, what...

Chairperson Pardo: Let me ask you one question before I turn it over to my colleagues. The San Sebastian Apartments...

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: Is it designated?

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: Not yet.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, but -- it's not?

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: No.

Chairperson Pardo: Would you conclude, in your professional opinion, that the San Sebastian Apartments are -- have historical value?

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: There are three things we really look at when assessing historic significance: One is over 50 years of age. Two, does it have architectural or historic significance. And three, does that building retain its integrity, integrity of setting, location, design, workmanship. So, obviously, if you have a building built in the 1920s, and the 1970s, someone put an addition on the front of it, it's lost its historic integrity. Generally, you can get a reasonable impression if something is eligible and likely to be eligible to be designated, but until you've done the research, you can't really be definite. But certainly, in my opinion, they certainly appear on the face of it to be potentially eligible.

Chairperson Pardo: So, I...

Board Member Bermello: (INAUDIBLE) questions. You're the Historic Preservation Officer of the City?

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: What staff do you have?

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: What staff? I have two other people who generally focus on historic preservation. I have one person who is more of cultural arts and public arts, that is an archivist, an administrative assistant, and is a part-time (INAUDIBLE) for the Merrick house. So, there are really three of us that focus on historic preservation.

Board Member Bermello: So, again, I'm not sure about their mission and how well staffed you are or are not, but it seems to me that if we're really serious about historic preservation, that really, every property that should be designated is. And we should not even be talking about properties that are not. I mean, I think any community that is worth its salt, like we are, whether you're Santa Barbara, California, or you know, outside of Boston, you know, where you have numerous historic properties, I think those that are worthy of designation should be. I think it's a bad statement to say that we're...

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: And there is the...

Board Member Bermello: Swamped. We don't have enough time, and it's up to somebody coming up, you know -- because the comment here, which I reacted to, which obviously was when -- the redline was building assessed to be of historic value but not designated. So, assessed by whom? A I -- you know, not, again, to be disrespectful to anyone, but I don't want anybody just to wake up and say, "I think that building is of historic value," and it hasn't gone through the litmus test. I also personally believe, as an architect, that it's not of architectural or historical value. I think there has to be both.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: That's not the way the Code reads so...

Board Member Bermello: I realize that. But if you have a building that is only of historical value -- there's no architectural value at all, it has no significance to the period, as far as architecturally, to the vernacular that it represents. People sometimes also wonder, "What is this? And this is really of historical significance?" So -- but that's a different discussion. But my point is, if it's not designated, we should not open the can. Now, if it's designated, absolutely. But if it's not designated, I don't know, because then it's like, you know...

Board Member Behar: Who makes that determination.

Board Member Bermello: Who makes that decision? I wake up one morning...

Board Member Behar: And I agree with you.

Board Member Bermello: And I think that I, you know -- and you know, so I think that that becomes -- that was my problem here. Now, if every property that has been designated or is in the Department of Interior Designation, even more important. I mean, to me, that's a higher level, then yes, absolutely. But if not, this opens up the Pandora's box for any neighbor that doesn't like what his other neighbor's doing and to say this property is of historical significance.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: I think the other issue is that if we do assess something to be of historic value, we would then move ahead with the designation. So, if an application comes in for a building which is near a number of 1920s buildings, and we had to determine if they were of historic value, we would be obliged to then move ahead and do the designation. As I said, the correct way to do it is actually do surveys of various parts of the city, not necessarily just react to...

Board Member Bermello: Right.

Chairperson Pardo: So, if someone came in tomorrow and said, "We want to knock down the San Sebastian Apartments," what would the city...

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: They would have to apply for a letter of historic significance from this department. We would then do the initial research...

Chairperson Pardo: The City would be the applicant.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: And if we determined the appeal to be eligible, we would move ahead with the designation.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Behar: I think that example is not a good example. That building, even though it's not designated historical, has a lot of the contribution, the time it was done, some of the architectural significance that it has. Even though stuff was done, you know, over the years, but it's not -- but personally, I think it still maintains that attribute for designation. But I'm going to use the example -- a couple years ago, there was a house -- I remember, you know, going through the process -- that it was built in the '50s, but it was not a lot of significance to that. And there was a battle, and then that property owner was going to lose his rights for something that, in many opinions, did not historic designated for no reason. So, I think that the project -- the example you're giving us, yes, I believe that project should be designated -- personally -- designated historical. But my concern is just like, you know, Willy -- Mr. Bermello said -- opens a box -- a Pandora's box because who is going to make that determination? That's my problem. Properties that are worth of getting designated should go through the process. And maybe you could identify and go through something that has value, but it has to be done in a manner that is done that really analyzes correctly. That's my opinion. That's why I don't feel comfortable with that language.

Board Member Bermello: And by the way, I think...

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: There is a process for that. And you know, you may have believed that the building that wasn't ultimately designated, the post-war building, didn't have any value, but there was a substantial report prepared that actually split the Preservation Board in two. So, there obviously were people with the opinion that that building had value. And so, these sort of designations, especially for the post-war properties, they are the tricky ones because there are so many of them, and a lot of them maybe do not have a lot of significant architectural features. So, we're not going to designate...

Board Member Behar: But with all due respect, that's very subjective. And in some cases, you may say that that has the value, but you know, when you look at -- at least when I -- as an architect, as a registered architect, I looked at it and says, "Okay, I believe" -- if I recall correctly, it was designed by Alfred Browning Parker, if I remember.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: If it's the Asturia one, it was Pancoast.

Board Member Bermello: Russell Pancoast, Russell Pancoast.

Board Member Behar: Russell Pancoast, I'm sorry. You know, that was it. That was -- I mean, you look at the house, it could be any -- you know. So, to me, that's what is concerning to impose something like this. That's my opinion.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: But to other architects, it had value, and that's why the board was split. There are architects on the board. So, these sort of things, there is always a level of opinion. But I think if you have a 20-page report, it's more than just subjective. It comes to a point where, yes, it's an opinion, but I don't think if you have a thorough report, then it's a subjective -- it's opinion, yes, but it's not subjective. And there is a process in place to do this, which has been established not only in this City, but throughout the country. So, I agree that there is a process in place, and I do think, you know, this particular one thing could have its difficulties. So, yes, that is maybe not the best way to do this.

Chairperson Pardo: Some places -- if I recall, some places have like a radius around a certain project where they say, you know, 200 feet or 300 feet, and then they basically do an evaluation to see if there's any potential...

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: Projects there. And for example, like this one, like the San Sebastian would be, you know, one of them. So, if it's like within a 300-foot radius -- a project is within 300 foot, then at least it would be, you know, pinged where people would know that although this is not designated, it may have historic value, not to the point that it's, you know, designed by...

Board Member Behar: But Felix...

Chairperson Pardo: A certain architect or someone...

Board Member Behar: You're talking about a specific project that I think we all could attest that has significant value.

Chairperson Pardo: Correct.

Board Member Behar: Ten years ago, I think that -- I live off of Pinta Court, which is off of -- I live on Pinta Court, off of Santamaria. Santamaria was designated as a historical block...

Chairperson Pardo: District.

Board Member Behar: Okay, they wanted to tie Pinta Court, which the houses were built late '50s, early '60s, of little significance, but tie it to have -- to, you know, those guidelines. I personally opposed it because, you know, that will restrict me doing just about anything to my house, so it's a time and place for everything.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: And again, a buffer zone around any properties would require a change to the Code. And you know, it's a rare thing. I don't know of many places that do it, because as you said, I really don't know how much support putting buffer zones around historic properties would actually get.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you. Don't go anywhere yet. Alright, so...

Board Member Behar: But we're going to...

Chairperson Pardo: The historic value not designated will be stricken.

Board Member Behar: Building accessed to be historic value not designated will be stricken.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: Agreed.

Chairperson Pardo: But it says the historic City plan adopted by the Coral Gables -- that's part of the ordinance. There's an ordinance in place.

Board Member Behar: That stays.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, that stays.

Board Member Behar: (INAUDIBLE) up to Gables Commission.

Chairperson Pardo: Is everybody good with that?

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: And can I point out the historic City plan is the designation of the street plan and changes to the street plan only. That does not reflect any of the buildings effectively, so I just want to make that clear. The historic street plan is for the historic street layout of the city. It doesn't include the buildings. So, the historic street plan is for the street layout only.

Chairperson Pardo: Oh, no. I know exactly what it is, and that was the intention. I'll give you an example now. So, when you go to the next page, and you look at C, which was added, compatibility with the viewshed of historically significant buildings shall be considered in the site planning, massing, and step-backs of the Board of Architects. These are now officially approved buildings. These are not historic -- you know, these are with the certificate and the whole thing. The second one is compatibility with the historic City plan shall be reviewed by the Planning Department in consultation with the Historic Resources Department and the Board of Architects. Now, the plan was approved. Mr. Adams, can you give me an example, for example, of the street plan on how it can affect a historical building?

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: With actual changes to the actual layout of the street pattern?

Chairperson Pardo: How it would affect a historically designated building.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: This is what I was saying. The historic street plan is for the street layout only. Widening of streets, changing of plazas, you know, actual alterations to the layout of the street. It doesn't include the buildings actually on the street. So, if there was substantial alteration to the street plan...

Chairperson Pardo: I'm referring to the viewshed.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: Well, the viewshed is a different thing. The viewshed is how either a view from a historic building...

Chairperson Pardo: Correct.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: So, for instance, if then -- there was a case with the Bonnet House in Fort Lauderdale many years ago, where there was a proposal to build a

hotel. And there was a case raised from the Bonnet House because the hotel would be visible from the gardens. And the argument was that that was destroying the viewshed from the property. The other thing is, if you are viewing a historic property and a new development is proposed around it, then potentially you're destroying the setting of that property, especially if you've got a two-story historic building and someone wants to put 14 stories on the lot next to it. So, you're negatively impacting the setting. A good example is the Dade Heritage Trust office in Miami, where you have their historic...

Board Member Bermello: Which office?

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: Dade Heritage Trust is just one example.

Board Member Bermello: Heritage.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: Downtown Miami, where you have a small one-story historic building, and it is now surrounded on all sides by, you know, 40, 50, 60 foot buildings.

Chairperson Pardo: In the Plaza project, you have 2901 Ponce de Leon. It is a small three-story historic building. And when you look at that, the viewshed isn't necessarily -- because there's no verbiage yet in here where it discusses the viewshed and how it affects the height and/or massing when you're looking at that, how it affects that historic building. And I guess another example would be when you look down Miracle Mile from Douglas towards City Hall, which is also a designated building. If you would eventually canonize Miracle Mile by having height on there, it would affect the viewshed of the historic significance of the City Hall building.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: It would change -- certainly change it, yes. You know, a good example would be if someone built a 15-story building in the parking lot right next to City Hall. Obviously, if you look at City Hall now, you see the building in its, you know,

setting, but all of a sudden, if a 15-story building built right next to it, and you look at City Hall in completion of that, then obviously, there's a negative impact to the setting of the historic building.

Board Member Bermello: You know, it may, and it may not. It all depends on how it's done.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: Exactly, yeah.

Board Member Bermello: I mean, I've seen it done, you know, very elegantly, with a lot of respect.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: And then I've seen projects done not correctly.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: It can be done.

Board Member Bermello: You know, the two examples that you've used -- or that you've used, and the Chair has used -- are buildings that are almost like a little island, so that you're actually -- the viewshed is important because you can see them from four directions, or from three directions. There may be other buildings...

Board Member Salman: And not only that...

Board Member Bermello: That are historic.

Board Member Salman: But just beyond them, like this building.

Board Member Bermello: And there may be a building that has a historic front, but its sides are blank, or of no significance, where then a viewshed has to be looked at very differently than this building or the building on Ponce that I know it's the genesis of a lot of these comments in terms

of that project there on Ponce Circle. So, I think, even though I totally agree, I think it needs to be always calibrated...

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: By the setting and the conditions of that building because...

Chairperson Pardo: Correct.

Board Member Bermello: I'll tell you a funny story. I used to live on 2601 Granada. My house - side of the house was Valencia. And across the way -- and I think Glenn might have been involved maybe in the design of this single-family home, where there was a lot splitting. And during the construction, the old house, they kept the front of -- front façade. Was that your project? And I recall a hurricane was coming, and they had -- and I got concerned. I called the Mayor at that time, and I said, "Mayor, this thing is going to blow off. Why is it being done?" He says, "No. Because it had to be done because of the Historic Preservation Board." And I said, "Really?" And you know, I don't know who lived there or, you know -- I lived there for 28 years across from it, and it looked...

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: But I think...

Board Member Bermello: It looked like, frankly, a dump, but I'm sure that the developer who bought it -- and they didn't want any problems -- had to keep the façade, which is, you know...

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: But I think you're right in what you say. It's a matter of just taking it into consideration.

Board Member Bermello: It's just consideration.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: Exactly.

Board Member Bermello: As opposed to prescribing it, because once you prescribe things...

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: I tell you; bad things happen. I'd rather leave it in the hands of the very capable Board of Architects or the Historic Preservation Board and give them the flexibility as it comes up. So, you know, like in this comment from the Chair, I -- again, I think it should be designated properties only because...

Board Member Salman: I agree.

Board Member Bermello: As I look at the property that I just made the comment that was my...

Board Member Salman: Designated only.

Board Member Bermello: Neighbor for 29 years, and I looked at it, somebody here must have thought it was significant. But I got to tell you, living there...

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: And again, the...

Board Member Bermello: And seeing it every day -- and Glenn, I hope I'm not offending you...

Board Member Pratt: No, no, no. I...

Board Member Bermello: Because I'm sure you had to do what you had to do, right? I mean, like we always do. But I wonder, you know, how can that be historic, you know? I mean, I wonder

other things, like how can some artwork be called artwork, but that's a different discussion. But you know, so I would say, if it's designated, it means it's gone through your process.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: Yeah, exactly.

Board Member Bermello: It means that you've done your studies. It means that it went through proper vetting, and it wasn't just someone waking up one day saying, "Oh, I think that it's significant."

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: Again, because when you look at viewsheds as well, what happens when you have four blocks of single-story homes that are potentially historic and someone builds something at the end of the street, which is higher. That obviously affects the viewshed, but should we then be designating every single home in that block simply because there's a new building that interferes with the viewshed? And I think all you can really do is consider it.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: You consider the setting of the historic building.

Board Member Bermello: You know, and I'll tell you, I know a lot of what we're talking about is compatibility, and I can point to some examples -- I'm sure all of us can -- of projects that I would say are not necessarily compatible with the neighborhood but are still good additions to our community. For example, the Luminaire project by (INAUDIBLE) Matteo. That could not check the box of compatibility anywhere. But I would tell you it's a beautiful design and I think it's a great addition.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Pardon my interruption. We need to make sure that all conversations being had are being had on the microphone, and that there's no conversations falling outside of that because of the Sunshine. Thank you.

Board Member Bermello: You know, Frank Lloyd Wright's Guggenheim Museum, the same way. If you look at the neighborhood, is it compatible? Absolutely not. Is it a good addition? Absolutely, yes. So, even the issue of compatibility, which you know, there have to be certain circumstances where, you know, you have to weigh it.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: Absolutely, yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: The only thing -- just for the record, under C, compatibility with the viewshed of historically significant buildings shall be considered in the site planning, massing, and step-backs by the Board of Architects. In other words, it only says, it should be considered, not that it is...

Unidentified Speaker: No, it says it shall be.

Chairperson Pardo: Done in a certain way. That is C, page 54, top of the page, where it says, "compatibility with viewshed of historically buildings shall be considered in the site planning, massing, and step backs of the Board of Architects."

Board Member Pratt: Again, who's establishing the viewshed? Is -- I just did a quick Google search on viewshed, and there's multiple ways it's calculated. Is there -- how is that established?

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: How about compatibility with the setting of historically significant buildings?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Director, I have a quick question.

Board Member Pratt: I mean, that's -- the Board of Architects generally, when we review projects, we review the compatibility, and especially if there is a historic structure that's a part of what's being proposed. But I have some trouble with a kind of a nebulous term, viewshed, that -- what is it really? You know, how do you calculate it? What is -- how does it, you know...

Chairperson Pardo: For example, if you had Mount Vernon and you put a building in front of it that blocked the view to and from the...

Board Member Pratt: Actually, that was on Google. That...

Chairperson Pardo: Is it?

Board Member Pratt: You must have Googled. Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: Is it? That's pretty funny.

Board Member Pratt: But...

Chairperson Pardo: So, the point is, on the viewshed, for example, if you think about this -- the - - as Willy came up with an example, it could be a historic building that's got only one façade and the rest are blanks.

Board Member Bermello: Right.

Chairperson Pardo: But the viewshed could be the front. So, now all of a sudden, if you slam a building or you block it in such a way, you don't consider it, and if you have enough step back to do it in such a way where it doesn't hurt it -- for example, Mitch Alvarez, when he did the Douglas

Center, he was very careful with the new buildings that were there to make sure that it did not alter that existing Douglas Entrance building.

Board Member Pratt: But how is that different from viewing...

Chairperson Pardo: And it's preserved by the way he pushed back the volumes of the new buildings. He did a masterful job doing that. So, that's part of the viewshed. The only thing is that there's no verbiage whatsoever in the Code from one end to the other that discusses viewshed of historic buildings anywhere, and it doesn't necessarily have to be on three sides, like the 2901 building, but there are buildings that have a specific viewshed that is necessary to be considered. Not says approved. It just says that the (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Salman: I think what Glenn is talking about and my particular heartburn, and I think what Willy's talking about is all the same things.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Salman: I think we just need to define viewshed somewhere if we're going to include it in as part of this Code. Okay, that's it.

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Adams, can you get us a definition on viewshed please?

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: Yes. Legally, how do we agree on a definition? And just bear in mind, I mean, it may be that setting is actually the preferable option because setting is one of the criteria of integrity that we look at with historic buildings. And everything that you're describing is actually setting. How does new development affect the setting of historic buildings, so...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: If I may. I think Director Warren could address one question I think that kind of speaks to what we're discussing here.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Does the current code require properties within a certain range or buffer around historic properties get some sort of historical approval?

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: No.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: None.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: I believe there maybe was something like that in the Code several years ago, and I believe it was removed, but I would need to look into that.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Okay, but specifically, also in regard to the City plan, because there's discussion about adding that language, right now any modifications to the City plan would have to go through Historic Preservation and go through the entire approval process.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: Any alteration to the historic street layout and (INAUDIBLE), yes.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I only say it because I think it may be redundant because it's already in the Historic Preservation Department section.

Board Member Behar: Good point.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, it's funny that you say that because some people don't even know that the historic plan is there, and we're talking about a section specifically that has bonuses where people are going...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Well, we're referring to the street. I just want to make sure that the record is clear. We're referring to the street. So, an actual physical property wouldn't affect the City plan.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, it depends, I guess. You go into public rights-of-way and things like that, you know.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: If they did that then...

Chairperson Pardo: If you get a loggia that goes into a public right-of-way, that becomes an issue. It does affect the city plan, and there could be other examples also. But I would ask for a specific definition, if you could, Mr. Adams, if you don't mind sharing that with...

Board Member Behar: And let's leave this item for next time.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah.

Board Member Salman: Okay, let's move on.

Board Member Behar: Let's table this one for now.

Board Member Salman: Let's table this one.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: But could we agree at least on the issue that we're dealing with designated properties?

Board Member Behar: Yes.

Board Member Salman: Yeah. We -- I thought we had.

Board Member Behar: In my opinion, yes.

Board Member Salman: I thought we had.

Chairperson Pardo: That's been stricken.

Board Member Bermello: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Bermello, that has been stricken. The words "historic value not designated" has been stricken. Alright. So, just want to leave -- because obviously, we're not going to have enough time to complete this today. But I wanted to just add one thing and make sure that everyone here is in agreement. I inserted under B(1)...

Board Member Behar: Mr. Chair, I think that that whole table...

Chairperson Pardo: No, no, no. I'm not going to get to the table. I'm going to get to above the table.

Board Member Behar: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: I'm only above the table. I just wanted to, under number one, required standards. Applications shall be required to satisfy all the requirements of Articles 2 and 3, which

is Zoning and Uses, and Section 102, Design Review Standards, A and B, which we've discussed before, which are for all projects that are reviewed by the Board of Architects, and in Table 1. The reason that I wanted to insert Section 5-102 Design Review Standards, A and B in is because massing and 19 other items are included in all designs in the City of Coral Gables. And it should -- in my opinion, it should be highlighted the same as Articles 2 and 3 were added there, which is Zoning and Uses. So, the reason that I would really like to have Section 5-102 Design Review Standards A and B is because those are the tools that we all need to be able to have the proper step-backs, proper massing, and proper compatibility, which are already written in that section. Just highlighting it there to make sure that everyone that reads this Code and uses this Code knows they have to comply with that section. Does anyone have any disagreement?

Board Member Bermello: They were fine. Are you suggesting we stop here today and continue on?

Board Member Behar: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: I agree.

Chairperson Pardo: That's what I am suggesting.

Board Member Behar: Yeah, the table, I think, is going to take a lot more time.

Board Member Bermello: We'll start with the table in the next meeting.

Chairperson Pardo: I just want to ask -- there have been -- there are several people here. Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone on Zoom that has requested to say anything at all? Any emails?

City Clerk Urquia: No, sir.

Chairperson Pardo: And I just brought up...

Board Member Bermello: How about persons from the public?

Chairperson Pardo: Section B(1), where we added Section 5-102 Design Review Standards A and B and the word (INAUDIBLE). It's underscored in red. Nobody -- and anyone requesting to speak?

City Clerk Urquia: No, sir. And the gentleman that was here that wanted to speak also left.

Chairperson Pardo: I know the doctor left. He left earlier and I owe him that later. Is there anyone here that would like to say anything from the public?

City Clerk Urquia: There is. Absolutely, Ms. Kawalerski. And Mr. Chair, right after, there is someone on Zoom requesting to speak at this time.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, thank you.

Sue Kawalerski: My name is Sue Kawalerski. I reside at 6830 Gratian Street. Thank you again for your service. When you were talking about the review, that would certainly be nice if the public -- some part of the public was also part of that pre-review review, and this is the reason why. You know, we want transparency, and it's always the public that seems to find out last what's going up. It would be nice to include possibly in this amendment that the public also be in on that review, and that's all I ask. So, thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you so much for your comments. Appreciate it. Is there anyone else?

City Clerk Urquia: Mr. Chair, on Zoom, we do have one person. It's Adan Quesada.

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Adan Quesada: Good afternoon. Good evening. My name is Adan Quesada. I reside at 718 Valencia. And I just wanted to make a comment. I've been following the blue-ribbon committee, and I just want to say, there's a lot of wonderful ideas coming out of it, and I'm just glad to be able to be -- see history being made. As a young architect in the city, I just want to commend everyone in the board on a spectacular job. And that's what I wanted to say. Thank you.

Unidentified Speaker: Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you, Mr. Quesada.

City Clerk Urquia: That's it, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, thank you very much. Is there a motion to adjourn?

Board Member Behar: I make a motion to adjourn.

Board Member Pratt: I'll second.

Board Member Bermello: Just a quick comment on the comment made by Ms...

Chairperson Pardo: Sue.

Board Member Behar: How would that happen? I mean, it sounded good, but how would it actually happen? Because it seems that when the City sends out notices to say, residents within 500 feet, there's already like a very formal process. You're kind of ready to go. And this conceptual seem to me to be more of an informal showing up very early. You don't have all your ideas yet. You're kind of testing them. And so, you know, if a client of mine asked me, "Would you want to

spend that kind of money yet," when they're not even yet set, they're just trying to get some feedback -- and I realize what she said, that people don't want to come in -- they want to come in early. But I'm just wondering how that would work.

Board Member Behar: Because you would have to send notices to, I guess, a radius of that property, and there is a process like you would normally do when you're going to go to the Planning and Zoning.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah.

Board Member Behar: So, in order to do that and get the public involved from the beginning, I think it's going to be a little bit difficult, because at that point, like Mr. Bermello said, the project is not really defined or it's just in the conceptual stages.

Board Member Pratt: Or you know, typically, the property is just posted. You know, there's a notice.

Board Member Behar: But this will be before it goes to the Board of Architects.

Board Member Bermello: I even have -- with some of my clients, I'm always very hesitant at what time, at what point I'm ready to show them something, because -- I'm not saying that the lady that made the comment or the citizens that would show up are -- don't know our can't read plans or can't understand. But even a client -- if an idea is not totally well presented, it can go in the wrong direction for all the wrong reasons, even though it may be a great idea, just wasn't well worked out, wasn't well thought out. And when you're discussing it with a colleague, it's kind of okay. It's kind of like, you know -- because we all have gone through the early phase of developing an idea. And it may not be perfect, it may not be right, but when you put it in the public purview per se, and you're saying invite -- coming in -- you know, it's not what I personally -- when we voted for it, it's not really what I had in mind. I had in mind something definitely more collegial, more

intimate, maybe more at a professional level, where you're kind of bouncing off an idea of a group of very well-informed professionals, and before you go to the DRC, just to get their feedback. Am I -- is this -- what did you think? And so that's -- I guess it's like maybe a couple of doctors talking to each other about a procedure before they go ahead and do it. You're kind of at a professional level getting a very early reading, a very -- which I think is what -- it's almost like doing a fatal flaw analysis with your colleagues at a very high level looking at something very early, where things are not yet defined, and you know, I can see it going in the wrong direction, sending wrong messages, people getting riled up because things weren't properly presented. So, I want to be clear because I'm very transparent. I want to tell you things, you know, the way I see them. When I voted for this, it wasn't in mind that at that conceptual level, I'm doing like a public hearing. I see myself being here with maybe -- it tells you how old I am -- with yellow trash, but it's that kind of thing with showing it to the board, going through it and getting some comments on massing, on setbacks, and maybe heights, on the parti, maybe some of the visioning, that sort of thing. And taking that and then preparing for the DRC, and then coming back formally. When we come back formally at that preliminary, that's where I would see all the residents, because at that point, I can get up on that podium and answer any question that anybody would have with definition, with clarity, and not having to later somebody say, "Oh, you did a bait and switch on us. You presented this and then you went back and did something else." Of course, if I'm doing something very early, for sure, it's going to change it, right? So, I hate to take -- because I know I'm taking too much time. But the comment was made, and I know I voted fully in support for the conceptual, but it wasn't based -- and not that I'm against public inclusion. That is not -- the wrong message to take from this. It's where it happens and at what point is the public involved.

Ms. Kawalerski: And if I can just say this. This does not have to be formal, where you have to send out notices. I mean, for the DRC, plans are presented. You don't send out notices to the thousand foot -- you know, people within a thousand feet for a DRC meeting, but the public's invited to the DRC meeting. I've spoken there at DRC meetings. So, the idea is -- and what you just said. So, you talk about -- you throw good ideas around, you add better ideas. The public also might be adding better ideas to the concept. And at that point, before anything is actually done on

paper and the developer has spent a half a million dollars, you know, at that point, you already know where the public sentiment is, and you're including them. And some of their ideas may be ideas never thought of. You can include them, and that would be a welcoming, you know, differentiation between what's happening now and what could be. And I'm not saying that this would be a belabored point where we would spend till midnight talking about this, but you would collegially...

Board Member Bermello: Okay.

Ms. Kawalerski: And collegially meaning not just with, you know, the professionals, but with the affected community and saying, "Look, here's what we're thinking. What do you think?" It doesn't mean we're going to do everything you say, but we're going to take your opinions into consideration. And again, nothing formal with notices or certified mail or anything like that, just like the DRC process.

Board Member Bermello: So, what you said, it sounds good, just how you said it.

Chairperson Pardo: Mitch has had his hand up for a while.

Board Member Alvarez: I just want to share with you a thought. This conceptual situation can be very delicate. What are the expectations of the clients that Mr. Bermello is representing? And what do they expect to hear, what level of commitment and they come out of that meeting with from the city to continue? What level of direction can he give his staff to proceed in a certain manner? I mean, what are the expectations as a result of that conceptual? Every project I have done have had a conceptual process, but there's never been a project conceptual presentation with any attachment or consequences. The consequences come when you come in and present your preliminaries and you start working. So, I don't dislike the idea, it's beautiful. But let's read into what are the results and the consequences and the level of commitment that both the architect, his client, and the city are willing to put on the table. I hate to have somebody on my staff with 500

hours work developing a concept -- and this is not a little house that we're talking about -- and all of a sudden somebody thinks this is not enough information to make a call or a judgment or doesn't feel secure enough to make a statement and you're out in the boondocks. And you know, beware of what you wish for.

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Trias.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Mr. Chairman, if I could just add. The notice that we have right now is posting on the property, like Mr. Behar said. There's a little sign that says, "Oh, there's a hearing before the Board of Architects." That's probably not enough, I think. But what I would ask you to think about is the most important decision is when a project becomes public, meaning everybody gets a chance to discuss it, and it has to be at a level that people can give input. You don't want to do it too early. You certainly don't want to do it too late either. So, I would ask you to think about it for the next meeting. And what I will tell you is that when I was in private practice, what I used to do is what I hear people want, which is the charrettes that I used to do. That was what I used to do. I used to do conceptual design with a little public participation. A lot of cities, clients, throughout America and so on. This is done all the time. We haven't done it often enough, I think, in Coral Gables. However, having said that, it was done professionally, and it was done in a way that was -- the expectations were very clear. So, I would encourage you to think about that because when a project becomes public, then is when we have to have a serious discussion with the community and so on. Very important point. Right now, that point is DRC. It's in the map and the website. People can contribute through Zoom or in person. That is the point we have now. If we're going to change that, let's think about it carefully and see how we can do it. That would be my recommendation. Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: It could be also based on the size of the project.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Could be.

Chairperson Pardo: It could be based on the...

Board Member Pratt: I agree with Willy, though. I think it should be something very informal and kept on a very, you know, collegial basis. And it's really more about getting feedback for the applicant from the BOA and for direction, and you know, I think it's something that would be very, very beneficial.

Board Member Bermello: I think so too.

Board Member Pratt: But I think -- I understand your concerns too. I have the same.

Board Member Bermello: Well, on the public level, I mean, it's like -- you know, we -- before we put our name on something and it goes out to the public, it goes through a whole level of scrutiny and review that would not be present, you know, in a conceptual plan that you would do informally. Hey, let me take -- let me show you what we have in mind, what we're thinking about. It's that kind of thing.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: And you bring, you know, I don't know, the site plan and...

Board Member Pratt: But that's where the most help could occur, and that's where the most direction and input...

Board Member Behar: It's really -- that becomes almost a charrette.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, exactly.

Board Member Behar: And that's very good. Because before you go in developing that further, you have a basis. But I agree with Mitch. You got to be careful up to, you know...

Chairperson Pardo: What you wish for.

Board Member Behar: Yes.

Unidentified Speaker: Be careful what you wish for.

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Trias.

Board Member Alvarez: Be careful what you wish for.

Chairperson Pardo: There's one more thing. I think that maybe if you don't mind, if you could give us a breakdown of the size of the projects -- for example, we were discussing the difference between a PAD and just a special site plan. You said, "Well, it's an acre and it's less than an acre." Can you break down, especially, you know, most of these projects, you know, the types of projects and the quantity of the projects and the size of the projects.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah, I could...

Chairperson Pardo: You go all the way up to the gigantic project. And I can't stress enough, the reason we're here is because something just hasn't worked quite right. You know, we're not trying to reinvent the wheel, but we're trying to fix the wheel.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Of course.

Chairperson Pardo: So, what I'm trying to do is, if you could break it down in such a way where it becomes logical that there's neighborhood participation -- when I say participation, not the

neighbors marking up the plans, but the neighbors being aware because, you know, someone saying, you know, your loading zone is like right across from my house, or that traffic is going to come right through my residential street, and you could put it somewhere else, you know, at the end of the day, what you want to do is have people that are genuinely happy with those projects. And the problem is that the reason that we're here today is because there are a lot of people that are unhappy with some -- not the majority -- with some projects, and those are the ones that we want to correct.

Board Member Behar: But Felix, you're right to a certain extent. But if you look at the projects that have been the most controversial, okay...

Chairperson Pardo: Vilified.

Board Member Behar: Are the projects that go over and beyond, you know. Look at the two examples that we have used in the last couple meetings, Plaza -- but that's even, you know, over and beyond. And the other one that I heard also is Gables Station. Those are not the typical project that we go through. Those are except -- you know, special projects that go over and beyond. Unless -- because I -- you know, as a member of the Planning and Zoning Board, I see the projects that come through. For the most part, they're not the problem projects. These are the ones that, you know, the one -- for example, the Plaza. But those are over and beyond, and those are the one that, yes, those projects may go one step further and you start doing the charrettes specifically for those projects, you know.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah. What I would say is that there are three categories in the updated Zoning Code that we finished very recently. Ten thousand square feet -- I'm talking about the site area -- 10,000 square feet, 20,000 square feet and the one acre for the PAD. Those are the magic numbers that I think set the difference in terms of height, in terms of the applicability of the Med Bonus Level 2, Level 1, et cetera. We -- in the perfect world, maybe if you have a PAD, you have a requirement to have special public participation early on. If you have 20,000

square feet, you know it's going to Planning and Zoning, and then Commission. Maybe there's some preliminary review by Board of Architects in those projects. If you have 10,000 square feet, you don't do it, for example, because those are not as significant. Some thinking along those lines, I think, would be very helpful in terms of enhancing the Code.

Chairperson Pardo: I would like to see from your department basically a short paper on being able to bring in that neighborhood participation based on size, intensity, type of project, so people are aware...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: Much more than just posting.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And right now, the neighborhood meeting is a requirement, except that it's not explained very well, and the expectations are not very clear. So, yeah, people do that. The developer does those meetings. But when are they more or less productive; that's really an issue.

Board Member Behar: And that may be where you do it early on, not after...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: It could be.

Board Member Behar: The project is ready to go to Planning and Zoning. And then you bring the neighborhood in to get their feedback. Listen, I am 100 percent in favor of getting the neighborhood feedback, you know, because at that time, yes, there's an opportunity, not all the way at the end before the Planning and Zoning meeting.

Chairperson Pardo: Exactly.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And my goal here is just to listen to your ideas and the ideas of the public and see if we can...

Chairperson Pardo: I'll tell you; you may want to look at what Collier County does. We did a project there recently, and we had neighborhood participation early on, very early on, and a bunch of people came out, over 100 people came out. And staff was pretty nervous, and there was a -- it was a bad situation because the original developer had made them promises 15 years before. It was a terrible, terrible relationship they had. So, the fact that when we were making our presentation, every time we mentioned the original developer, it looked like you were in right field in Yankee Stadium. The boos were just absolutely incredible. It got to the point where we finally allowed them to just boo all they wanted to get it out of their system. Once we made our presentation, they understood. Once they understood, then we left on -- in pretty good shape. In fact, they gave us a standing ovation. Once we left and we went through the process, as Robert said, the more formalized process, the Zoning Board, the Commission, et cetera, it was a cakewalk. The thing was that the difference of the neighbors knowing exactly what we were doing became a benefit instead of a liability. And therefore, depending on the size of the project, depending on these things, they -- in fact, those neighborhood meetings had to be recorded and transcribed because what happens now is that you can meet with the developer and they could tell you anything they want, and they'll tell you that we met with the neighbors, and that's the end of that. In Collier County, you have to record it physically on video and also transcribe the meeting and what the comments were. And then that way, there's no mistakes. So, I'm not suggesting that you have to copy it. I'm just suggesting that you look into their requirements there for certain projects, including changes of zoning and things of certain impact, and that's just a suggestion of what another municipality, or in this case, a county, does.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: That could also be a trigger. The change of land use, for example, change of zoning, in the projects that require that, you could have special requirements for public meetings. What I would encourage you is I'll think about it, and if you please think about it also, I think we can come up with some solutions at the end. My frustration with a lot of

the projects that have been criticized in the past is that having been through the process, the process was very lengthy, and it did not focus on solutions. It focused on frustration, on complaints. We need to focus on solutions. And I think if we all do that, if the public is a partner in that effort, I think we can come up with a much better project.

Board Member Behar: I think that's a good way to come in and to finish.

Board Member Bermello: Make a motion to adjourn.

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE), you raised your hand? Yes.

Samuel Lawson: I've been to -- as all of you. This has been a very technical meeting, very, very technical.

City Clerk Urquia: Sir, if you don't mind, can you state your name and address for the record?

Mr. Lawson: Sure. I'm Samuel Lawson and I spoke two meetings ago. I wasn't here last week. Represent the Youth Center community. I know you, Felix, and have met some of you after the meeting last week, and it was very useful. If you recall, the last time I was here, I brought up that question about process, and it was directed at -- is there a breakdown somewhere that at the end doesn't yield what was the original intent and what was originally agreed upon. So, I'd like to be a little bit -- since that time, I think after talking to a few people after the meeting, I realize there's a lot more for myself personally to dive into, and I would love to have a very -- you know, continue to learn, Felix, and maybe have a good understanding of what are all the elements that impact that. So, I don't think that right now I can talk more about that. And thank you for some of you who, after the meeting last -- two weeks ago, talked to me a bit about that. But what I -- on a larger level -- because this is very technical, and I'm a technical person. I've been in a ton of technical meetings as all of you have, but sometimes you sit back and you say, "What's the really big picture? What's really happening here?" And at least me as a citizen -- and I'm not an architect and I'm not

educated in these areas, and I'm fascinated listening to all of you. It's really fascinating the level of detail you go into, and I'm sure this is only the tip of the iceberg. And I also appreciate like a lot of the big picture thought that's happening. But one thing that I do know, and I have heard and from my group is that at least in terms of the most recent election, there were people that were angry, and this was one of the points that was the number one point that they focused on was development. And now, I didn't talk to all those people. Is it anecdotal? Is it not? I have it from one person that I trust completely gave me very good information that it's not anecdotal. There were a lot of people that complained. By the way, I do believe very much in what you said, a lot of times it's just bringing the public up in terms of education and getting them on board and making them feel they have buy-in, I think, is big because there's a lot going on there. But -- so people -- if people were angry, my question is why? Like why would that -- why were they angry? And I have neighbors that I've spoken to. I've listened quite a bit to other people here. Is it the Mediterranean design? Is that really what's got people upset, if they are upset, which I believe? Is that it? I want to say something. I've been around -- I went down US 1 the other day with my wife. I've seen -- I was at Whole Foods the other day looking at some new projects going up. I've seen a lot of projects go up. They look really beautiful to me. I don't -- they don't look -- you know, they look, from a design standpoint, they look beautiful. I'm not an architect. I don't know if there's good construction. I don't know what's going on behind the scenes, but the projects themselves look nice. But is it a Mediterranean thing? And I brought something up to a couple of architects after the meeting last time, and I'd like to bring it up here on the mic instead of just behind the scenes. There was a gentleman at the last meeting -- and by the way, I love what you said about 50 years. Will you look back in 50 years and appreciate it? But there was a gentleman at the last meeting, and he came up and said he was a very big advocate of Mediterranean architecture, very big advocate of that. And I know it's the history of Coral Gables, and I personally think it's beautiful, there's no doubt about it. But you know, if you think about like iconic buildings and iconic structures and what makes a place beautiful, as time goes on, cities evolve, and they change the architectural styles of it. And I'm not here to talk about architectural styles. I just want to bring it up as a side point because it's something that I've seen happen on South Beach and on Brickell and I want to bring it up here. I hope it's a good forum to bring it up. Maybe it's not, I

hope it is. I'm thinking how they built an Eiffel Tower in Paris, completely doesn't fit the architecture, right? I mean, it doesn't look like anything that was a part of the Parisian architecture. People like Frank Gehry built bizarre looking buildings that everybody cherishes to have in their city. Zaha Hadid, she built a building there on Brickell -- right? -- and you've seen her body of work, and these are buildings that are not Mediterranean style. Again, the 50-year test, I think is phenomenal. But here's something as a Miami citizen that I noticed and I brought it up, and I think you guys will really appreciate it, is years ago, South Beach -- well, you know, South Beach in Miami Beach has gone through its ups and downs, but maybe in the '90s, it was quite -- you know, it was booming, right? There was a lot of things going on there. There was a lot of draw there. You know, this was before Wynwood. All the young people were going there. It was a big thing. But there was a lot of architectural, let's say -- I don't know personally, but it seems like from everything you hear living there, a lot of architectural control around the building -- anything built on South Beach needs to be Art Deco in style. The building heights could only be, you know, three or four stories or whatever it was, six stories, I don't know what it was. And if you look at what happened...

Board Member Bermello: If I may make a comment only because I have to take a Zoom call at 7, and I don't mean to interrupt you. But at five minutes to 7, I wanted to walk out, so I don't want to sound like if it was disrespectful. I just...

Mr. Lawson: Thanks for saying that. And I don't take it like that.

Board Member Bermello: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Lawson: So -- but these -- you know, but then what did everybody do? All the developers moved across the water to Brickell, and they developed the hell out of Brickell. And guess where everybody that comes down to Miami wants to go? They want to go to Brickell. They don't want to go to South Beach. South Beach is a mess. And Brickell, by the way, has a Zaha Hadid building there, right? But Brickell is a big problem if you've lived there. I lived on Brickell. It's a big

problem. The congestion is crazy. So, when I think about what's the possibility of -- what people are angry about, you know, I think about what is it that people when they come from New York down to Miami, what do they always tell you why they love coming down here? They love the trees, right. They're always like, "We can't believe all the trees," you know. People love the trees. They love the space. What do they complain about? They complain about how overcrowded it is to try to get around. And you know, at least before the pandemic, what it was like to drive around New York City or try to get around New York City. So, I said before, there are some other issues that seem to be going on. I don't know exactly, and I want to get behind the scenes. I've heard different things about why certain projects come to fruition that maybe were not intend -- is it in the process? Is it -- what party's impacted? But I would say that what I think that is probably big in people's minds is developers coming in and taking, but not giving, not giving back. And I think you can definitely mitigate things by, you know, including the public, you know, making them feel involved. But really, at the end of the day, you know, this is your town too. I mean, you guys are pouring all this effort into this piece of it. Something's happening behind the scenes. And it seems to me, it's the things that relate to, you know, the future growth. I mean, the world is growing, Florida is growing. Coral Gables is growing, right? So, what's the infrastructure going to look like around Coral Gables. You know, you built Merrick Park or designed Merrick Park, and you know, there's no traffic issues around Merrick Park. It's nice, but Coral Gables is going to grow, and it's going to continue to grow. Developers are going to pour in, and I don't know that it's the Mediterranean thing that's the big issue. I know it's beautiful. I love it personally. I think it's great. But I think what -- at the end is what happens -- like I think what you guys were talking about, public amenities, green space, traffic, congestion, traffic, so the density issue. But is it really in the height of the building? Is it really in those things? Are there other things to manage around? And again, I know I've listened to the technical conversation that you guys have had today. I just wanted to go on record to say a few things. I appreciate the technical piece. I appreciate all of your, you know, genius behind it. And what you're doing in this piece is indispensable. But big picture, you know, as just a normal, everyday person, that's the stuff that I'm thinking about. Is it Mediterranean or not? Is it beautiful? Does it fit? Is there space around it? Is it green? Has somebody thought about infrastructure? I mean, isn't that what always plagues

New York City? Infrastructure, infrastructure, right? So, we're going to grow. The City's going to grow. So, I think those are some things that I'd just like to talk about. I thank you for this technical piece of the discussion, and I continue to follow you and we'll see how it goes. So, keep up the good work.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you very much.

Unidentified Speaker: You did good. Great, thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, we're adjourned.

Unidentified Speaker: Thank you very much.

Board Member Behar: There's a motion and a second.

Chairperson Pardo: Adjourned.

Board Member Behar: Thank you.

City of Coral Gables Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting
August 12, 2021
City Commission Chambers
405 Biltmore Way, Coral Gables, FL

Blue Ribbon Committee Members

Chairperson Felix Pardo

Board Member Aramis "Mitch" Alvarez

Board Member Robert Behar

Board Member Willy Bermello

Board Member Glenn Pratt

Board Member Javier Salman

City Staff

Assistant City Attorney, Gustavo Ceballos

City Clerk, Billy Urquia

City Architect, Juan Riesco

Public Speaker(s)

Tom O'Malley

Maria Magdalena Estupinan

Chairperson Pardo: Good afternoon. We're going to bring the blue-ribbon committee -- we're going to start the blue-ribbon committee meeting on today, August 12. Clerk, can you call the roll, please?

City Clerk Urquia: Yes, sir. Chairperson Pardo?

Chairperson Pardo: Here.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Alvarez?

Board Member Alvarez: Here.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Behar?

Board Member Behar: Present.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Bermello?

Board Member Bermello: Present.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Pratt?

Board Member Pratt: Present.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Salman?

Board Member Salman: Here.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Riesco?

City Architect Riesco: Here.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you.

City Clerk Urquia: Mr. Chair, you have a quorum.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. We just received the minutes of the last meeting of last week. It is a true transcript of the meeting. Is there a motion to approve?

Unidentified Speaker: So moved.

Unidentified Speaker: I make a motion.

Chairperson Pardo: There's a motion to approve. Second?

Unidentified Speaker: Second.

Chairperson Pardo: Second?

Board Member Alvarez: Second.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright. Can you call the vote, please?

City Clerk Urquia: All in favor?

The Board Members (Collectively): Aye.

Chairperson Pardo: Opposed? Alright, thank you, Mr. Clerk. So, at the last meeting, we were able to go through the Section 5-201, and we stopped directly at Table 1, so this is a continuation of that meeting. So, that being said -- alright. Table 1. So, Table 1, to the -- I guess to the public, so they understand, Table 1 are what are called required standards. Now, in the formatting, the tables and the bonuses do not coincide with each other. Let me explain for the public. The Level 1 bonuses as exist today have to do with the -- a particular style known as Coral Gables Mediterranean style. And if you adhere to that design concept and approved by the Board of Architects, you are eligible to a maximum of an increase of FAR of .20. So, let's say that normally

you may have an FAR of, let's say, 3.0, you would be allowed to build up to 3.2. In other words, an addition of .20. You would also -- or you are also, in today's Code, allowed to be able to go up one additional story above what is allowed. So, if you're allowed four floors, you would be allowed to go up one floor to a fifth floor if you choose to do that. So, when you look at Table 1, it may be confusing to you because you would think that that has to do with the Mediterranean bonuses, Level One bonuses. They are not related. The way that the Code was written after 1986, what they did is they put in some required standards as thresholds. So, in there there are certain types of elements and then there are certain requirements, at least this is the way that it is written. So, I wanted everyone to understand that since we are trying to be very transparent so the public can follow what we're discussing. Getting to Table 1, the reference one, we have under type -- well, first of all, we have a difference between residential and mixed-use projects. Mixed-use projects have to have a certain percentage of a retail use normally, and normally located on the ground floor. Mixed-use projects can also have other elements at other levels. But that being said, there are two separate categories. The other thing is that when you look at the amount of categories, not in Table 1, but in Table 2, you'll see that it says basically that you have to have a certain amount of the total amount of reference numbers to be able to qualify for the second level of bonus. That being said -- and hopefully you're not too confused; you could follow with us, and we're going to be discussing now the different requirements and also the types to see if they should be changed or not. So, that being said, let's start with Table 1. So, if we start at Level 1 under requirements, we have architectural elements on building façades. I'm going to read it. The similar exterior architectural relief shall be provided on all sides of buildings. No blank walls shall be permitted. Let me see if I can get rid of this. Shall be permitted unless required pursuant to applicable city, state, or federal requirements, such as fire and life safety or other applicable codes. The second paragraph: parking garages shall include exterior architectural treatments compatible with buildings or structures that occupy the same property and/or street. Now, I think Mr. Bermello wanted to add "and which concealed the view of automobiles." I have no objection to that. Does anyone have any objection to that or any other objection to this item number one? Alright.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chair?

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: If I could add (INAUDIBLE)...

Board Member Behar: Can you speak into the mic?

Chairperson Pardo: No, the mic is on. Turn it on.

Unidentified Speaker: Yeah, we turned them on.

Board Member Bermello: Is it on now? Yeah, there we go. So, the thought is it's not just the view, but it's also the potential for the light emanated from cars on adjoining residential areas. So, it's -- I don't think it needs to be in the Code necessarily. I think by the view should be sufficient.

Chairperson Pardo: The intent is there.

Board Member Bermello: But the -- that's --

Board Member Behar: But it think this makes it clear. It's already -- I believe it's already a requirement, but this just emphasizes that -- reinforces it.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, correct.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Pratt: If I could add just one thing also to that. One of the things that the Board of Architects generally looks at too is the light that not only comes from the cars, but the light that

is illuminating the garage itself and whether that's also shielded and -- so that it creates a -- or that there should be some thought given to the illumination of the interior of the garage itself.

Chairperson Pardo: Glenn, I think it's in other parts of the Code, including the foot candle levels for spillage and also for minimum foot candle levels in parking garages and parking lots.

Board Member Pratt: Right.

Board Member Behar: I think it's specified that you have to put it on the facade that is -- it'll be pointed away from the exterior of the building, so it's already covered, but this is good to have.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, alright. Let's go on to number two. The Code right now reads architectural relief elements at street level. And I'm requesting that we strike the word "relief" and add the words after elements "and amenities," so it reads "architectural elements and amenities at street level." The word "relief" can be taken literally of just adding a declaration. And by adding architectural elements and amenities, it starts to make sense when you look at the description. So, on the description, if you may -- or if you will. It says on any building façade fronting streets where an adjoining pedestrian sidewalk is located, one or more of the following design features shall be included at the street level: a., display windows or retail display area; b., landscaping and/or; c., pedestrian or architectural features accessible to the public. So, at this -- what I was going to suggest is: a., display windows or retail display in commercial areas, so it would be the only place where you can place them; and b., landscaping and/or -- leaving that as is -- and c., under architectural, it would be to add the word "pedestrian architectural features accessible to the public." Because right now, architectural relief element or ornamentation doesn't go that additional step, I think.

Board Member Behar: I'm okay with this language, the addition of this.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Salman: I am as well.

Chairperson Pardo: Anybody else?

Board Member Bermello: I'm fine.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright, let's go on to number three. Now, one of the things that we discussed before were the design standards that are in another section that apply -- that the Board of Architects applies to all projects, which include the 20 elements, which include massing. There's several things there. So, in order not to be repetitious, I requested certain things be struck out. We could leave them in if the committee desires. But for example, in the exclusion from height, that already exists in the Code for every commercial building, as far as the exclusion from height, for air conditioning equipment, elevator shafts, elevator machine rooms. So, in my opinion, this really has -- it's already detailed and described in another part of the Code, and it's being shown here almost like if this were above and beyond for this particular standard or the Mediterranean ordinance component.

Board Member Salman: I agree that the repetition is problematic, but I prefer if you just left it as a reference C section...

Board Member Behar: Well...

Board Member Salman: And that...

Board Member Behar: Let me tell you, I am -- I don't feel as you guys do. I think it needs to be clear in every possible location, and I'm going to you why. Because when I get an interpretation by a reviewer, it says the parapet, it can't go over 100 feet, well, it should not be included. It should

be excluded from that calculations. So, I want to make sure that that -- and I'm going through it right now. I'm going through it on a project...

Board Member Salman: Okay.

Board Member Behar: As we speak. I want to make sure that it is clear, and they understand what is excluded from those height. For them to reference another location, Javier, I don't think...

Chairperson Pardo: I have no objection leaving it in.

Board Member Behar: I will leave it in. Personally, I really feel that -- and Glenn, and you...

Board Member Pratt: No, no, I agree. I think it's an important aspect of it. I don't think it's repetitious. Or it may be included in other parts, but I think it's something that...

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. We'll leave the entire section...

Board Member Bermello: I feel strongly both ways, but I think probably the most important thing is to make sure that -- and it's beyond the scope of, I think, this committee. But staff is here, and staff can obviously -- I think it's important that where you define building height for the overall Code, every section, that that definition parallels this so that there is no doubt. Imagine that there's another area in the Code where building height is defined, and maybe it's a little different than here. So, I have no issue keeping it here, but I think it's probably more important to make sure that the building height definition...

Board Member Behar: Willy, typically...

Board Member Bermello: Parallels this.

Board Member Behar: Building height is measured to the top of the roof deck, typically, in most municipalities.

Board Member Bermello: Right. But most municipalities also will say excluding for, and then it lists elements like this: elevator machine room, decorative motifs, and in those cases, it may have a maximum height. You know, you can mention a parapet. A parapet can be 10 inches, or it can be 10 feet. So, the parapet -- given what you're trying to hide or -- can be -- for the layperson, they can say, wow, you know, that was the case. So, I just think -- I have no problem in keeping it here. I like it here, kind of the redundancy. Kind of like -- in this case, I think it works because of the issue on style and so much of the architectural style of Mizner deals with elements that are decorative and that go on the roof, you know.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: But I think having a very strong definition of building height and what are the exclusions of that in other parts of the Code will be just as important.

Board Member Behar: And one more. And I wish Ramon or somebody from Planning would be here. This is inapplicable in MX, should also be considered to be put in MF as well. It's not there. One of my comments was, should it be also applied for MX.

Board Member Bermello: Well, it was -- it should be in MF.

Board Member Behar: Because in my notes, in my comments, I put it as in the MX, MX also, correct.

Board Member Bermello: Oh, MX? You're referring to MX?

Board Member Behar: MF.

Board Member Bermello: Okay.

Board Member Behar: I mean, that's something that I wish Ramon was here to...

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Clerk, can -- is there any way you could reach out to see why Mr. Trias isn't here today?

City Clerk Urquia: I've just sent a message, and I'll get a response for you.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you.

Unidentified Speaker: Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright. Okay, so we will leave number three as is, and then we will ask Mr. Trias...

Board Member Alvarez: I would like to suggest -- talking about item two, amenities. It refers to the façades fronting the street, and very much interested here on the display windows, et cetera. I would suggest that as an element that is positive, not only positive, desired by commercial institutions and everybody, is number one, and I see you touched on that, the height of the vertical distance and the ground floor to the upper (INAUDIBLE). Number two, recess. I'm not in love with arcades. I think arcades are beautiful to look at, but establishment don't really appreciate it, and they don't prosper very well in arcades. And unless you have an exquisite arcade with very good proportions and very high entrance -- I mean, very high above the ground so you have enough light coming in, it would not be a very pleasant environment. So, I like to propose as an enhancement elements of projecting canopies, whether fabric or solid. I remember that I was very impressed the first time I visited -- it was not Seattle; it was Vancouver -- and they had an incredible collection of protruding elements protecting their windows. I was surprised. They were glass.

They were not solid, and they were sloping to the building, meaning whenever water comes in or snow begin to become water, they'll capture it inside with drainage, not coming in and throwing it into the people walking by. But the presence and the visual effect for the display windows, the protection it offered to the people without enclosing and making it a dark area, even on projects we have done, the façade arcade on Aragon or Colonnade has (INAUDIBLE), big recesses. Never seen success in those stores, only certain type of display -- I mean, only certain type of businesses would be -- feel comfortable with -- attracted to it. But the ones we're talking about is building height from ground to the plinth instead of 88 -- you know, instead of 12 or 13, maybe it could be a floor and a half or two floor levels high, the verticality and the receding -- maybe that window display is two feet, three feet, four feet in, not 10 feet in. And then a projecting canopy for shade and rainy season will be added without creating the canyon of dark surrounding the perimeter of the building on the ground floor.

Chairperson Pardo: Especially if they face north.

Board Member Alvarez: What?

Chairperson Pardo: Especially if they face north, the arcades.

Board Member Alvarez: Oh, you're dead. It's dark.

Chairperson Pardo: Exactly.

Board Member Alvarez: It's black.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. Well, what I'd like to do, if you don't mind, Mitch, is there's a reference to arcades and loggias in Table 2. Since these are the standards, and maybe we could add that in label -- in Table 2.

Board Member Alvarez: Well, you are more familiar with the process, but yeah, anywhere that it presents...

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Alvarez: Itself the opportunity to indicate it is valuable.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, alright.

Board Member Alvarez: I think the user, the tenant that would make the building successful and activate the building -- street in that area will be very happy to receive such a treatment instead of a dark arcade.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, very good. So noted. We will discuss that in Table 2.

Board Member Pratt: Mr. Chairman?

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Board Member Pratt: If I could ask Mr. Behar a question. Robert, you we were saying about the -- we were talking about number three in the exclusion from height. You're talking that the inclusion would also for -- in the MF -- that it would apply to both MX and MF?

Board Member Behar: Correct.

Board Member Pratt: And you're taking about the -- it would include all of the things, the A through D, as well as also the roof structures and the four ornamental purposes?

Board Member Behar: Correct. That's -- yes.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, I think that's an idea that I could really support too. I think that one of the things that as a designer we find that, especially on the MF properties, that you don't really have the ability to make any type of a decorative feature other than just a treatment -- a roof treatment. And it becomes -- the buildings become very, very flat in terms of -- without having some type of a -- you know, I think we've talked about it before, that a lot of the times we use the towers that we see around as reference points and guide points for making our way around the City and the commercial section. But I think that also applies in the residential component too -- in the multi-family area. I'm not talking about single family.

Chairperson Pardo: Can you just define for the public...

Board Member Pratt: Well, the...

Chairperson Pardo: MF versus MX.

Board Member Pratt: Well, the MX would be a commercial -- would be a mixed-use type commercial product or commercial project. And the MF is the multi-family. Multi-family is defined as buildings larger than duplexes and single family. So -- but I think that the flexibility or the -- allowing roof decorative -- roof features, non-usable areas -- we're not talking about them being usable. They're really architectural features, just as the top of the Biltmore Hotel is an architectural feature that is a roof element. Those are the decorative components that really make architecture much better in terms of the visual appearance and create a lot more visual activity or visual enhancement of the urban environment. So, I think that -- I don't see why should it be limited to the MX and not the MF if...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: It should apply to both.

Board Member Pratt: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: And I thought it did, when it says residential and mixed-use, and they're both checked off. They're not? Well, then maybe we clarify that it should. I mean, the one thing here that kind of caught my eye is the last phrase in the original wording, which says, "except for commercial buildings in the Central Business District where no such structure" -- and referring to the structures above -- "shall exceed one-third of the allowable total building height." And if we're dealing in an area where you have a small building height, you know, the one-third is not an issue. If you're dealing with an area where the building height, you're talking about 16 stories, then the one-third, in my opinion, is excessive. And so I'm wondering why we have that there. I'm wondering why not the 25 feet. You know, I mean, 25 feet in most buildings that we've done up on the roof, you know, maybe you want to make it 30 feet. But to say a third, I think a lot of what the criticisms that we're dealing with here is those things that I think have gotten out of -- really exaggeratedly out of whack. And if you have the ability to do, I don't know, 165-foot-high building and then the roof structure could be a third of that.

Board Member Behar: No, no, because you're limited to the maximum -- in that case -- to the maximum height, which is the Biltmore, which is 190 feet, right?

Board Member Bermello: I don't know. This is not what this says.

Board Member Behar: I know, but it's not clear -- you're right. It's not clear.

Board Member Bermello: What this says to me is except for -- and it gives me up to a third, and then you could end up with a really bad situation, you know.

Board Member Pratt: No, I think you're right. I think that -- and I think you can easily do something decorate within 25 feet. I would be willing to accept a 25-foot cap, but -- and the one-third would be taken out.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: That's...

Board Member Behar: You know what, that's a great observation, and you know, it makes it clear.

Board Member Bermello: It would make it clear because, I mean, I -- you know, I mean, we all want to crown a building. And particularly, the taller the building is the more you're concerned because it's more of the cityscape. But even then, you know, 25 feet is a pretty good, you know...

Board Member Pratt: No, I agree with that. I think that's a good...

Chairperson Pardo: So we'll strike out the sentence that starts "where no such structure shall exceed" -- in other words...

Board Member Behar: Except.

Board Member Pratt: Except.

Board Member Bermello: Where it says except. You end the sentence at "above the roof," period.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Behar: You eliminate the exclusion.

Chairperson Pardo: Gus, did you get that?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Got it.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, so after 25 feet above the roof, period.

Board Member Bermello: That's right.

Board Member Behar: So, it will apply for the MX and MF.

Chairperson Pardo: Correct.

Board Member Bermello: Correct.

Chairperson Pardo: Did you get that, Gus?

Unidentified Speaker: It's applicable to MF and MX.

Board Member Pratt: Yes.

Unidentified Speaker: Both, not just MX.

Unidentified Speaker: That's what I was saying.

Unidentified Speaker: All the MFs, right?

Board Member Bermello: Yes, I would say all of them. I mean, it's...

Board Member Behar: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: All roofs matter.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. Okay, alright, moving on to four. Again, these standards, we have bicycle storage shown in other places in the Code.

Board Member Behar: I concur.

Chairperson Pardo: Why repeat something? It makes no -- plus the fact it kind of -- you know, what does this have to do with Mediterranean? It just -- no. Alright, so does anyone have any objection with that? Going on to number five, building façades. Leaving that intact. Does anyone have any objection to that?

Board Member Behar: No.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, going on to number six, building lot coverage. Now, I don't understand -- and I had a question mark for the committee. I guess I'm not smart enough to understand why we would have to -- as a qualification, the sentence, "no minimum or maximum building lot or ground coverage is required." I mean, it seems to me that that's a really good way to get in trouble somewhere, because it seems like it's nullifying any requirement of any type. And also, it's mentioned in great clarity and detail in Table 2.

Board Member Behar: Well, but if you say that -- you don't put a limit, it means that I could cover 98 percent of my lot?

Board Member Bermello: No, not really, not really.

Unidentified Speaker: Do you have open space requirements?

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, there's other requirements.

Board Member Bermello: You got setback, side setback, front setback, rear setback. And you know, I'll tell you my feeling on this. I mean, lot coverage is really applicable to non-urbanized areas; you're doing a subdivision, you're doing single-family homes with large, you know -- an acre, or half acre, quarter acre, and you're thinking about impervious versus -- impervious services. Then lot coverage is obviously a consideration. But when you're in an urbanized area, if you have front setback, side setback, rear setback, why does the lot coverage come into play? It's like -- I get it in a single-family home, any one of our districts. But in an urban area, dense urban -- Central Business District, the MF/MX districts...

Board Member Behar: I'm not sure that is. I

Board Member Bermello: I don't...

Board Member Behar: I'm not sure that's referring to those CBD area or anything like that, because in those -- in the urban area, you don't have any basic limitations.

Board Member Bermello: Right.

Board Member Behar: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: And I thought this was what that is referring to.

Chairperson Pardo: That's the danger of what I saw in this, because then it conflicts directly with other uses in other parts that are outside of the CBD. And I understand the CBD. The issue here, I think, is that -- I just think that there's no place for this because, number one, I just don't think that this is a requirement. They have it under the...

Board Member Behar: But I look at this more into single family, and I don't do a lot -- you know, single-family, so for me it's a little bit more, you know, difficult to really -- but if -- let's take a lot, a single family that you got an acre lot -- okay? -- and you go do have setbacks. But it means that when I do that, I may be covering 80 percent of the lot.

Board Member Bermello: And you have coverage requirements also, which I think are applicable in this. What I'm saying, Robert, is that the building lot coverage makes absolutely no sense in an urbanized context of multi-family mixed-use because you already have the setbacks that regulate your coverage on those properties. I mean, if you're downtown Coral Gables beyond the setbacks -- and if you want to have broader setbacks, change the setbacks, increase them.

Board Member Behar: Willy, I don't think -- personally, I don't think it applies, again, to those CBD or the commercial. I think -- and I don't know enough about the residential per se because, again, I don't do much residential.

Board Member Alvarez: Do you think that item, particularly number six -- and it's very dramatic. It's a line and an inch. There's no minimum or maximum building lot or ground coverage is required. This is an opportunity to put a little line there and setbacks are encouraged for bonuses or don't mention the bonus word. But somehow put it there as an attraction or consideration so people don't just bypass it and say, "No, no. Disregard it, it's irrelevant." No, this catch an eye. And I may add in the previous line, building façades -- well, these are required standards. It's a good opportunity to put that as required standards. Furthermore, building façades, the vocabulary of the signage of that intended façade is fundamental. In any shopping center project -- and I have done a couple -- the signage vocabulary was determined as mandatory as a quality of the standard of the center. And obviously, you go about the City, and at least not for everywhere in the City, you're going to have the same standard, but you -- for that particular area, for that particular building, it should have a well-studied signage vocabulary presented as much as an architectural design on lighting. And they all go together. Now, I have a concern. You said you're looking through another Table 2. When we discuss that comment I made, and it says item one of Table 2,

arcades, ends up saying awnings or other similar items do not satisfy these provisions. This contradicts the possibility I tried to present. So, this issue of awnings do not satisfy this provision. Well, the fellow who wrote this could have been thinking maybe an old-style fabric canopy that was not kept, something like that in his mind. But as I explained, (INAUDIBLE) opportunities exist now. One of the buildings that we don't particularly feel very happy with it, the Plaza, but I have to respect the canopy they just put in in copper, and they are beautiful. As an architectural detail, they're beautiful just to say that canopies properly applied are valid and should not be excluded with this wording, "awnings or similar items do not satisfy this provision." This is under Table 2, line item number 2 -- excuse me, line item number 1.

Board Member Bermello: So, Mr. Chair, if I could add, maybe a way to address this item is wording that would say something like, aside from complying with all front, side, and rear setbacks, no minimum blah, blah, blah. Because what that does is kind of sets it straight that -- and again, I think this is dealing in areas where the special allowances or the bonuses are going to be in play, which obviously is not single-family duplex areas. We're talking about the multi-family mixed-use commercial zones of the Gables, that they are what really should regulate, which is what has been violated, in my opinion, with the following sections are the front setbacks, are the side or rear setback. So, I would just say that that is what really should be here, I would suggest to the board.

Chairperson Pardo: Does the Committee have any comments about that? Can you read that again, Willy, please?

Board Member Bermello: I would say aside from complying with front, side, and rear setbacks, no minimum or maximum -- now, I'm reading what's in the Code right now. I'm not changing it. I'm just adding a phrase in front of it.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. And it was complying with setbacks.

Board Member Bermello: Which is what we would do. I mean, the first thing we would do in any district -- right? -- is, you know, figure out what is the front, side, and rear.

Chairperson Pardo: You only mentioned setbacks.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, the setbacks, yes.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. Gus, are you good with that?

Board Member Pratt: No, I'm good with that. I think that because -- and I do support actually leaving number six in, and I'm okay with what Willy is saying, but I do think that it gives the designer a little more flexibility if they don't have to...

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Pratt: I mean, there are sites that are -- have certain conditions that...

Board Member Bermello: Otherwise, we're dealing with arbitrary percentages that mean nothing to anyone.

Board Member Pratt: Yes, exactly.

Board Member Bermello: You know...

Board Member Behar: Correct.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, very good. Number seven, on the drive-throughs -- again, this is kind of an unusual -- this is restricted in other places of the Zoning Code. I don't understand why it's in

the Med part as if -- it doesn't make any sense as a -- like a standard, a standard of what. It's already restricted in other places of the Zoning Code, not just Mediterranean, but in everywhere. You cannot do this anywhere because of the restrictions that already exist in the Zoning Code, so why have that here? There's no point of clarity. It's almost -- it's very unusual for this to even be brought up, and it's already covered in the rest of the Zoning Code. Why clutter this? So I don't know if the board members have any comments about that.

Board Member Bermello: I agree with the Chair on it.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, I do too. I don't really see a purpose for it.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, alright. We'll strike seven out completely. Okay, number eight, the landscape open space.

Board Member Salman: Actually, it reads really well now after we leave in six.

Chairperson Pardo: I'm sorry, Glenn, can you say that again?

Board Member Salman: Since we left in 6, except for Willie's notation, aside from compliance with front, rear, and side setbacks, and then we can talk about the landscape.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, I'm confused.

Board Member Behar: I'm confused, Javier.

Board Member Salman: We've stricken number 7.

Board Member Behar: Right.

Board Member Salman: So, number 8 becomes number 7. It makes sense that it'd be there.

Board Member Behar: Oh, okay, okay, okay.

Board Member Salman: That's all I'm saying.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah.

Board Member Behar: Oh, okay, okay. I get it.

Board Member Salman: And no changes to it. I think it's perfect just the way it is.

Unidentified Speaker: Is the public going to ask any questions or...

Chairperson Pardo: Let me entertain this. I'm sorry. Say that again.

Unidentified Speaker: Can I ask a question about just number 8? (INAUDIBLE).

City Clerk Urquia: Sir, if you're going to speak, can you please approach the podium?

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Unidentified Speaker: For the record.

Tom O'Malley: My name is Tom O'Mally, and I live at 616 Geronimo Drive. And it's come to my attention from the Planning and Zoning that open landscape and open area have come to mean the same thing, and I was very surprised to learn that. And so there's a certain development that's going on today that I was reviewing with the Planning and Zoning Department. I said, "Where's all the open landscape that's supposed to be here because I don't see it on the plans." As a matter

of fact, I see Chicago cobblestone or bricks where they're supposed to be open landscape. And the answer I received was, open landscape is the same as open. And I said, "How can that be?" And he said, "That's the way it is now." So, we have a paragraph here that talks about open landscape, and that paragraph is not respected. That's what I wanted to share.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. O'Malley. Okay, so can you repeat again, if you don't mind, the comment about number eight?

Board Member Salman: Me?

Chairperson Pardo: Yes, sir.

Board Member Salman: My comment was that having deleted number 7, it now leads better following...

Chairperson Pardo: Got it.

Board Member Salman: Number 6. That was my comment.

Chairperson Pardo: I agree. Thank you.

Board Member Behar: No, what I think the gentleman's comment was that, you know, one is open space that doesn't have landscaping, green area, and the other one is landscape. And here, they're combined both, right? And what I understood from the comment is that they're not the same.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, no.

Board Member Bermello: I think they're not the same in certain contexts, and I think in certain contexts, they are the same. And that's...

Board Member Behar: This is the way that it's written, and we agree. What the comment -- the gentleman's comment was is that, you know, it could be paved, but it's considered landscape. And landscape in his eyes are green.

Board Member Bermello: And I think landscape in maybe a single-family residential area should in fact be green.

Board Member Behar: But in an urban area, in a CBD...

Board Member Bermello: But an urban area, CBD...

Board Member Behar: It should be a plaza, maybe that...

Board Member Behar: Well, that's how they can have waterscapes, softscapes, hardscapes. And naturally, my comments to the committee -- there was an add-on to this -- was really to, I think, clarify that for staff, because I think there is confusion as to when it is and when it's not. I think, you know, those projects that provide -- and I realize there may be an issue as to how public is a roof garden. But public roof gardens, I think are a definite benefit in the City Beautiful, again, in certain areas. So, I believe in giving the Board of Architects discretion where those that properly in the correct context, apply waterscapes and hardscapes in addition -- softscapes, I'm referring to landscape. That'd be, in an urban context, be treated as equal. They're just as important. And you know, sometimes providing some green space, making a sidewalk narrower instead of using a tree grate is totally ridiculous, you know, and inappropriate.

Board Member Behar: But is that appropriate?

Board Member Bermello: And it's inappropriate, but you could see how somebody with (INAUDIBLE) is going to say, "No, no. The Code says you got to provide some landscape," and

then you end up with these kinds of, you know, camels. So, one of my suggestions, Mr. Chair, was to add -- and again, this is directed not at the low-density and single-family residential areas, but more at your very urban, multifamily, commercial, mixed-use areas that under landscape, the wording that includes softscapes, hardscapes, and waterscapes at the discretion of the Board of Architects be considered one and the same. I would not say that in a single-family area, where you have a totally different situation. Then you have somebody that's just paving, you know, the front entrance to their house and it looks like you're in another community in South Florida, right? So, that was the wording -- and you're laughing because you know what I'm talking about, right?

Board Member Salman: I know the community you referred to.

Board Member Bermello: You know the community I'm referring to.

Chairperson Pardo: Let me read into the record what you wrote. After locations, it says, "and include both amenitized hardscapes, softscapes, and waterscapes via discretionary review and approval by the Board of Architects. The provision of roof gardens can qualify up to 40 percent of the 25 percent required for residential properties. In other words, 10 percent can be satisfied through roof gardens. Now, that being said, with the roof gardens, if these are public amenities and you have a roof garden, that roof garden is only enjoyed by the residents of the building.

Board Member Bermello: Right., If it's a roof garden that's only for private use, that would not count because then there's no really public amenity. But if you're providing, let's say a restaurant, which is for public use, a public niche or use that is designated on that rooftop area, and that's amenitized, absolutely. The cost involved in waterproofing and amenitizing a roof is 10 times what it would be doing it, you know, at grade. So, and you know, the cities that have done that successfully, urban areas, you know, they become great after hours use for the residents that go to those restaurants or et cetera. So I think that would be, you know, appropriate; again, in certain districts, not everywhere.

Chairperson Pardo: How do the rest of the committee members feel about this?

Board Member Behar: I'm okay -- go ahead, Javier.

Board Member Salman: I have a problem with -- I don't have a problem with roof gardens per se, but they're limited access, even when you have a commercial establishment. You have to go up there and buy something to be able to -- you can't just go and hang around. It's not really a public space. It's really an amenity to a private restaurant or private business.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Salman: It's -- I would not even address that.

Board Member Bermello: And I think also you got to consider what you're taking away from the ground floor.

Board Member Salman: Right. You're actually hurting the public area to (INAUDIBLE) that.

Board Member Bermello: That percentage up on the roof level, which may or not be visible, or people may not know about it. So, you're detracting from the ground plane by giving it on the roof area. So I don't know if that's a good idea.

Chairperson Pardo: Getting back to the comments that Mr. O'Malley made, which I think are very specific. There is a sentence at the end of -- after C. It says, "The total area shall be based upon the total lot area." Then it says, "This landscape area can be provided at least at street level, within the public right-of-way, planter boxes, planters, and other ground-floor locations." Now, there we go again. We're going into the public right-of-way. You know, we're looking at property that doesn't belong to the develop -- to be able to comply with landscaping that may be required by Public Works or by somebody else, like, you know, you have to put in street trees. You have to

do this; you have to do that. All of a sudden, you're counting that area there. Right now, you know, we have a very modest -- in my opinion -- a very modest amount, 5 percent, for non-residential property, 10 percent -- and by the way, it can be used on site using other things, such as planter boxes and other mechanisms. So, by going 5 percent on non-residential, 10 percent for mixed-use and 25 percent in residential areas, I just -- you know, I'm a proponent of hardscape, but there's nothing like seeing that green area. When I run in the morning, I don't run through the commercial district in Coral Gables. I run through the residential districts. And one of the things that I like about running through the residential districts, which include multi-family high-rises, is that they have green space there. I agree with Willy about, you know, the roof areas, having a special condition there. I think that there should be flexibility for showing that in such a way -- Miami Beach, for example, if you have a roofed area, there are certain areas or certain times where you could actually count it toward -- for public, but you have to have a hundred percent public accessibility. So, they actually address the concern you have, Javier.

Board Member Salman: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: You know, so I think right now to be able to move on, I would like to be able to leave it the way it is, and then be able to revisit this because this same issue not only occurs in this particular section of the Code, but this same issue occurs for regular zoning that is not taking advantage of any Mediterranean bonus. So, the percentages are identical. Again, they're being repeated, but there is nothing here that is talking about specifically the bonus areas. This is just, in my opinion, a repetition. I did not strike it out. I put on there an arrow and I wrote down their board with a question mark, and I wanted to hear what everybody had to say. And also, before the end of this meeting, I want to let both Willy and Robert know that I'm going to read into the record two suggestions that they have made independently about two different subjects that should be considered that isn't necessarily under the purview of this committee as what the committee was asked to do, which is specifically the Mediterranean ordinance. One has to do with less density and height, and I think -- and the other one has to do with styles other than Mediterranean and people earning bonuses for great architecture, not good architecture, great architecture. I want to

read that into the minutes at the end of this meeting. But I think that some of the confusion here is that when you look at these standards, you think that someone discovered America, they didn't. They're repeating it, they're taking it from another section in the Code that causes great confusion, especially when other sections of the Code are amended or changed, and then they forget that they have it stuck in the Mediterranean one. I would like to be able to move on. We're making great progress. Leave it as is. And then possibly look into the suggestion of the roof areas and also a clearer definition, but I think that has to do with the other sections where landscape is discussed specifically in other sections of the Code, very specifically. That definition should be there, and I think that Mr. O'Malley's comments are very relevant, that you can't go a hundred percent without having anything that's green, and it has to be done in such a way, even though -- even if you're in the CBD or in your residential area. So, these percentages are there for a reason. Right now, I think from a proportion standpoint, I think it's something that we should be discussing, but I think this is one of those amenities that we should look at, but also not close our eyes to some of the taller, bigger buildings that have the potential of having these recreational areas up on top. For example, if the City is building a parking garage, a dedicated parking garage, why not have recreation on top of the parking garage? That's not a new idea. But you know, that's something that we could count toward our parks and our master plan competence -- compliance rather. So, I think, you know, that this is a very good subject, but I think it's one of the subjects that I'd like to tack on into the record at the end of this meeting today.

Board Member Bermello: So, the only thing I would you bring to bear is that you can have in two properties, one mixed-use, one that's dealt with in a residential fashion, similar density, and one has more than twice the requirement for landscape open space, and they're both in a urban area. So, if -- part of the reason why I think it's important to provide staff and the Board of Architects with certain discretion and with clarity as to what is landscape open space is to provide the language (UNINTELLIGIBLE). If the Chair believes that maybe this is best done in a different section, I have no problem with that. But I know that there is always a struggle with staff looking at this issue and what it is and what it's not. And I think the level of appropriateness comes to bear, you know. Again, in single-family areas, without a doubt, the green wins. But in an urban area,

you know, the plaza, I believe wins. And even how you deal with street trees is very different than you would trees in a swale area. It just changes totally. And so that's kind of like the concept.

Board Member Behar: Yeah, and...

Chairperson Pardo: I'm with you.

Board Member Behar: I agree with Willy's comment because I think that it will also enhance the building, the massing of that. So there -- I think there is some benefit that I think that the project will be able to make good from. You know, I'm okay leaving it for now, but I think we definitely revisit this because I think there's a lot of potential to create. You know, maybe the percentages is different, maybe there's an incentive, maybe it's something that if you do on a rooftop, you know, or somewhere where it's visible and the public benefit at the end, I think it's a good idea to do that.

Chairperson Pardo: And at the end of the day, it's a public benefit.

Board Member Bermello: Right.

Chairperson Pardo: And I think that Mr. O'Malley hit the nail on the head. And I think this is a concern. And the concern is, you know, are we providing something that makes it pleasant? You know, are we walking through Mitch's projects at -- project at the Merrick Shops -- Shops of Merrick? You know, are we walking through a subway in New York? You know, what is the impression that we're giving people? So if we're promoting great architecture, you know, we should really look at the landscape interpretation for the Code itself, which is another story for another day.

City Clerk Urquia: Mr. Chair, really quick. Mr. Trias will not be able to join the meeting today.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

City Clerk Urquia: However, Ms. Suramy Cabrera, the Development Services Director, is available and she's already connected on Zoom and watching the meeting, so any questions you may have.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, thank you. So going on, we'll leave 8 for now, if the committee is okay with that. Number 9 on the lighting of the street and the Public Works Department, again, this is a standard. I truly don't understand the relevance of why it's even mentioned here. Street lighting, et cetera, the approval of the Public Works Department. Public Works has the right in every project to request street lighting and do it based on their standards, et cetera, so it's just kind of confusing for me why this is a standard here. That's the only reason that I brought this up. It just -- it seemed like it's unnecessary because it already gets done and it's not getting done because this paragraph is in these "standards."

Board Member Behar: I agree. It doesn't belong, so I'm okay taking it out, striking it from there.

Chairperson Pardo: Is there anyone else have --? Okay. And on the parking garages.

Board Member Behar: This is one that I think that if I read this -- and if you want to go ahead and read it for the record, then I'll give you my comments.

Chairperson Pardo: I'll read it for the record. I just pushed the wrong button. We're very lucky I don't work at Turkey Point.

Unidentified Speaker: I only have one clarification.

Board Member Behar: Mine is only one too.

Chairperson Pardo: I'm sorry?

Unidentified Speaker: Let's see if it's the same one.

Chairperson Pardo: Let's see. I had a copy -- there are two documents. There you go.

City Clerk Urquia: That one?

Chairperson Pardo: I think so. There you go. Thank you. Reminds me of the old joke, I used to be young and stupid and I'm not young anymore. Okay, here it is. Sorry about that.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Behar wanted to add something to this item, no?

Board Member Behar: I did.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah.

Board Member Behar: I did.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, I'm sorry, Robert. What number were you at?

Board Member Behar: We're at number 10.

Board Member Salman: Let's see if it's the same one.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, here we go. Sorry about that. Ground floor parking as a part of a multi-use building shall not front on a primary street. ADA parking is permitted on the ground floor. Ground floor parking is permitted on secondary/side street and shall be fully enclosed within the structure and/or shall be surrounded by retail uses and/or residential uses. Ground floor parking

is permitted on alley frontages. Parking facilities shall strive to accommodate pedestrian access to all adjacent streets and alleys.

Board Member Behar: My comment there, Mr. Chair, is that it says ground floor parking as part of a multi-use permit should not front a primary street. I think that you may have instances where you only have a primary street. And my -- what I propose to do is "may front on a primary street if it's concealed from view by use of a liner or habitable space." So, you never really see the parking, but you're allowed to have it on a front street -- on a primary street.

Board Member Salman: Yeah. I'm thinking a similar thing where you're doing like an apartment building in the North Ponce area where you have a locked in site and you're on a primary street. And because of setbacks, you want to take advantage of some of that space for parking or a portion of it anymore.

Board Member Behar: You mean as long as you conceal it.

Board Member Salman: You could have it. That's good. I have a clarification. I think the ground floor off-street parking would probably be more clear if we added the word "off-street."

Board Member Behar: Well, but parking inside the building is a require -- this is not...

Board Member Bermello: Well, that's off-street, not necessarily, right?

Unidentified Speaker: It's assumed that it's off-street. It's a garage.

Board Member Bermello: Right.

Chairperson Pardo: I think that...

Board Member Behar: We're talking about the garage. It's not off-streert. I mean...

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, it's ground floor parking as part of a multi-purpose...

Board Member Behar: Right.

Board Member Bermello: Mixed-use building.

Board Member Salman: But what you're talking about is parking that you want to put into the setback or visible from the green area that's screened.

Board Member Behar: Well, there may be instances where you have only a primary street...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Behar: And you know, you could put parking there. You don't have to take it up to anywhere else, as long that it's concealed by -- not screened, but it has to be something more like a liner unit or a habitable space.

Unidentified Speaker: By a usable space.

Chairperson Pardo: Miami Beach does...

Board Member Behar: Yeah.

Unidentified Speaker: Not just an (INAUDIBLE).

Chairperson Pardo: Miami Beach does that.

Board Member Behar: Yeah.

Unidentified Speaker: Is what he's trying to say.

Board Member Bermello: Do we have the definition for --? I mean, we know what liner is. But in the Code, is there a definition?

Board Member Behar: Of habitable space?

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, I think it's defined as habitable space.

Board Member Salman: Or usable space.

Unidentified Speaker: (INAUDIBLE) where they use it on a liner, which is like three feet deep.

Board Member Behar: No, no, no, habitable space.

Board Member Pratt: No, no, that's not a liner.

Board Member Behar: Habitable.

Board Member Salman: And I can tell you exactly where.

Chairperson Pardo: City of Miami.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: So you're not talking about having a window dressing that you have like a you -- (INAUDIBLE) actually habitable space.

Board Member Behar: I see your point. You do a display window; that's a liner.

Board Member Bermello: Display window and that's a liner.

Board Member Behar: So you need a habitable space. Habitable space is not going to be, you know, five foot.

Board Member Bermello: So, the word "liner" and "habitable" go together in your suggestion -- right? -- which is the way that I'd like to see it.

Board Member Behar: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: I would like to have this applied not only to residential on mixed use; I'd like for this to apply for government properties, so as the City redevelops its parking facilities, City needs to comply and set the standard more than the private sector. I mean...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Behar: I have an issue with that.

Chairperson Pardo: Shall -- okay.

Board Member Behar: I mean, if you want to add off-street parking, I'm okay with it. But then if I'm doing a parking garage, it's parking that belongs in that development.

Board Member Salman: I'm thinking of other types of projects where you have a building, and you have a site -- an open area next to it that may contain parking and that you would have to have it screened.

Unidentified Speaker: No, this is talking about parking garages though. This is structured parking.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, there's a structured parking. This is structured parking.

Board Member Salman: This is not on-site parking.

Unidentified Speaker: Alright.

Board Member Bermello: And it's dealing with frontage on a primary street.

Unidentified Speaker: Right.

Board Member Behar: And I think those are the conditions.

Board Member Salman: And I think Robert's point is that you may be limited on a particular site where you only have street access from one side.

Board Member Bermello: That's correct.

Chairperson Pardo: So, it'll be...

Board Member Salman: I think that's what he's trying to say.

Board Member Bermello: So, you'll have a driveway, obviously, and maybe an exit, which (INAUDIBLE) will be together nearby. But I agree with this.

Chairperson Pardo: Do you mind if I take a stab at this?

Board Member Bermello: No, go ahead.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, so we'll call this ground floor parking. Okay, we're going to call this ground floor on-site parking.

Unidentified Speaker: This is only for (INAUDIBLE), multiuse?

Board Member Pratt: No, it's for both residential and mixed use.

Chairperson Pardo: For both? Okay, okay. Ground floor on-site parking as part of the multi-use building shall not front on a primary street. ADA parking is permitted on the ground floor. Onsite ground floor parking is permitted on secondary side streets and shall be fully enclosed within the structure and/or shall be surrounded by retail uses and/or residential uses...

Board Member Behar: But this is...

Chairperson Pardo: As a...

Board Member Behar: This is the wording. I think something very simple, which you know, it says shall not -- strike that out -- and say, "May front on a primary street, if it's concealed from view by the use of a liner or habitable space." Okay, and it doesn't -- I mean, I think that may...

Board Member Bermello: I think that encapsulates the concept -- right? -- that you're going to -- you're not going to see the parking from the street.

Board Member Behar: I would strike out "shall not" and say "may front."

Chairperson Pardo: Alright, let's start this again.

Board Member Pratt: But before you do, if I could just -- I mean, one thing that you mentioned that I think is something that I would support too, is that you mentioned instead of residential units, you mentioned residential uses, which I think is -- on the ground level, there could be lobbies, it could be better residential components that -- and to limit it to just residential units...

Board Member Behar: No, but I used habitable space.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: That would qualify, right?

Chairperson Pardo: What I read was in -- it's in the existing section now.

Board Member Pratt: No, but there is...

Chairperson Pardo: It says residential units.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, I know, but you mentioned...

Chairperson Pardo: And it should be uses.

Board Member Pratt: It should be uses.

Board Member Behar: Yes, uses.

Board Member Bermello: Uses, correct. Because I mean, if you -- (INAUDIBLE) is if correct. If you had a residential lobby on the street level that takes you...

Board Member Pratt: And the whole idea is to...

Board Member Behar: Yeah, you're right, you're right.

Board Member Pratt: Animate the ground plane and to...

Board Member Behar: I agree.

Board Member Bermello: That's correct.

Chairperson Pardo: With a gym or something.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, it could be -- so long as it's...

Board Member Behar: It's concealed. The intent here is to conceal the parking.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. So, why don't we start this again? We'll say on-site ground floor parking as a part of a multi-use building may front on a primary street if said parking is concealed from view by the use of retail or residential habitable space.

Board Member Bermello: I think if you say liner habitable space it will...

Board Member Behar: Yes.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, I think because...

Board Member Bermello: (INAUDIBLE) whatever use...

Board Member Pratt: You're not permitted to have retail.

Chairperson Pardo: Do we have a definition?

Board Member Behar: Yeah, I may not be able to do a retail in a residential.

Chairperson Pardo: No, but what I'm asking is, do we have a definition of liner in the Code now?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: If I may, the Chair, just a quick tidbit. The second portion of this section already says, I think, everything you already want to say, so why not strike the entire first section and just have it apply to the entire ground area regardless of what street it faces. That make sense?

Board Member Behar: Well, that's -- the second portion says ground floor permitted on a secondary street, not on a primary street.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Strike that. What I'm saying is strike that and it achieves your same goal without...

Chairperson Pardo: No, because what's going to happen, Gus, is you're going to then now have to put a liner on a side street or on a...

Board Member Salman: Alley.

Chairperson Pardo: Alley.

Board Member Behar: Correct.

Chairperson Pardo: You don't want to go that way because you're going to eat up that ground floor that way, plus the fact you're adding uses that don't make any sense necessarily on an alley.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: But that's exactly what that says. That says that it is required to be enclosed on a secondary street or a side street.

Board Member Behar: But enclosed by what?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Ground floor parking is permitted on secondary/side streets and shall be fully enclosed within the structure or shall be surrounded by retail uses and residential uses, so it sounds to me exactly what you guys want to do. You just want to also include the primary frontage.

Board Member Bermello: No, this is -- I think this -- Mr. City Attorney -- is a little different. This -- we're not -- we're making it compare -- a difference between the secondary and the primary street. On the primary street, we're saying, we don't want to see the cars. We want it very pedestrian, and we may -- and you may have parking on a primary street as long as it's hidden from view totally by liner habitable space. And whether it's residential or retail...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I'm simply asking the question, how is that different than what it currently reads for secondary side streets?

Board Member Bermello: Because secondary side streets says that you can, in fact, have parking fronting on it, not shielded...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: That's not what that says.

Board Member Bermello: Not screened -- I'm sorry?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: That's not what that says.

Board Member Bermello: Well, the way I read it, ground floor parking is permitted on secondary side streets -- is permitted -- and shall be fully enclosed within the structure. Now fully enclosed within the structure...

Unidentified Speaker: Is a wall.

Board Member Bermello: I mean, to me, it means that there are columns, that there's a roof over it. You know...

Board Member Salman: Inside of a building. It's not on-site, again.

Board Member Bermello: It's -- there's -- it's sprinklered, but I could still see the parking. That's what that tells me.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Okay. Then as long as we make distinction, I think...

Board Member Bermello: You know, that -- I mean, do you all read it like that?

Board Member Pratt: That's my...

Board Member Salman: Yes.

Board Member Pratt: Interpretation too, yeah.

Board Member Bermello: That's the way I read it.

Board Member Behar: Yeah, I agree.

Board Member Bermello: And I think we're putting another layer on the primary streets.

Board Member Salman: I like Glenn's comment of changing the word "units" to "uses." I think that gives us a little bit more...

Board Member Pratt: Yeah.

Board Member Behar: I think residential units should go out and put...

Board Member Salman: Residential uses.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, just residential uses, I think, covers it.

Board Member Behar: Correct.

Board Member Salman: Just say retail and residential uses.

Board Member Behar: And I mean, if you want to add, you know, "from said parking," I'm okay. Put the intent is that on a primary, as long as it's concealed, you could do it.

Chairperson Pardo: Gus, you okay?

Board Member Pratt: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chair.

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: Because we leave this table, could I take you back to an earlier item and see if there's an idea that maybe you would find acceptable 2 you? Going back to the

landscape, what I would like to consider is adding a couple of phrases on items B and C. So, C says 25 percent for residential properties.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: My suggestion is to add for MF2 residential properties. And the suggestion on Item B, where it says 10 percent for mixed-use properties, it will be 10 percent for mixed-use and MF4 residential properties, making a distinction in terms of the density and the size of lots between the two versus applying the same percentages to the two.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright.

Board Member Bermello: And my past experience, it creates a tremendous hardship on the latter, on the MF4 versus the MF2. So, that's...

Board Member Behar: I like -- on B, the MF4.

Board Member Bermello: That was -- that is a simple way of addressing it.

Board Member Behar: Can you repeat the A again, the 5 percent?

Board Member Bermello: So, A, I'm not touching at all.

Board Member Behar: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: I'm leaving it the way it is. B would read "10 percent for mixed-use and MF4 residential properties." I guess they have a semicolon, ";and," and then you go to item C.

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Bermello: Item C would say, "25 percent for MF2 residential properties." So, it's clear, it's cross-referenced back to the two zoning districts, and there's no doubt.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Just for clarification, your proposal would eliminate all of the residential under C, only MF2.

Unidentified Speaker: Right.

Board Member Bermello: So, the way that it would read is that the 25 percent -- or you could put "and other" -- and other residential properties.

Unidentified Speaker: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: MF2 and other residential properties.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I believe MF2 would fall under the category of residential properties.

Board Member Bermello: Right. But I'm thinking -- you're thinking to make it applicable to any other residential zoned district, and I would say, yes, that makes sense. In other words, the 25 percent would apply and flow down from MF2 down all the way to your largest lot, single family. Is that kind of clear, or no?

Chairperson Pardo: For residential properties and MF2?

Board Member Bermello: Yes, correct, the 25 percent; and the 10 percent for the mixed-use and the MF4.

Unidentified Speaker: So what you're basically saying is...

Board Member Bermello: So, mixed use will be all your MX districts, right.

Unidentified Speaker: Is excluding the MF4 from the 25 percent requirement?

Board Member Bermello: Correct.

Unidentified Speaker: That's what he's trying to do.

Board Member Bermello: Correct.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Okay, but then we don't need to include MF2 under C, is my question.

Board Member Bermello: No...

Unidentified Speaker: (INAUDIBLE) all the residential property.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: All residential properties fall within C.

Unidentified Speaker: Perfect.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Except MF4, which is now under B.

Board Member Bermello: That's fine. Yeah, that's the same thing.

Board Member Salman: I see.

Board Member Bermello: Would that be amenable to the Committee?

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, the MF4 is a high rise or a high-intensity use.

Board Member Bermello: Correct.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright, that's 8. Alright, Willy, are you okay? Willy, are you alright with that?

Board Member Bermello: Yes, perfect.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright, any other concerns about that from the committee? Alright. Okay, so that takes care of Table 1.

Board Member Behar: Let's go through 11. Let's just go for the purpose of this -- why it's been eliminated. Right, because you're eliminating number -- you're proposing to eliminate number 11, the porte-cocheres.

Chairperson Pardo: Oh, I'm sorry. I was looking at yours.

Board Member Behar: No, mine...

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah.

Board Member Salman: Porte-cocheres and drive-throughs.

Board Member Behar: I agree with taking it out. I already took it out.

Board Member Salman: They're removing porte-cocheres and drive-throughs?

Board Member Pratt: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: Right, 11. So, it would be to take out the reference to the porte-cocheres where, again, they're excluded from these areas, and there could be some exception somewhere where the applicant goes before the Commission and asks for a special, you know, case. This doesn't -- this won't happen normally, but when it does on these predictor streets, et cetera, that's up to the applicant and the Commission to make that decision.

Board Member Behar: I'm good with deleting it from this table.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: Did you have a problem with simply putting a pre-fix and saying, "Unless approved by the City Commission."

Chairperson Pardo: No, that's already as -- that -- the mechanism is there.

Board Member Pratt: Is already in place.

Chairperson Pardo: Gus? The mechanism is there for an applicant to apply for basically a variance to either the...

Board Member Bermello: Porte-cochere.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: Just to me, it seems that there may be a difference between a porte-cochere that's intruding into your property's setback as opposed to a porte-cochere that's intruding into the public right-of-way.

Chairperson Pardo: Right, but these are limitations specifically to Ponce, Southwest 8th Street, Bird Road, Miracle Mile...

Board Member Salman: Alhambra Circle.

Chairperson Pardo: And Alhambra Circle from Douglas to Le Jeune.

Board Member Salman: That's more of a traffic issue.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, I mean, I...

Board Member Salman: (INAUDIBLE) side entrance.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, I don't have a problem.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. So...

Board Member Bermello: You want to delete that then?

Chairperson Pardo: Right. Because...

Board Member Bermello: Yeah. Let's go ahead and delete it.

Chairperson Pardo: You know, if you recall the Hyatt...

Board Member Bermello: I mean, they can do it at Commission anyway.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. The Hyatt has one on Alhambra right now.

Unidentified Speaker: Yep.

Chairperson Pardo: But that was approved directly by the Commission.

Board Member Behar: Well, the Allen Morris, whatever, that has one; it was approved by Commission.

Chairperson Pardo: By Commission.

Unidentified Speaker: Right.

Chairperson Pardo: In other words, they were able to prove and satisfy, and the Commission has the ability to do that, so the precedent is there. So, if we take this off here, that'd be great. Sidewalks and pedestrian access. All buildings, except accessory buildings, shall have their main pedestrian entrances oriented toward adjoining streets. Pedestrian pathways or sidewalks shall be provided from all pedestrian access points and shall connect to one another to form a continuous pedestrian network from buildings, parking facilities, parking garages, entrances, and other structures. Wherever responsible pathways shall be separated from vehicular traffic. Now, I think that should be addressed on Table 2. And everything else that's in this section is already addressed in other parts of the Code. Because, for example, your front door has to -- whether it's a high-rise or whether it's a single-family residence, it has to be facing that street where you're getting your address. I mean, it's already there. When you also look at the pedestrian pathways and sidewalks, you know, of all these -- all this connectivity, I think it can be addressed on Table 2 to include some design features for qualifications. And the other thing is -- that I find rather disturbing is that last sentence in the second paragraph, where it says, "Wherever possible, pathways shall be

separated from vehicular traffic." Now, when you combine the vehicular traffic with the pedestrian experience, you know, what I've seen recently in some projects -- I mean, it's pretty appalling. There's no redeeming value to it. So, you either make them do it where you separate and make it safe and make it a pleasant experience, or you don't. That's why under these required standards, there's no beef to it. There's no meat, where you say, "Well, you know, this is doing something for us." And I just think it's unnecessary, in my opinion, but it has to be addressed, I think, in Table 2, as part of the pedestrian amenities and those kind of things. And I personally have done that, and that's where you give people the incentive to earn something for good design. And that's why I wanted to strike it from here but put it as an incentive in Table 2.

Board Member Bermello: You know, when I read this, I -- and to me, it seemed to me this is something we would do all the time everywhere.

Chairperson Pardo: Exactly, for every design. But I think (INAUDIBLE) ask for it (INAUDIBLE) the City architect will ask...

Board Member Bermello: Why give, you know, anything special for, you know, what you do by nature?

Chairperson Pardo: And the way I'm looking at this section, it's a standard. It's a standard of what -- where does it go -- you know, these buildings will have this as a basic standard, and there's no watermark here. This is already in the Code. It's like frivolous to have it in there.

Board Member Behar: I agree. It don't need to be here. I would strike it out.

Chairperson Pardo: Perfect. Does anyone have a concern with that?

Board Member Salman: No.

Board Member Pratt: No.

Board Member Bermello: We're good.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, so now the next one. I'm sorry, but structural soil, I mean...

Board Member Behar: Well, that is so important.

Chairperson Pardo: So, again, I would strike that.

Unidentified Speaker: Move on.

Chairperson Pardo: Unless the City architect is -- okay. Then the last one, windows on Mediterranean buildings. Mediterranean buildings shall provide a minimum window casing depth of four inches. I mean, back in 1986, the reason that they put this in was basically because of the glass boxes. They were trying to -- instead of having a clear face -- because you may not remember or not know -- oh, I'm sorry. Thank you, Mr. Clerk, for keeping me honest here. Let's see. I'm trying to catch up here. Thank you, sir. Alright, so the reason it was done is because of the glass boxes, and it was just one sheet of glass. It was curtain wall coming out. So, they said, "You know what, this is how we get rid of it. Let's depress it four inches." Then people like Mitch said, "Well, let's do something a little bit better." So, on his bank building there on the circle -- if you look at his fenestration -- the windows are set back substantially where the articulation is superb, and it's a lot more than four inches. The reason I want to take it out is I don't think that this formula is a good idea. But I did bring up the term of windows, which I did not use the term fenestration and articulation, and I should have, but I didn't, trying to keep it into a very simple language. But I think that the four inches is...

Board Member Behar: And not for this table. I don't think it's needed.

Chairperson Pardo: Exactly.

Board Member Behar: Not for this table.

Chairperson Pardo: Right, right. I would like to have someone earn a bonus for doing something special. So I don't know how you all feel about that, but I think that this was put in there -- so you understand -- to defend 1986. It was an answer to the curtain wall.

Board Member Bermello: I agree, Mr. Chair, with removing it the way you've stricken it.

Board Member Behar: If this goes, it goes in what I'm proposing in the third, you know, bonus.

Chairperson Pardo: Exactly.

Board Member Behar: Not here.

Unidentified Speaker: Correct.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, so believe it or not, we're through Table 1. Now, I'm not going to criticize this, but the way this is written, if you remember the first statement I made into the record this evening was about the Level 1 bonuses, Level 2 versus Table 1, Table 2. You know, one really doesn't have to do with the other. So, the Level 1 bonus, clearly for the record, states standards for Coral Gables Mediterranean styles -- I'm sorry. Let me read it the way it is now. Standards for all types of architectural design. Bonuses are available up to .2 floor area ratio, and up to a maximum of one story. The allowable stories -- for all types of architectural designs and building. The allowable stories are subject to the subject property application comprehensive plan map designation and the height is regulated by the Zoning Code. The allowable stories and heights are as follows. Number one, I think that they missed the target completely. This is all that first bonus, that Level 1 bonus of .20 or 0.2 floor area ratio bonus, and up to the one story of height was

specifically written for the Coral Gables Mediterranean style, keeping in mind, what I said before, what I'm going to read into the record and what was discussed a little earlier. So, once we do that, this is a straight shot. You do a Coral Gables Mediterranean style, and the Board approves it, you get a .2 FAR and up to one floor. So, the table below this -- which is not called a table or identified as a table anywhere -- it talks about the different types of zoning, and then what the minimum building site area is, and then what the additional floors are. So you know, in 1986, a floor was identified specifically as 12 feet, not 13.5 feet. Clear as a bell, 12 feet, and there was a reason. Because of the way the Zoning Code was written, somewhere, somehow, it went from 12 feet to 13.5 feet. So, that being said, that additional floor, when you look at this, gives you the aggregate total for the lot size versus the zoning, so if you have a 10,000 square foot lot that's MF2 and you add one story, which is 13.5 feet, you can get up to another height.

Board Member Behar: Can you go -- can we go back to C, because I think we're in the height, but I do have a problem putting Coral Gables Mediterranean style. Because you could do this and achieve, you know, these whatever number, eight items, and it doesn't have to be tied to a Coral Gables Mediterranean style.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Behar: Right, because what you -- going back -- go up a little bit. And your standard for -- it used to say "all style of architecture design." Why are we have to, you know, put this directly on Coral Gables Mediterranean style? You don't have to have, again, a Mediterranean style building, and you have to incorporate these X number of items that make the project better, and you will achieve .2.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, the Level 1 bonus is specific.

Board Member Behar: But is it -- all two tables are supposed to be for Mediterranean style. But what I guess I'm trying to explain is that you could do on any building, and yet, it's not in Mediterranean style.

Chairperson Pardo: Well...

Board Member Behar: It might not -- because you add in there "Coral Gables Mediterranean style," it's not part of the original language that was part of this. Why do we have to be specific at Mediterranean -- Coral Gables Mediterranean style to this?

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, so...

Board Member Bermello: I think what you're saying, Robert, is that the Level 1 is something we expect of everyone across the board, these are minimum standards to be met, and regardless of what the style, if you meet these, you end up with receiving the .2 and the extra story. Is that -- that's your point?

Board Member Behar: Yes, yes.

Chairperson Pardo: But it's not that way.

Board Member Bermello: To get the following incentives or allowances, you must be -- in other words, this would apply also to Spanish Mediterranean.

Board Member Behar: Correct.

Board Member Bermello: But it also would apply to...

Board Member Behar: Any style.

Board Member Bermello: Any. But the next table is only for -- is that -- that's the concept?

Chairperson Pardo: No. Well, let me clarify. This is why a lot of the confusion -- and this is -- you know, words mean things. So, the Coral Gables Mediterranean architectural style, which is Section 5-202 -- we've been concentrating on 501. In here, it says specifically, "A, the Coral Gables Mediterranean Architectural Design. All applications for development approval shall be required to satisfy all of the following." So, the Coral Gables Mediterranean Architecture Design is there now and is shown under a definition, clumsily, this way. In my opinion, this should have been put at the beginning, because the problem is, as I said, there's tremendous confusion because you look at those standards and you read the standard, there's nothing relevant there. I mean, the reason that this ordinance was put on the book and bonuses were put there, was that because they were trying to get away from the glass boxes, the brutal architecture that was being designed back in the 80s, and then it was being done in such a way to be able to create a Coral Gables Mediterranean architectural style revival. That was the crux of this entire bonus component.

Board Member Behar: Yeah, Felix, but if we use a couple of examples -- for example, and we're going to use the -- Mitch's building on the circle. To me, that's not really a Mediterranean style building, okay. It's a transitional building. It doesn't have the cupolas, doesn't have those elements that you will see, and the same thing with Glenn's building on Ponce. But those buildings incorporate all of these components, all of the elements that we're asking for. So, I don't see the need to include specifically Coral Gables Mediterranean style.

Chairperson Pardo: I disagree, and I'll tell you why. In 1986, there was a vacuum that existed in commercial design. And then this vacuum started to produce buildings that weren't well articulated. There are some buildings that exist there that were built in that era, built in the 70s, that are superb buildings. But this all started specifically with the Bank of Coral Gables on Ponce and Almeria. So, in order to create an incentive to be able to do a specific style -- and I'm not disagreeing with you, Robert, conceptually -- I'm just saying that when you look at this section,

it's a very specific section. This section has existed in the Code since 1986. Unfortunately, some people that altered this Code over time have strategically taken out certain parts. Now, right now the charge of this blue-ribbon committee is specifically about the Coral Gables Mediterranean ordinance. It's not about the great design ordinance; it's not about any other style ordinance. It's about the Coral Gables Mediterranean ordinance. Now, that being said, I feel that we should reward great architecture without a doubt. But if we take out this incentive -- and the only thing I added here was that it says here all -- Coral Gables Mediterranean architectural design, all applications for development approval shall be required to satisfy all of the following: Number one, include design elements -- and instead of saying, the way it says now, of the existing following buildings, it said nothing. It was stripped out completely. Therefore, you get people that do mediocre stuff, add some gingerbread here and there, and voila, they get .2 FAR bonus and a floor of height. So, when these different buildings were put in there, it doesn't come with any type of examples, so I tried to add one thing. The Coral Gables Mediterranean architectural character and the detailed description of the above buildings shall be contained within an illustrative document entitled "Coral Gables Mediterranean Architectural Style Guide," available at the Coral Gables Historic Resources Department, as adopted by resolution of the City Commission. Adherence to the principles -- wait a minute -- of the design element shall form the basis of judgment in determining the appropriateness of new construction or restoration in the Coral Gables Mediterranean architectural style. Now, that is a .2 FAR increase and a one-story increase. Table 2 -- not the "standards" of Table 1 -- (INAUDIBLE) almost irrelevant when you think of it and you look at it for bonuses. When you look at the second part, which are the public amenities, which is very specific, not only can you achieve .2, but you could achieve up to .3 there.

Board Member Behar: Yeah, but -- let's see -- let's go back to the other table. Again, if I -- let's say that an applicant wants to do -- an architect wants to do a contemporary building. Forget about incorporating -- I'm not going to get the .2. I'm not going to incorporate any of these requirements. Then we're going to get not a good project, you know. If you're not giving me -- if we're going to do a contemporary building, for lack of a better word, a transitional, and I'm not getting -- you know, because it's not a Mediterranean building, I'm not going to this. So, then we're going to end

up with a worst project. You know, I think that we should -- every project should be -- have the incentive, the motivation to be able to achieve these. That's the way I read it, unless, you know, from the board.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah, Glenn, I was going to ask you for your comment on this.

Board Member Pratt: No. And I think that the idea, Felix, was that the Medit -- or the bonuses, the reason why they were broken into separate sections or into individual components, was that if you -- it encouraged developers to add additional things and to create nicer urban amenities and nicer, you know, ground plain features and just to enhance the building itself without having to go the full Mediterranean design. And I think that that's an important part of it. I agree with Robert. I think that there should be something in there that not all development needs to be or should be, or not all property owners or developers really wish to do full Mediterranean buildings. And there should be some structure in the Code that allows them to receive -- or puts some incentive in there for them to do something above just minimal, which I think is what the Level 1 does. And I mean, I don't think it needs -- but I don't think there needs to be the word "Mediterranean" within that. I think that those development incentives are independent of Mediterranean design.

Board Member Bermello: I would say that the word "Mediterranean" is already in there, when you say all architectural styles. So, I -- I mean, I agree with the concept, which obviously is -- withholding what is currently there, which is every developer is incentivized to comply with all of the -- regardless of what the style is: transitional, you know, modern.

Board Member Behar: But you have to comply. You have to do this.

Board Member Bermello: You have to comply with this and...

Chairperson Pardo: But they...

Board Member Bermello: But you don't...

Board Member Behar: Don't limit to Mediterranean.

Board Member Bermello: You don't allow...

Chairperson Pardo: Wait a minute.

Board Member Bermello: Anyone to, you know, bypass this.

Chairperson Pardo: Let's go to Table 1, okay, if we're saying that Table 1 gives you the ability to do .2 -- forget about Mediterranean architecture, although this is called Mediterranean standards, Coral Gables Mediterranean Style Design Standards, et cetera. So, under elements, so all the façades -- none of the façades can be blank, okay. So, the building façades fronting the streets, adjoining, the pedestrian sidewalks, et cetera, must have display windows, et cetera, right? Up to now, there's no mention of any style.

Board Member Bermello: Right, because I think this applies to all -- Table 1 applies to all styles.

Board Member Behar: To all styles.

Board Member Bermello: All styles. We're not saying...

Chairperson Pardo: I call this generic. It could be any style.

Board Member Pratt: Right, it's the baseline.

Chairperson Pardo: But up 'til now also, it hasn't provided any incentive for great architecture. These are just -- when you read the words -- look carefully at the words of this Table 1. The Table

1 is a blue herring, in my opinion, because you're looking at development categories or types and requirements. The requirement is you can't have any blank walls. The requirement is that on the building façades, you know, you have to have display windows or retail whatever, and then landscaping pedestrian -- again, nothing there as far as coming up with something tangible that has to be provided by the applicant.

Board Member Behar: Or Felix, you go at the end, and when you add -- when you're adding Coral Gables Mediterranean style specifically, then you're focusing on that style in order -- so if I'm doing a transitional building...

Board Member Bermello: You don't have to comply with this.

Board Member Behar: I don't have to comply with this, so...

Chairperson Pardo: And you're right, and you're right. And the whole -- the point I'm making is that the intent of this particular incentive -- and again, I said it before, that I wanted to read into the record because it's a different thing. There is a design chapter that is not written or exists in the Code; it just doesn't exist. And that chapter does not include other styles, including contemporary, et cetera.

Board Member Behar: But it says all type of architectural design, the way it's written with any modification. Let me ask, in your opinion, the building on Ponce, is that --? That, to me, is different than the Biltmore and is different than a lot of the other buildings.

Board Member Bermello: Which building are you talking about now?

Board Member Behar: Mitch's building.

Board Member Bermello: Oh, the Regions Bank?

Board Member Behar: Yeah. Okay, that to me, when you look at it, doesn't have...

Board Member Bermello: Well, it's not a Mediterranean. I mean, maybe...

Board Member Behar: Not Mediterranean.

Board Member Bermello: But it's great design.

Board Member Behar: Oh, no. Willy, and that's the point.

Board Member Bermello: It's contemporary, but it pays homage to the intent, and that's why we all love it. That's why we talk about.

Board Member Behar: But Willy, that project was entitled to get .2 because it incorporated every one of those components.

Board Member Bermello: I'm agreement with you.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, let's...

Board Member Bermello: I'm not disagreeing with you.

Chairperson Pardo: Let's go back to Glenn and Tom Spain's building, at 5555 Biltmore, great design. Absolutely great design. It's right there with Mitch -- Mitch's building, but they're different. So, my question is, did you get a bonus for that design?

Board Member Pratt: No.

Board Member Behar: But that was a different time.

Board Member Pratt: That was before...

Chairperson Pardo: No, wait, wait, wait. I'm trying to make a point. Did you get a bonus for that design?

Board Member Pratt: No.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. Did you get a bonus for the Regions Bank design you did on the circle?

Board Member Alvarez: I probably did, but I can't remember.

Chairperson Pardo: So you plead the fifth. Here's the point I'm trying to make.

Board Member Alvarez: We were -- I don't think we were so intent on the bonuses numerically. I think we were intent in -- I remember we struggled with the parking, and the parking was a big issue. And we managed to present a case -- and it's difficult to remember all the details. I remember I was heavily involved in the zoning at the time dealing with this, the parking conditions. And the way the building -- that the areas were counted and the way -- maybe they allocated some, what you would call shared parking spots, because there were other parking available to do the (INAUDIBLE). The parking was a consideration or benefit. Maybe the bonuses were obtained in relation to the parking.

Board Member Behar: Yeah.

My memory fails. This is...

Board Member Behar: You know, maybe you were limited by the parking and the FAR you could do best in your parking, so that might not have been a concern back then.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Alvarez: But we wanted to present a case that even if the ornamentation or the style in itself was representing the pure Mediterranean style acknowledged, it was intended to have the components; basically, the arcade, the way the corners turn. We'll do cupolas instead of the arcades with light. They would not do the arcade, and were favorably positioned. We had a good light on it. The connection -- pedestrian to the building in both sides, the drop-off. We improved the alley and made it into a nice arrival place, instead of a cargo place, things of that nature, you know, improving the character and quality. Basically, inspired by those that provided bonuses if it was designed strictly as Mediterranean. But I don't remember the proportion or the ratio of floor, how that was handled. I can't remember that.

Board Member Behar: Can I ask the City Attorney a question? Gus, if you were in a position representing a developer, and you say, look, this says to me that if I do a transitional building, I don't have to -- and I'm not getting the .2 -- I don't have to incorporate any of these requirements.

Chairperson Pardo: Standards, standards.

Board Member Behar: Or standards.

Chairperson Pardo: The Table 1 standards.

Board Member Behar: Because if I'm not getting .2, I don't have to incorporate any of these requirements -- standards in the project. Well, and I could tell you, you're going to -- we're going to get...

Chairperson Pardo: So, you mean to tell me, Glenn, that the Board of Architects now doesn't -- you don't discuss Mediterranean style? You don't -- you know, when you give a Mediterranean approval now for the additional FAR and bonus, you don't hold them to any particular style?

Board Member Pratt: No. We have a review and the applicant -- you know, Robert will tell you, or any of the people that present before the Board of Architects, they have to identify with multiple documents and documentation how the project complies with the requirements of the Code, with the requirements of the table, and identify the use of the materials, all of the elements that go into making the -- or complying with the requirements for the Code. So -- and the Board of Architects reviews all of that, yes. That's all a part of what...

Board Member Behar: They do, and you have to provide examples and prove that you're going to meet Level 1 and you're meeting level 2 in order to get your bonuses.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Pratt: And it's not just not on, say the front elevation, it's -- we look at all elevations because -- or all -- you know, the entire building and the entirety of the project.

Chairperson Pardo: So there is a reference to these eight buildings. There is a reference to the elements of the eight buildings.

Board Member Pratt: In terms of their -- the essence of those eight buildings, because obviously, you can't reproduce a lot of the details in today's world, the same type of precast elements or the same, you know, roof tile, or the same type of things that that the buildings that are used as reference. It's more of a generalization of what is -- what do those elements create in terms of the sense of the appropriateness of the design, and that -- are those -- is that same sense of appropriateness being created in the project that's being presented. Because you can't make the Mediterranean building or none of us can make a project out of just those elements that are

represented of what goes to create goes. It would be -- it's more of looking at the project in totality and seeing if it -- if aesthetically, which is what the Board is charged with doing, is just -- we're not -- the BOA is not charged with reviewing the zoning, essentially. It's charged with reviewing the aesthetics of the project and if it complies with meeting the aesthetic requirements that are generated by the examples in the Code.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, you know, here's the issue. And I'm all for rewarding great architecture. But let's say if (INAUDIBLE) came in to Coral Gables to do a very contemporary commercial design and he complies with all the zoning regulations, and he asked for a Mediterranean bonus where it could look like something on Bayshore Drive or something on Brickell. You have someone with an incredible reputation, an incredible resume. And would you be able to say, "No, it doesn't comply with -- for the Med bonuses for the .2," although the Table 2 has the (INAUDIBLE). Now, what I'm saying is -- and I said it early on at the beginning of our meeting today -- and that is that I think that there is room, but it should be outside of this particular section articulated specifically for other styles. But once you dilute that, why call it Mediterranean? Why not call it another section?

Board Member Pratt: Well, no, I agree with you on that point. I think that there should be incentives for doing great architecture regardless of what the style is. And I think that if you -- if a developer -- there should be an incentive that gives an extra or something additional to the development standards that are identified for creating good urban buildings and good urban environments. If the developer wants to make a Mediterranean style building, they should be -- receive something even beyond what is the...

Board Member Behar: The .2. But that's...

Board Member Pratt: Exactly.

Board Member Behar: That (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Pratt: Exactly.

Maria Magdalena Estupinan: Mr. Pardo, I'm sorry. I don't want to interrupt. I'm just confused, and I would like to clarify because you are arguing...

Chairperson Pardo: Wait. I haven't recognized you yet because we're in the middle of a discussion.

Ms. Estupinan: But that's my point. I'm lost and I would like to kind of clarify so I can follow you. And I would appreciate it. If you don't allow me, that's fine. You tell me, and I'll...

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chair, I think this is an important topic. We need to complete our discussion and then convey to the public what we're doing. We're right now in the middle of cooking this.

Chairperson Pardo: I agree. We're in the middle of a discussion right now, and if you could be patient...

Ms. Estupinan: No problem.

Chairperson Pardo: And...

Ms. Estupinan: Will I be able to...

Chairperson Pardo: We're going to see based on the time.

Ms. Estupinan: I see.

Chairperson Pardo: We're in the middle of a...

Ms. Estupinan: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: Discussion now, which is really crucial to...

Ms. Estupinan: No, no, it is. That's why...

Chairperson Pardo: This blue-ribbon committee.

Ms. Estupinan: I wanted to explain to you...

Chairperson Pardo: Right. And I understand...

Board Member Alvarez: But you're not part of this board, ma'am.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah, and that's the thing. This is...

Ms. Estupinan: No, but I am part of Coral Gables.

Board Member Alvarez: No, but...

Chairperson Pardo: No, no, no.

Ms. Estupinan: No, I understand.

Chairperson Pardo: No, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait.

Ms. Estupinan: I asked -- I asked...

Chairperson Pardo: I think -- wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait.

Ms. Estupinan: I do understand, but I asked very respectfully.

Chairperson Pardo: No, excuse me, excuse me.

Ms. Estupinan: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: Address the Chair; don't address anybody else on this committee.

Ms. Estupinan: But he...

Chairperson Pardo: Excuse me.

Ms. Estupinan: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. Let's be civil about this.

Ms. Estupinan: I haven't (INAUDIBLE)...

Chairperson Pardo: No, you're not.

Ms. Estupinan: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: This gentleman said one thing, which is very specific. You're not part of this committee. We're in the middle of a deliberation and a discussion.

Ms. Estupinan: Right.

Chairperson Pardo: Everybody that's sitting here in this audience, the same as the people that are on Zoom, wait their turn to be able to be (INAUDIBLE). The Chair does not have to recognize anyone to speak from the public, just so you know.

Ms. Estupinan: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Attorney, am I correct about that?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: That is correct.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, so that being said and that being established, if you don't mind, if you could please have a seat. We're in the middle of a discussion. We don't want this to get out of hand right now because...

Ms. Estupinan: Of course not.

Chairperson Pardo: This committee is right now in the middle of a very interesting conversation, and we need to get it to the point where we can move on. Because if you recall, there's a moratorium now in the City, and we need to move on to be able to get our work done. So, if you would be patient, I really appreciate that you could take a seat. And if we have the time, we will open it up to the public, not just to you, but to everyone on this.

Ms. Estupinan: No problem.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Estupinan: Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright, so...

Board Member Behar: Back to the...

Chairperson Pardo: So -- and again, I truly -- you know, I understand. And it's not that I don't understand. The point I'm trying to make is that why do we have the examples of those buildings there? One thing is to say there is a certain amount for this type of style building, which was the intent from the very, very beginning, and how it was established. And at some point, it was expanded to the point that some of the buildings that go up today aren't necessarily great architecture. They almost look like cookie cutter, whatever, and it really is a shame, in my opinion. Because I think if you have a certain limit and you're allowed to go up one more floor, two more floors, three more floors, and increase the FAR up to .5 and you're giving me something mediocre, I think that's why we're here. And the thing is that I want to reward all styles of architecture, but I have a real understanding problem that this is the Mediterranean standard. And I do believe also that Table 2 -- which we haven't quite gotten there yet -- on Table 2, those amenities not only apply to Mediterranean, but they apply to all architecture. And again, it has -- in my opinion, it has to be addressed as a separate section, as an alternative to a particular style. I don't have a problem with that. And adopting even the same table of Table 2 for these pedestrian amenities, I don't have a problem with that. But I think that has to be an extension of what this blue-ribbon committee was asked to do. Now, if you're saying, we're going to give bonuses to any style of architecture, contemporary, whatever, and we'll go up to whatever the height restriction is, I think we have a big issue that we have to understand what it is. The premise of this chapter, when it was originally written and approved by the Commission, was that it was for a specific style. Now, that style doesn't have to be as traditional as one thinks. But let's say, if you're saying, "Well, we're going to do a glass box and it's going to be very contemporary and it's going to look great," and we're going to give you a bonus on top of that. It looks like we went backwards instead of forward. So, I'm all ears.

Board Member Behar: Mr. Chairman, I respectfully disagree.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Behar: And I think the -- what you're proposing, in my opinion, you're setting it up for somebody to come in and says, "If I'm not getting the .2 bonuses, I will do a glass box that allows whatever the zoning permits me to do and I will do that." And I think -- on the contrary, I think this will promote to go back to the 1986 and get to those glass box. I think that the Board of Architects reviews the project and says, "Okay, you want to get these bonuses on any style, you have to comply, and you have to show me why it does." But if I'm not -- if you're not giving me the opportunity to get that .2, then I don't have to. The way I read it, you don't have to adhere or comply with any of these requirements. That's the way I see it. I'm not an attorney, but I am sure an attorney will say, "Hey, you know, you're not getting .2, means you don't need to comply with any of that." And we want every building to incorporate these requirements. And I think the way that it was written I think applies to all styles, not just Coral Gables Mediterranean style.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chair, two points. Number one, I agree with what Mr. Behar is saying regarding the incentive for all styles to comply with these requirements. Number two, I think it's been pretty clear that if you want to have point FAR and have the additional level beyond the Table 1, it has to be Mediterranean. There's no -- as far as I know, there's no other option. So that has been, in my opinion, very, very, very, very clear. So, I don't see an issue there. I saw more on the things that later, you know, we -- I think should be taken out because they are the result of why people are so upset and why I personally don't like some of the things that have been done lately, which have to do with the issue of encroachments and lack of, you know, open space along the public rights-of-way and the public realm. But I think the concept of a two-step or a two-tier which says anything, any style in the Gables has to comply with this, and we provide you with this incentive as an incentive to not end with what happened before 1986, as an incentive for people not doing blank, unimaginative walls just because they did .2 less or one less story. So, we're saying we want quality, and that's the .2. But if you want .5, then there's no discussion. It has to be...

Board Member Behar: I agree.

Board Member Bermello: Mediterranean.

Board Member Pratt: And I think we're all in agreement.

Board Member Bermello: And I think we're all in agreement with that.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, if you -- again, if you at Table 1, the standards. The standards say nothing as FAR as the quality of anything. Think about it. If you can indulge me for a minute. The elevations, they can't be blank. I don't think the Board of Architects would even allow that to happen, but it's here under requirements. The building façades fronting the street adjoining the pedestrian side -- you know, there's nothing there that says -- it's not talking about fenestration. It's not talking about massing. It's not talking about any of these things.

Board Member Bermello: Could I ask the question maybe in reverse? Why would you give the .2 -- if none of these things are that good or necessary, why would you give .2 and the extra floor to Mediterranean and not to any other style?

Chairperson Pardo: The original concept -- when we did the Bank of Coral Gables, the original concept was that it cost that much more to do something like that. That particular building goes back to the original style of the founding of this City. So therefore, if it costs 20 percent more to build -- it was given as an incentive to be able to equalize compared to someone doing a curtain wall cube, which is what they were doing at that time. Now, again, I'm not...

Board Member Bermello: Again, I don't know about 1986, I was quite younger there, and didn't have any gray hair. I had a lot of hair. I don't know if that made me less wise, but I can tell you today, if I do a building with punch-out walls, a punch-out windows, and give it the decoration, add some, you know, barrel tile and some trims and corbels and outlookers and, you know, it's

going to cost much less than if I do a super duper curtain wall that would cost me \$150 a square foot. I mean, the price differential is not even in the stratosphere. I don't think -- I -- you know, now that may not be the case for what some people call transitional, okay, but I don't think it should be a cost issue. I think maybe it should be an issue of appropriateness more than cost, because the cost can fluctuate all over the place.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, you know...

Board Member Bermello: I mean, I have -- I spent today half an hour with a client who was trying to tell me to take more glass out of a building because of the cost of glass. And by the way, they're correct. But I'm trying to educate them as to how that solved the wrong thing in that situation. I think this issue is that -- and I think this is what we're trying to say that we want to hold every architectural style to get it up to a certain level, and that Level 1 is a hurdle. That if you want that additional story and that additional .2, you have to meet this standard. And to take that away or to make that only to one style means that everything else is going to reduce in mediocrity. I don't want to take that risk.

Board Member Behar: I don't either.

Board Member Bermello: Personally, you know, I don't want to be associated with, "Oh, you are the one that was responsible for us being able to get now this crappy stuff in here." Imagine. So, that's my concern, Mr. Chair. And -- because our actions here today will, you know, have repercussions, so that's my concern with the first level. The second level, I'm 100 percent...

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: It's got to be Spanish Mediterranean. And we can add all the bells and whistles as to what it must comply with. I get it. I know that a lot of people have questions about the eight or so examples, and maybe there should be more illustrative guidelines, a little more

specific. And I realize it's not an issue of element. We all have discussed that elements don't make a design style. It's a lot of the composition, you know, the massing, the articulation, not just the ornamentation. So, but I think we would be making a mistake if we limit that first level of, let's say we're striving for excellence, to just one style.

Chairperson Pardo: Would you -- would the committee mind -- I think this is a discussion that obviously is extremely important. But if you don't mind what I wanted to do, just momentarily, if you don't mind, is simply jump to Table 2. Why? Because these are the amenities that we were talking about from the (INAUDIBLE). And what I'm trying to do is not -- don't take it the wrong way. I'm not trying to ignore this. This is...

Board Member Behar: No, because I strongly feel -- I mean, you know how I feel about this. I don't think we should be doing it, and I agree with Willy. This is going to come back in the future and say, "Oh, you were responsible for getting mediocre building because you took that incentive from all the other styles."

Chairperson Pardo: I'm not disagreeing with the argument. Okay, I understand it. What I wanted to do, if you don't mind, if the Committee doesn't mind, is get to Table 2, which is the table that has to do with public realm standards. Is everybody okay with that just for the moment? Okay, so under Table 2, the first one, arcades and/or loggias. Willy, you brought up...

Board Member Bermello: Adding some elements, like canopies...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: Trellises, and awnings. And I think Mitch made a comment earlier, which is totally correct.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. I wanted to add Mitch's comment in there to your comment. Hold on for one second.

Board Member Behar: Mr. Chair, I have a question. How long -- how late do you think we're going to go on tonight?

Chairperson Pardo: One more hour, Mr. Behar.

Board Member Bermello: I have a problem. I'm chairing a webinar, a workshop at 7:30.

Chairperson Pardo: What time do you have to leave, sir?

Board Member Bermello: I would need to leave here by 7 o'clock.

Board Member Behar: I think 7 o'clock would be a good stopping point for me too.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Behar: Last night I went to 9:45 in the same seat.

Chairperson Pardo: You slept here.

Board Member Behar: In the same chair.

Board Member Pratt: I was here at 9 o'clock this morning until 1:30.

Unidentified Speaker: I was with you,.

Board Member Pratt: On the BOA.

Board Member Behar: I saw you leave a little bit before.

Chairperson Pardo: I did. I had to go pass out, I think.

Board Member Pratt: I got all of two hours in the office today so...

Chairperson Pardo: Alright, sorry about that.

Unidentified Speaker: So, we agree to go to 7?

Board Member Behar: 7.

Chairperson Pardo: I'm sorry?

Board Member Behar: 7 o'clock?

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah, 7.

Board Member Salman: Everybody's in agreement?

Chairperson Pardo: Alright. Okay, so number one, the arcades and the loggias. We added -- or I added what's in red there, which are Willy's comments about limitations of encroachments on corners of buildings may be required to control view corridors and ground stories, building bulk and massing, and must respect the established setbacks and must not encroach into the setbacks or public right-of-way. Awnings or other similar items do not satisfy these provisions. Let's -- based on the comments that Mitch made earlier tonight, let's add verbiage to...

Board Member Alvarez: Yeah, just say awnings shall be encouraged.

Board Member Behar: What is similar items?

Board Member Bermello: I had three; canopies, trellises and awnings.

Board Member Alvarez: Encourage, yeah. Awnings shall be encouraged.

Chairperson Pardo: I think the word awnings -- can we put like a material type?

Board Member Alvarez: Well, you can word it better than I did.

Board Member Bermello: It could be a fabric. It could be metal, but...

Board Member Salman: I think the initial objection was to one of just canvas awnings. I think the initial objection was just canvas awning, as I recall.

Board Member Bermello: And what is the objection?

Unidentified Speaker: They get dirty and deteriorate quickly. It's Florida.

Board Member Bermello: I know, except, you know, in a retail sense, they still work. They add to the animation. They make it -- they're lively; they can add cover. It's great for the retail environment, you know, as opposed to a loggia, frankly, kills retail. And you know, if you want to have a dead street, add a lot of loggias, and the retail won't -- just doesn't survive. So -- but again, I can see where an arcade and a loggia does make sense. And that's why, you know, we have a great Board of Architects. So, my thinking of the awnings is usually the developer and the architect will discuss what is the material.

Chairperson Pardo: Could we change the word --? I think, maybe Mitch would agree, instead of using the word "awnings," use the word "canopies."

Board Member Bermello: I think canopy also or trellis. They're different, but they -- there are times that a trellis is the appropriate...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: Element.

Board Member Behar: Let me ask a question. If you have an overhang or you have a -- I don't want to say a canopy, but if you have a slab that is...

Chairperson Pardo: A cantilever.

Unidentified Speaker: An eyebrow.

Board Member Behar: A cantilever that is giving you the protection, but it's not creating the colonnade. So -- and the retail are not -- you know, have a clear view.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Behar: What is that? Is that a similar item?

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, to me, a roof overhang, I mean...

Board Member Behar: Because I agree; arcade/loggia are terrible for retail, terrible, especially that we have to do them 12 feet -- what is the depth, 10 feet?

Board Member Pratt: I think it's 10.

Board Member Behar: 10 feet.

Board Member Bermello: 10 feet.

Board Member Behar: So by the time that, you know...

Board Member Bermello: You don't see it.

Board Member Behar: You can't see it.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. So, I think if we add -- if we change the word to canopies...

Board Member Bermello: I think canopies will be -- I mean, if what you're trying to get out - away from the traditional awning...

Board Member Alvarez: A complement to that should be the façade line on the retail storefront should be receding -- I couldn't tell you whether it's two or three or four feet. But you don't want a flat wall coming down and then a door opening, and then just the awning. You need to make the effort of...

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Alvarez: (INAUDIBLE) to it.

Chairperson Pardo: Can we change that last sentence instead of being a negative, making it into a positive?

Board Member Alvarez: This is not a setback. The structure will still be...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Alvarez: (INAUDIBLE) with no setback. But the presence of the line where the storefront touches ground should be receding.

Unidentified Speaker: Exactly.

Chairperson Pardo: So how about canopies shall be encouraged?

Board Member Alvarez: Yeah, shall be encouraged.

City Architect Riesco: Why don't you just take out the negative? Take out the "do not" and leave it alone. Say awnings and other similar items -- which can imply canopies, trellises, so you don't limit it to certain typologies.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, it could be a trellis, a...

City Architect Riesco: Leave it open-ended, and again, let the Board of Architects...

Board Member Behar: I agree with that.

City Architect Riesco: Make the determination.

Board Member Alvarez: Let me add another little bit of salt here. It will give an opportunity for those designers that really are very intent in creating a style manifestation of the -- all architecture. Those elements would provide them tools to present that case much better than a little arcade or other insignificant pieces, you know. The way you handle that, it could be through (INAUDIBLE),

it could be exquisitely detailed and move the sense -- the style by the sense of what it looks in not just the present, but also -- by the same token, if you choose not to be strictly -- what's the word? -- you know, if you don't want to be strict with the style of the architecture to Mediterranean by making things like that, it can still be a little more simple, but it would achieve a lot for this environment.

Board Member Behar: I think Juan is correct. I think if you take away, the "do not."

City Architect Riesco: That's it. Leave it alone.

Board Member Behar: I think that -- and then again, it's going through the Board of Architects for approval.

City Architect Riesco: Yeah, you have an architect designing it, and you have a board reviewing it.

Chairperson Pardo: So, it will say -- Juan, it would say...

City Architect Riesco: Awnings and other similar items satisfy these provisions.

Board Member Behar: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: Perfect.

City Architect Riesco: Period.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

City Architect Riesco: And leave it open-ended for the architect to choose whether it's an awning, whether it's a canopy, whether it's a trellis. Who are we to dictate that?

Chairperson Pardo: Shall satisfy.

City Architect Riesco: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: There you go.

Unidentified Speaker: Turn the negative into a positive.

Chairperson Pardo: Gus, you good there?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I'm good.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright, number two, building rooflines.

Board Member Bermello: Can you read the entire item, please? Because I -- do you mind?

Chairperson Pardo: I'm sorry?

Board Member Bermello: Can you read the entire item?

Chairperson Pardo: The one we just did?

Board Member Bermello: Yes, please.

Chairperson Pardo: Arcades, loggias, or covered areas constructed adjacent, parallel, and/or perpendicular to buildings to provide cover and protection from the elements for pedestrian

passageways, sidewalks, and other walkways thereby promoting pedestrian passage/use. Limitations of encroachments on corners of buildings may be required to control view corridors and ground stories building bulk and massing and must respect the established setbacks and must not encroach into setbacks of public rights-of-way. Awnings or similar items shall satisfy these provisions.

Board Member Bermello: Okay, so here's where I think there's a problem.

Board Member Alvarez: Are you in line 3?

Board Member Bermello: Okay, so...

Chairperson Pardo: No, we're in...

Board Member Bermello: We're talking about encroachments. And the concept of a loggia, an arcade, where you have columns encroaching on the public realm is an issue, which I think is what this is addressing. But once we introduce an awning, an eyebrow, and overhang, trellis, the whole issue is that, that in fact, can be an encroachment.

Chairperson Pardo: Into the public right-of-way.

Board Member Bermello: Into the public realm because it's not putting -- it's just providing overhang for protection, and it's not providing a screen. It's not creating -- so, I think -- that's why I wanted to read it again, because what makes great retail streets is that you can still see the retail. You see the signage. You don't have to get wet. And so, what if you have an awning or a canopy that's protruding 10 feet into the sidewalk, or if you have a -- you know what I'm saying? If you're having an outdoor café, and there's a cover that overhangs into that area and you're outside on a sidewalk having dining? I mean, who wants to get wet when it's raining in South Florida? So -- but it seems to me that -- I think what I wanted to get away was from any encroachments of

buildings, which is what we see on US 1, where you see the colonnade right on top of the roadways. That's what I think is kind of like bad.

Board Member Pratt: But within the context of the paragraph, it's saying it must respect the established setbacks.

Board Member Bermello: Yes, but then when you read the awnings, that's what threw me at the end. So, imagine your building is at the setback, you've complied with the setback of the front of your storefront of the retail is right there. And if you have a canopy that's protruding over the sidewalk, so as you're walking, it covers part of the sidewalk, where if you have a couple of tables and chairs under it, you know, you're having coffee and you're covered from the element...

Board Member Alvarez: That's part of...

Board Member Bermello: That would not -- it seems to me that would be now prohibited here.

Board Member Behar: But see, I see your point and I'm trying to -- but I don't read that there when it says in respect to the setback -- established setbacks. What I see is awning or similar items satisfy this provision is -- maybe it's not an arcade. Maybe it's not a loggia or a covered area.

Board Member Bermello: Because everything above says must -- which I agree with -- must not encroach, you know, your loggia, your columns, the colonnade has to be within your property.

Board Member Behar: And look, there's an example right here on Le Jeune Road, just the City National Bank. There's an arcade and there's canopies that I think project over...

Chairperson Pardo: The awnings.

Board Member Behar: The right-of-way.

Unidentified Speaker: Right.

Board Member Behar: Right? That's what we don't want to have -- or at least that's what you don't want to have.

Board Member Bermello: Right.

Board Member Behar: Right?

Chairperson Pardo: In the public right-of-way.

Board Member Behar: Right. So -- but -- I mean, I'm not reading that, Willy. I'm reading that awnings and other similar satisfy this provision. That is whatever you do, whether it's an arcade, loggia, or covered areas, or an awning or similar items, has to respect the established setback.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, that's...

Board Member Bermello: Oh, for example...

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON.)

Board Member Bermello: Robert, if we approve this, immediately Caffè Abbracci would be noncompliant...

Board Member Alvarez: Yeah, but those awnings are...

Board Member Bermello: Just to put it in perspective.

Board Member Alvarez: Into the right-of-way.

Board Member Behar: Oh, okay. I got you.

Board Member Bermello: Just put it in perspective.

Board Member Behar: That's a good example.

Board Member Bermello: Ruth's Chris would be noncompliant. We immediately make a bunch of retail owners that have struggled through a whole pandemic, and we just made them noncompliant for something that they've had for years. That does -- I don't think there's anybody that's come -- that's talked to me that they're upset about, you know, the awnings at Caffè Abbracci or Ruth's Chris, you know. It's -- people are upset about different things, not that. So, that's my concern, that if we do that here, it would make immediately -- I mean, maybe we could grandfather them in, but then, you know, what kind of environment do you have walking down Ponce de Leon or -- so, in areas where you have, particularly, eating establishments, you know -- and then someone will say, "Well, I can't have an umbrella either?" You get into all those, you know...

Board Member Pratt: My take on it, Willy, is that -- I mean, in other parts of the Code where it addresses awnings and awnings are permitted to extend into the setback provided they're canvas or non-ferrous metals -- I think is the wording -- but I think that my take on the change that Juan was suggesting is that it permits the Board of Architects to review the project, and that there may be an instance where awnings or other similar items could be used in lieu of arcades or those other features within the project.

Board Member Bermello: Could we then add some phrase regarding the -- as per the discretion of the Board of Architects in their review?

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, I think...

Board Member Bermello: Something along those lines.

Board Member Pratt: That's my take on it is really giving the Board of Architects the...

Board Member Behar: The discretion.

Board Member Bermello: The discretion, yeah.

Board Member Pratt: Ability to determine that.

Board Member Bermello: That will be perfect.

Board Member Behar: I read it the same way. Mitch, you were going to say something?

Board Member Alvarez: I just want to say that I think it's important that these awnings be allowed into the right-of-way. If you -- the moment you said they cannot exceed the property line, then you're really making the owner...

Unidentified Speaker: Push it back.

Board Member Alvarez: Set the building back X number of feet. It may be possible...

City Architect Riesco: And also...

Board Member Alvarez: (INAUDIBLE).

City Architect Riesco: I think there's a distinction. Arcades, loggias imply columns...

Board Member Behar: That's correct.

City Architect Riesco: Which are vertical elements that come to the ground. And awnings, canopies, trellises, these are things that project.

Unidentified Speaker: Correct.

City Architect Riesco: They don't have columns. So...

Board Member Alvarez: Yes.

City Architect Riesco: I think there's a distinction there that we need to make because there's a big difference between something that has a column that comes down to the ground and something that's a projection.

Board Member Bermello: Correct.

City Architect Riesco: So...

Board Member Alvarez: That's the famous value of the outdoor café, that you're not taking away from the owner property, but you're allowing him to create the environment.

Board Member Behar: I'm okay with it.

Board Member Alvarez: And maybe it will never -- maybe it happens only under certain conditions with the sidewalk...

Board Member Behar: But you're right. At Caffè Abbracci is an example, you know. That's exactly what they have, right?

Board Member Alvarez: It doesn't mean it has...

Board Member Behar: And it works.

Board Member Alvarez: To go everywhere.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah.

Board Member Behar: You're right; I agree.

Chairperson Pardo: We should add "may encroach into the public right-of-way."

Board Member Alvarez: May.

Board Member Behar: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: Right, there you go.

Board Member Behar: I'm okay with it.

Board Member Bermello: And you could say subject to review and approval by the Board of Architects.

City Architect Riesco: By the BOA.

Chairperson Pardo: Exactly.

Board Member Alvarez: To be evaluated on condition...

Board Member Behar: It works for me.

Unidentified Speaker: I got it.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. Because there will be height clearance issues also and...

Unidentified Speaker: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: All sorts of other things.

City Architect Riesco: Yeah, that's already in the Code. There's already a height issue...

Chairperson Pardo: Exactly.

City Architect Riesco: A height clearance issue.

Chairperson Pardo: Exactly. Alright, so...

Board Member Bermello: A height issue, distance from the curb...

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: Because of the curb, you know, it could get...

Board Member Behar: That's a good...

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, all of those.

Chairperson Pardo: Number two, the building rooflines. Incorporation of the horizontal and vertical changes in the building roofline. Would you like to add maybe under the development category or type, add the words multiple building rooflines?

Unidentified Speaker: How about multiple building roof elevations?

Chairperson Pardo: I'm sorry?

Unidentified Speaker: Multiple building roof elevations.

Board Member Pratt: I don't know. Actually, I think it's pretty clear the way it is.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah. I think the distinction between horizontal and vertical implies a multiple level.

Board Member Behar: Yeah.

Board Member Pratt: It depends on the size of the building and the site, and there's multiple things that I think...

Unidentified Speaker: Yeah, the idea is not to create a monotonous roof...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Unidentified Speaker: To break it up into pieces so that the scale is lessened.

Chairperson Pardo: And what about shaped parapets included there also?

Board Member Behar: No, I'd leave -- I think the way it is written...

Chairperson Pardo: Alright.

Board Member Behar: Gives enough discretion and...

Chairperson Pardo: Building step back is already -- exists under the design standards; step back, massing, et cetera. It's already there. So, I just wanted to strike it out because it's already there. It's a requirement. Number four, building towers. The use of towers or similar massing to reduce the mass and bulk of buildings. That is not anywhere there. It's not in the 20 there. That's a specific...

Board Member Behar: I think the building tower should be one of the element that is...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Behar: Attributed to the -- I would leave that.

Chairperson Pardo: So -- okay, you'd leave that. Okay.

Board Member Bermello: Wait, if we're going to take building setbacks away, I think there should be some record in maybe the minutes that it was done because we believe that it's already covered elsewhere. And not to give someone the feeling that...

Board Member Behar: It's not required.

Board Member Bermello: That this is not required...

Chairperson Pardo: No, no, no.

Board Member Bermello: Or it's not important...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: Because it is.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, if you remember, Willy, at the very end of the meeting, the last time, we added that -- specifically for that, we added the words "and Section 5-102 Design Review Standards, A and B," and that was added in there right above Table 1. And if you notice, Table 2 doesn't have that little preface above it. It's above Table 1 under 1. And what that says is, "Applications shall be required to satisfy all the requirements of Articles 2 and 3," which are Zoning and Uses, "and Section 5-102 Design Review Standards, A and B, and in Table 1 required standards," et cetera. And then when you go to Table, 2 that preface of required standards, that's already there. So that's why, Willy, we did take care of that, and that was the last thing we did at the last meeting.

Board Member Bermello: Okay.

Board Member Pratt: The only thing that -- Mr. Chairman -- I would -- is Robert had a suggestion about adding the sentence that the Board of Architects at its discretion may allow for variations to underlying zoning step back requirements. And I -- and there are -- we're talking about number three.

Board Member Behar: In the building step back.

Board Member Pratt: If we did leave that in there. And I think that -- I support Robert's suggestion, because I think that not all -- it's -- not all designs are a one-size-fit-all, you know. There's...

Board Member Behar: Yeah, I...

Board Member Pratt: There can -- there may need to be some adjustments and sometimes if it's at the discretion of the board, if it's something that the board considers and reviews, and finds that it's acceptable, you know, I think that that would be something.

Chairperson Pardo: So...

Board Member Behar: That's the language in...

Chairperson Pardo: I have no objection to that, the building step back. Instead of being stricken, Gus, if you could add the verbiage "the Board of Architects at its discretion may allow for variations to underlying zoning setback requirements." This is under specifically building setbacks, not setbacks, setbacks.

Board Member Bermello: Where is it right now, mostly at 45 feet and above? Is that where the setbacks occur?

Board Member Behar: Correct.

Board Member Pratt: Right. That's where the Code says.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. Not setback.

Board Member Bermello: No, the setback.

Board Member Pratt: The setbacks.

Board Member Bermello: Stepbacks is at 45 feet.

Chairperson Pardo: S-T-E-P, correct, very different. Okay, moving on.

Unidentified Speaker: You all agreed to four, right?

Chairperson Pardo: Under -- we discussed powers. Driveways. Again, the consolidation of vehicular entrances, et cetera. What I wanted to do, if it was okay, if you can indulge me for a minute, I wanted to just go ahead and strike out lighting and landscaping, and I'll tell you why. The lighting of landscaping, I think it's something that, you know, it is an enhancement obviously, but this is something that I don't think merits, you know, the importance of additional height and additional FAR. This is a minor type of thing, but I do want to -- I would like to strike out that, the overhead doors, and the paver treatments. And what I wanted to do, depending on what the committee would like to do, is I'd like to be able to add courtyards and with a minimum size of -- saying courtyards, a minimum of 800 square feet, which was previously 400 square feet. And then also, water features shall include substantial areas and detail for BOA approval, and this would be all under courtyards, so it would be courtyards and...

Board Member Behar: Why don't we go back to --? One at a time. Let's go -- let's deal with the driveways.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah.

Board Member Behar: Okay. I mean, I think, when possible, consolidation of vehicular entrance is appropriate. But you may have cases where you cannot do all of them in one.

Board Member Bermello: But still, this is a good incentive. I mean, you know, you can have a project where you have a lot of street frontage and then you decide to put three driveway entrances, curb cuts, and you kind of kill the whole pedestrian continuity. I think forcing or enticing the

developer that says, you know, we got to hide the back of-house, limit the entryways, pinch those as much as possible. As far as the public realm, I think it's...

Board Member Behar: I agree with you on...

Board Member Bermello: It's important.

Board Member Behar: When you reference like that, yes. When possible, you want to do that. What about if your lot is...

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, if you only have one street frontage, let's just say you're between two lots, there you got no choices. You know, you're going to have one or -- hopefully, not two, but at least one, right? But I still think it's a good thing to...

Unidentified Speaker: Incentivize.

Board Member Bermello: Incentivize. Unless -- now if you tell me that we have this somewhere else in the Code, and it's already required, no discussion. But if not, I think this is a good thing to have.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, and that -- if that's the case, then what you could do is substitute under pedestrian amenities section where it says freestanding information kiosk. No advertise -- instead of that, add that there.

Board Member Bermello: Where is it? Where?

Chairperson Pardo: Under pedestrian amenities. If you go to the second page, number 10...

Board Member Bermello: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: You see it says benches, expanded sidewalk widths beyond the property line.

Board Member Bermello: I think that's talking about something totally different. This is more about site planning the property, proper site planning.

Unidentified Speaker: This is site furniture.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, this is site furniture. This is benches and...

Unidentified Speaker: Planter boxes.

Board Member Bermello: This is more street furniture and (INAUDIBLE).

Unidentified Speaker: Water features, fountains, other similar features.

Board Member Bermello: This isn't a -- you could say it's a pedestrian sensitive approach, but I would not put it in the context of a planter box or public art.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, and then the other thing is that conceptually right now, there is a certain amount of items that if you have X amount of items, you get the bonus. And there's a difference between residential and mixed use. And you know, I would like to ask what the committee feels about instead of doing it by checking off X amount of these items, about providing a fraction of the FAR for a certain amount to be able to get up to the maximum of 3.

Board Member Bermello: I mean, I have a different position there. My feeling is you should do all of them. No, you know...

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah, if you do all of them, you get the .3.

Board Member Behar: Yeah, if you get all of them, you get the -- I agree.

Board Member Bermello: You get it. Yeah, and that's...

Unidentified Speaker: Substantial completion, like we talked about, you know. You have to comply with...

Board Member Bermello: You got to do it.

Unidentified Speaker: If you're going to get it, you got to do the work.

Board Member Bermello: I mean, you're going for .3 and an additional floor, I think -- and you -
- the message is, you've got to do all of these, period, you know.

Chairperson Pardo: And I'm thinking is that it is possible that this would work for larger buildings,
but not necessarily smaller buildings. So that's why I was...

Board Member Bermello: Which one do you think would not work for smaller buildings?

Board Member Pratt: I think it would work on any project.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, I think this...

Chairperson Pardo: On any project?

Unidentified Speaker: Yeah.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: I think so.

Board Member Pratt: To the extent possible, I think that they could be implemented, yes.

Chairperson Pardo: So -- okay, so in other words, instead of 7 out of 10, or 6 out of 10, depending on what it is...

Board Member Pratt: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: Number one, the committee feels that it should be the same for residential and mixed-use.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: And it should be all of them.

Board Member Bermello: All.

Board Member Pratt: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: Absolutely.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Unidentified Speaker: That include underground parking?

Board Member Bermello: If you're sending a message, you know, (INAUDIBLE) to the Commission, I think this is a strong message being sent.

Board Member Behar: You need to...

Board Member Bermello: Comply, boom.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright, okay. So...

Board Member Bermello: I mean, I'd like...

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE) like to leave...

Board Member Bermello: I recommend we keep the driveways because it's definitely a plus.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright.

Board Member Bermello: For the pedestrian realm and the public realm to have those minimized, consolidated.

Chairperson Pardo: I have no issue whatsoever keeping that and adding lighting, and then this becomes --it's all or nothing.

Board Member Behar: All or nothing is the way to go.

Chairperson Pardo: What about the overhead doors?

Board Member Bermello: You know, one thing about lighting -- and I know this is another topic. I mean, cities are known for their lights and parts of cities, you know; in Paris, City of Lights, Manhattan. So, I think lighting is an important ingredient for the pageantry, nighttime of cities. And I don't know whether it's here or somewhere else, but I think whether uplighting, you know,

a row of date palms or the colonnade on a building, the cupola on the roof, I think all of those are things -- and yeah, how are you going to police it later on? But I think there are things that are very important for -- at ground level and the cityscape.

Unidentified Speaker: I agree.

Board Member Bermello: They add to, you know, what makes the City special.

Unidentified Speaker: And when you don't do it, it's a problem.

Board Member Bermello: I'm sorry?

Unidentified Speaker: And when you don't do it, it's a problem.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, and...

Unidentified Speaker: At Coral Gables Museum, we ended up putting in lighting just to get lighting on the plaza so they could use it, and then we took advantage and lit up a tower and it helped create a public place.

Board Member Bermello: And it's beautiful. Imagine when it's dark. It's, you know...

Board Member Behar: I think it's a must.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, done. Alright, so what about the overhead doors? I mean, it just...

Board Member Behar: I think today you are required to put them 20 feet behind a distance, right?

Board Member Pratt: Yeah.

Board Member Behar: But not...

Unidentified Speaker: Not on the plane of the building.

Board Member Behar: Not at the -- yeah.

Unidentified Speaker: The plane of the building. It has to be back.

Board Member Behar: And I think, you know, in some buildings, I would want to close if you have a loading area or something to make sure I don't see into it. So -- but it -- like -- again, today you're require to set it back 20 feet or whatever it is, from the face of the building. I think that's okay.

Chairperson Pardo: So you mean leave it in? What about the paver treatment?

Unidentified Speaker: I -- with regards to the overhead doors, I don't have a problem with -- for vehicular entrances, but I'd like to be able to close up trash rooms and stuff like that. I think we need to just define it because otherwise the prohibition of, you know...

Board Member Bermello: We're leaving the overhead doors, right, or --?

Chairperson Pardo: Alright, paver treatments; leave them in or take them out? That's number 9.

Unidentified Speaker: 9 A, B.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah. The only thing I think I'd like to add is not just Public Works. I'd like to add the Board of Architects. No offense, Public Works. They're going to look at other issues.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah, they're going to be looking at it at permit level anyway.

Board Member Bermello: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: So, you know, as far as their standards.

Unidentified Speaker: Agreed, that's it.

Chairperson Pardo: I think we should substitute completely there Public Works Department and simply state, you know, Board of Architects approval, because when they do go in for their permit, they will have to go to Public Works. Then pedestrian amenities. How many times...

Board Member Bermello: So, it also has minimums. And can we get rid of the minimums? And you know, like if you were incentivizing to amenitize the driveway, which is really what we're trying to do -- right? -- have the entire driveway, not 10 percent of the driveway.

Chairperson Pardo: The percentages are a bad idea.

Board Member Bermello: So get rid of the percentages.

Chairperson Pardo: Get rid of those.

Board Member Bermello: Just say if you're in the Gables, we expect you -- the driveways, they're going to be beautiful.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: They're going to be amenitized. The sidewalk, you're going to be doing the Coral Gables standard, you know, not 25 percent, the entire thing, right?

Chairperson Pardo: Agreed. Any objection to that?

Board Member Behar: No.

Board Member Pratt: No.

Unidentified Speaker: No.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Unidentified Speaker: None.

Chairperson Pardo: Gus, you got that?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: My only question is, what will the language read then if we remove percentage?

Chairperson Pardo: It will just say drive...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Just simply include paver treatment in all the following locations, driveways and sidewalks?

Board Member Bermello: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: And then the type of pavers shall be determined or shall be approved by the Board of Architects.

Board Member Bermello: Correct.

Chairperson Pardo: So, poured concrete color, you know, that doesn't have to be in there. It's already required by Public Works. Okay, and then pedestrian amenities as well -- leave it intact, except freestanding information kiosk. You know, I don't see the applicability anywhere.

Board Member Behar: I've never seen it used correct. I've never seen them used.

Board Member Bermello: Which one?

Board Member Behar: Freestanding.

Chairperson Pardo: The C, freestanding information kiosks. Kind of bizarre. And by the way, have you all ever seen the City of Coral Gables Master Streetscape Plan?

Board Member Pratt: I've seen some versions of it, but I've never seen a final one, and it gets consistently changed.

Chairperson Pardo: If they have that, I think, you know, from an enforceability, does that happen...

Board Member Pratt: We've seen on the -- I know that in some applications we've seen, the Board of Architects have tried to ensure that the master plan is implemented. But the -- Public Works

has changed multiple times on requiring landscape bulb outs and then not requiring landscape bulb outs, and so there's a hodgepodge of multiple conditions.

Chairperson Pardo: I personally would take it out because it - we don't even know what it is.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: We don't know. It's a moving target. I mean, why...

Board Member Pratt: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: Put it on there. Does everyone agree to that?

Board Member Pratt: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: To do what?

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: To do what?

Chairperson Pardo: To take out the last sentence of number 10, above amenities shall be consistent in design and form with the City of Coral Gables Master Streetscape Plan.

Board Member Bermello: Again, I haven't -- I'm not familiar with what the streetscape plan says or requires, so pardon the ignorance, but I'll just make a comment. With the additional mobility and different modes of transportation that you see around town, I've also seen in the public realm and the sidewalks, particularly Miracle Mile and surrounding streets, a proliferation of the bicycle racks that are currently being used. And I think before we get too far into the future, we're going

to see like a smorgasbord of all this littering features along our city's sidewalks. And just like we have the Coral Gables Bank and Key Biscayne has the green sidewalks, has an element of continuity, not for this board, but I think maybe for the City architect to -- that there should be some elements of continuity that if you are providing some of these elements, whether it's in the sidewalk area, in the public realm, that it should be consistent and that you shouldn't have 20 different types of trashcans or bicycle racks all over the place. I mean, it looks chaotic. It starts to look like -- and so having elements of continuity with the light posts, and that if a developer is going into that area, that he's going to abide by that. Otherwise, every property owner is going to do whatever the heck they want within that sphere. And you know, even though these can all be amenities, if everybody does something different and puts it out in the front, it can start to look pretty bad.

Unidentified Speaker: I want to go back a second to where we were talking about the City of Coral Gables Master Streetscape Plan. It exists, it's out there. It includes a lot more than just streetscape finishes and furniture and whatnot. It includes signage, public signage for parking and try to get some uniformity, and that was the intent.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright, so let's keep it in then.

Unidentified Speaker: It came out of the Communications Board in part, and was worked through with Public Works on a lot of...

Board Member Pratt: I know that I've seen it for the -- down in the Merrick Park area, but I don't know that I've ever seen anything completed up to the North Ponce or generalized through the City. I think that...

Unidentified Speaker: Well, the parking location signs are all the same.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Unidentified Speaker: And they're on different buildings.

Chairperson Pardo: I would like to, if you don't mind, do we want to leave it in there because we don't even know what it is.

Unidentified Speaker: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: I would want to know what it is. I think uniformity in the public realm is an important consideration.

Unidentified Speaker: Is super important. I couldn't agree more.

Board Member Bermello: You know, and...

Unidentified Speaker: We're doing that with umbrellas and street tables and chairs. We're trying to come up with a standard.

Unidentified Speaker: Leave it in.

Unidentified Speaker: So leave it in for now.

Unidentified Speaker: That's what I'd like to do is leave it in.

Unidentified Speaker: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chair, do you think we could make a stopping point here tonight? Is that possible?

Chairperson Pardo: And -- well, I wanted to do something. In all fairness to the public, I know that you and Robert have to leave.

Unidentified Speaker: I've got to also. I can't stay either. I need to leave too.

Board Member Behar: I think e reached a stopping point. We'll deal with number 11, but I -- you know, next time.

Chairperson Pardo: No, what I wanted to do is just -- if the public wants to speak, as long as we have a quorum.

Board Member Behar: I'll stay. I'll stay for the public to speak.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. I mean, we need four people for a quorum, correct, Mr. Attorney?

Unidentified Speaker: I think five.

Chairperson Pardo: Five? Okay.

Unidentified Speaker: Five for quorum?

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, if the comments can be very, very brief. You know, we've spent a lot of time and I think that if there was confusion before, I think that a lot of -- there's been a lot of explanation and there shouldn't be.

City Clerk Urquia: Mr. Chair, before you guys -- before everyone leaves, just really quick, we had set up the meetings up until today. Do we want to continue scheduled meetings every Thursday?

Board Member Behar: I -- personally, yes.

Unidentified Speaker: Yes.

Board Member Behar: I recommend -- I make a motion that we extend the meetings.

Board Member Bermello: I second the motion.

Chairperson Pardo: Second.

Unidentified Speaker: I agree to extend; however, this next Thursday, I've got a previous commitment. This board was supposed to meet for a month, and I did schedule something for the 19th, and I'm not going to be able to be here.

Chairperson Pardo: And I also know that...

Unidentified Speaker: So I'd like to be excused.

Chairperson Pardo: Mitch will not be here either.

Board Member Behar: Well, then we don't meet this coming Thursday. We'll meet the following Thursday.

City Clerk Urquia: Understood. And one more thing, Mr. Chair, would you like to place an item on the August 24 City Commission agenda...

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

City Clerk Urquia: Providing an update?

Chairperson Pardo: I'll -- I think it would be good to give a report to the Commission of what our progress has been so far, because at the time that the blue-ribbon committee was initiated, they were talking about 30-day clips on that, and I think that would be important. So, let's take this as a stopping point. And I would like to have the Clerk call anyone that would come up -- and you have to leave? You can leave. Thank you very much. We know that we're not going to have a meeting next week. We'll have it the following Thursday.

City Clerk Urquia: Correct. So, no meeting for Thursday, August 19th. The next meeting will be August 26th at 4 p.m.

Chairperson Pardo: Correct.

Unidentified Speaker: Perfect.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you, Mitch. Thanks for being here.

City Clerk Urquia: The first speaker we have is Maria Magdalena Estupinan.

Board Member Pratt: If things can be quick, I'll...

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Maria Magdalena Estupinan: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: Your name and address for...

Ms. Estupinan: My name is Maria Magdalena Estupinan, 21 Madeira Avenue. I apologize if I interrupted you. It's just that I wanted to clarify because I was confused and maybe the people that were watching were also confused. I keep hearing the word "incentive," and I'm kind of confused

because it's like me going to Harry Winston because I want to buy a diamond and then thinking that Harry Winston is going to cater to me or try to accommodate me. Either I can pay for the diamond, or I can go to -- I don't know -- Zale's maybe or Macy's. So, my point is -- and Mr. Behar kept saying, "Well, you know, we have to give incentive, because then we might have a building glass tower," and no. I mean, we have a set of -- this is what we want. This is Coral Gables. If it doesn't fit you for your purposes, you can go to another city, and that's my point. I do not understand why we have to give them incentives to kind of -- the developer get good architects. If he cannot get a good architect to just do the work here in Coral Gables, they can go to another place. So am I confused that you were discussing that point for over 45 minutes?

Chairperson Pardo: No, a little bit.

Ms. Estupinan: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: And I'll tell you...

Ms. Estupinan: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: Let me explain.

Ms. Estupinan: Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: If you don't mind. First of all, there are certain design elements.

Ms. Estupinan: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: For example, under the public realm thing, for example, you're not required to have arcades. You're not required to have loggias. You're not required to have fountains. You're not required to have towers. You're not required to have all sorts of these things.

Ms. Estupinan: Right.

Chairperson Pardo: And they all cost money to do.

Ms. Estupinan: Right.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, so that doesn't mean that you can't have a beautiful building that the Board of Architects can improve, but they won't have these public realm improvements.

Ms. Estupinan: Right.

Chairperson Pardo: So, therefore, you create incentives to be able to offset giving someone a bonus for something that is special or unique. So, that's one part of it. The discussion that we were in the middle of has to do with another component of it that we are going to debate, discuss, and hopefully, agree to in the near future.

Ms. Estupinan: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: So, the reason that you create the incentive is to be able to provide something that is unique, that is special, that goes beyond good, that it goes to excellent. So, these things, the reason you provide those incentives, those bonuses are very specific to be able to get these things that are not in the Code.

Board Member Behar: That are not required.

Ms. Estupinan: Right. And I follow -- I don't see -- then I would have to kind of look what is in there because why do you have to have an arcade? Why do you have to have this? You see what I'm saying? So, my point -- and it has nothing to do with you gentlemen. Maybe it's just the way

of the City putting that there so they can give incentives to the developers and that is exactly my point. If you have a beautiful building -- I mean, if you are a good architect, you can have a beautiful Mediterranean building. And we're not talking about arcades or this or that. You see what I'm saying?

Board Member Behar: I don't because those are component and element that make the Mediterranean architecture great. And if you don't provide those incentive, the developer may say, "You know what, I'm going to do a building that is flat and I'm not going to provide an arcade that you see in a lot of the Mediterranean cities," in Paris, for example.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Behar: So, that costs a developer money. So, in return, I might -- what I --- my professional opinion is that you do give them those incentives in order for us as a City to get that is going to benefit the public.

Ms. Estupinan: Okay, well, I just, you know, respectfully disagree. I think they can go to another place with their -- if they don't want to comply with Coral Gables look or whatever we're requiring. And as a matter of fact, that would be a blessing right now because we have too much of the benefit. And I thank you so much.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you. Next.

Unidentified Speaker: Thank you for waiting.

City Clerk Urquia: Okay. The next speaker is Mr. Tom O'Malley.

Mr. O'Malley: Thank you, sir. My one comment might be kind of long, so what I would like to know is, can I send you a message, Mr. Chair? And it's an email, so...

Board Member Behar: I think it goes through the Clerk, right?

Mr. O'Malley: Who does -- who would it go to?

City Clerk Urquia: Absolutely, yes. Send the Clerk an email, and then I'll distribute it amongst the board members.

Chairperson Pardo: Distribute it to all the board members if you'd like. But do you have any specific question or concern at this time?

Mr. O'Malley: One other item Sue Kawalerski asked me to bring up is that she doesn't believe that green space, open green space should be allowed to be computed on right-of-way, so there shouldn't be any planters or whatever they may be, that should be placed on a sidewalk or right-of-way.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Mr. O'Malley: And so, she wanted...

Chairperson Pardo: The calculation should -- in Sue's comment to you, the calculation should be within the private lot.

Mr. O'Malley: Correct. Thank you, sir.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you, Mr. O'Malley.

City Clerk Urquia: That's it, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you. Anyone on Zoom?

City Clerk Urquia: No, sir.

Chairperson Pardo: Very good, thank you. A motion to adjourn?

Board Member Behar: Motion to adjourn.

Unidentified Speaker: Second.

Unidentified Speaker: Second.

Chairperson Pardo: Second.

Board Member Behar: You all have a great -- and we'll see you in two weeks.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright, perfect. Thank you.

City of Coral Gables Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting
August 26, 2021
City Commission Chambers
405 Biltmore Way, Coral Gables, FL

Blue Ribbon Committee Members

Chairperson Felix Pardo

Board Member Aramis "Mitch" Alvarez

Board Member Robert Behar

Board Member Willy Bermello

Board Member Glenn Pratt

Board Member Javier Salman

City Staff

Assistant City Attorney, Gustavo Ceballos

City Clerk, Billy Urquia

City Architect, Juan Riesco

Planning and Zoning Director, Ramon Trias

Public Speaker(s)

Chairperson Pardo: Good afternoon. Welcome to the City of Coral Gables Blue-ribbon Committee meeting of August 26. Just to let you know, Mr. Clerk, Mr. Salman is running about 10 minutes late. He will get here, but we'd like to start the meeting on time, please.

City Clerk Urquia: I will make note of that, sir.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. Will you call the roll, please?

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Alvarez?

Board Member Alvarez: Here.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Behar?

Board Member Behar: Here.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Bermello?

Board Member Bermello: Present.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Pratt?

Board Member Pratt: Here.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Salman? He's going to be 10 minutes late. I apologize. Board Member Riesco?

City Architect Riesco: Here.

City Clerk Urquia: Chairman Pardo?

Chairperson Pardo: Here.

City Clerk Urquia: Sir, you have a quorum.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you. So, we took a week off and we've received notes that Gus Ceballos, our Assistant City Attorney, has been gracious enough to provide to us on a preliminary

basis, his -- the changes that he's recorded because he uses the verbatim text to be able to add that information there. You see that in red. And at the last meeting, we had gone a pretty good clip, and we had pretty much gone through Table 2, and we'll pick up there. But I wanted to share something with the board first.

Board Member Behar: And before we start, Mr. Chair -- if I may -- give me a second. Because I want to bring out -- and something that I want to see -- bring it out to the board and see. We elected Mr. Pardo as the chairperson. This past Tuesday, Mr. Pardo appeared before the City Commission. And what sounded as not only to me, but other people, that you were representing this committee. With all due respect, I don't think that this committee has concluded our work, in order for you to go and represent the work that we're still doing. You and I -- you mentioned to me that you had gone only to -- because I came -- I was watching at the office, and I came -- and you mentioned that you were just getting the time extension. I'm perfectly fine with that, but what I don't think - - at this point, I want to at least from my opinion, my voice, is that we have not concluded. Therefore, we cannot be representing to Commission anything that is yet a work in progress. Just wanted to put that out there. I think that once we conclude our work, then it's a different story.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. Let me answer that. I was requested by the Commission to provide an update -- which I did -- of the work of the board. In fact, Mr. Ceballos actually started on the timing, where we were, and what he thought we were doing on the timing of the work of the board. I also explained to them, there was a draft of Mr. Ceballos, except not this one, but the previous one that we were provided that said draft on it. And that was used by the Commission to see the work that had been accomplished at that point. They -- I explained to them also that these were the general agreement of this board. And then I also explained that we were at a crossroads because there was a specific issue that we needed direction from the Commission because at the end of the day, we are making a recommendation to the Commission. It's the Commission's right to address any and all changes to the Code. And then at that point, I said that at the last -- the previous meeting -- and hopefully, I did not misstate it -- but at the previous meeting, that there was a difference of opinion of the style of architecture that would be allowed if it would be -- for the

bonuses. In other words, if it would be all styles of architecture or if it would be Mediterranean. The Commission asked several questions. The -- what was supposed to be a brief meeting lasted two hours. And at their direction, they stated that the style of architecture that they wanted to be promoted for the bonuses would be Coral Gables Mediterranean style, and that's the direction of the Commission. Now, Mr. Ceballos, you being our City Attorney -- Assistant City Attorney and you were there, have I misstated anything that I just said?

Board Member Behar: Before you do that, Mr. Ceballos, Mr. Pardo, you went and you -- example of some buildings that you brought in as an example of -- and besides that, I may agree with you in some of those buildings but -- because we -- you know, the Plaza was brought in. And what we may have, our personal opinion, which we may agree on, we are not yet concluded our work to give those opinions based on behalf of the committee. If you do it on behalf of Felix Pardo, architect, it's a different story.

Chairperson Pardo: No. I was asked to attend because I was the Chair, and I was asked to attend and give a synopsis.

Board Member Behar: And Mr. Ceballos could now address was the example of work -- you know, building used in the presentation. And you know, that's what I gathered. That's why I left my office, and I came over.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. Well...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: In regards to the comments from the Chair, I believe it's an accurate reflection of what occurred during the Commission meeting. Just for the purposes of everyone that maybe did not watch the Commission meeting, I reiterated no less than three different times at the very beginning of the item that everything that was being presented and every document that they had received was a draft, a very rough draft that has not -- it does not show an accurate reflection of the intent of this committee. So, at least to that end, I believe the Commission

had the right idea that what they were seeing was a very rough draft that still had a good amount of work left to be done. In regards to the comparison of the architecture, I don't think at any point was Mr. Pardo stepping out of bounds in his purview, I guess. But I'll defer to the board if they believe differently.

Chairperson Pardo: I was -- and the other thing is, I've been the Chairman for many boards over my career, and I always try to be very impartial. I try to be a good listener to people. I don't try to talk over people or make them feel that their opinion is not worthy. And hopefully, I haven't done that to you, Robert. And at the same time, I try to be very even-handed, because if you recall at the last meeting that we had two Thursdays ago, there was a big difference of opinion amongst us. So, one of the things about this is that the Commission, number one, wanted to understand the timing because they were extending both the life of this committee and also extending the life of the moratorium that is still in place. The second thing is that I wanted clear direction from the Commission as far as what they wanted to do, and I showed them examples of architecture, just a few photographs to try to hurry up, you know, their understanding of what we were talking about. And I gave them examples where they could choose, you could go this way, or you could go that way. I was not necessarily trying to do anything except have them give us direction, so we understand which way we were going, because at the last meeting, if you recall we had a lot of discussion, and then once we had the discussion, I requested that we continue -- go around and continue with the particular section of the Med bonuses, so we could continue the pace that we've been going. And the Commission was clear, and in fact, Mr. Ceballos provided -- he says, "Additionally, I am providing the latest working draft and the following guidance from the City Commission." And they issued guidance: Number one, discussion of 5-200 shall be limited to Mediterranean architecture only. Future discussions may be had on different architecture. Number two, further define the term "compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood" because they did not want it to be too subjective. Number three, expand on the applicable design standards as they would apply to Mediterranean bonuses; make it less objective. Again, that was another concern they had. And number four, the Commission would like to have a final draft for the September 14th meeting. It will then go to the Planning and Zoning Board and come back to the second

reading of the Commission on September 28th. So, I was there representing this board as the committee chairman because I was requested by the Commission to address the board. I did not show up there as Felix Pardo, architect, or anything like that. And furthermore, I want you to also understand that I also attended the Board of Architects meeting, not today, but of the previous week. I did not speak at that board meeting. In fact, Glenn was -- and the City Architect were there. and I said there simply watching the process in real time of a particular project that was coming for Med bonuses, because I wanted to be clear on how the discussion was going. And I only use that for my own edification, but I wasn't there representing the Board. I didn't ask to be addressed.

Board Member Behar: And Felix -- and I agree with you on 90 percent of what you said. Okay, the only thing I didn't agree on Tuesday is that you got into example -- because I don't think we're prepared to do that. And like I said before, I may agree on a one-to-one basis on some of that. But as a committee, I don't think we're ready to do that just yet.

Chairperson Pardo: Oh, know, and I get that.

Board Member Behar: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: And Robert, this is -- you know, what I'm trying to do -- and I said fair -- I always try to be very fair, you know. And one of the things is, there are a lot of concerns. There are a lot of things that we haven't gotten to. We're trying to get it to the point. And the other thing is that when this final draft goes to the Commission, I'm sure they're going to ask, you know, that we're there. I'm going to ask every board member to be there. So, I was -- you know, this was not intended in any way to omit -- in fact, I was embarrassed because when the Mayor recognized Robert sitting in the back, I had not seen him in the back. And in fact, I turned around, and I said, "I'm sorry, Robert. I didn't see you there. If not, I would have recognized you immediately."

Board Member Behar: And you noticed that I did not come up to say anything to you.

Chairperson Pardo: No, no, no.

Board Member Behar: Okay. I was very...

Chairperson Pardo: And that's the whole point.

Board Member Behar: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: And you know, so for me, you know, I...

Board Member Behar: Listen, just wanted to put out -- we put it -- just we know that...

Chairperson Pardo: That's fine.

Board Member Behar: Moving forward, we -- as a committee, we need to be...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Behar: All together.

Chairperson Pardo: Exactly. And I explained also to the Commission quite clearly too, that I said it's not easy to get seven architects to agree on everything.

Board Member Salman: Or anything.

Chairperson Pardo: And I said that to them, and they also chuckled. It's not easy to get anyone - you know, when it's a committee. I said, if it were one person, this thing could have been done in a few days. But it's seven people, seven ideas, seven thoughts. We all, you know, respect each

other, and that's all we're trying to do. So, when I was asked to go there, it was a multi-purpose thing. And by the way, the Commissioners and the Mayor asked me personally, not as a committee member, but asked me personally several things that had nothing to do with this committee, about my opinion on certain designs and certain things. And that is their prerogative to do. And they could do it with anyone. So...

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chair.

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: If we could, I think this point of the report has been established. You explained it. Mr. Behar has brought up, you know, good points. I suggest that we consider moving on. And if I may just make just quick points. Number one is, I want to thank staff for providing us with an updated redline. It was very helpful. And I'm sure you all appreciate having received it before today, as I certainly did. And since we're now at a certain point of having gone through it, there were a couple of items that I found that at least in my memory, in one case, I know we had taken a different tact, and this is not saying that staff did not do a good job in recording the minutes or transcribing, but I'd just like -- and I sent it last night -- I'd like to bring it up quickly. They're not big points. I don't think there's going to be a lot of discussion on them. But I recall very clearly that when issue of the historic designation came up, and there was the language of, you know, assessed value, and we had the Historic Preservation Officer of the City of Coral Gables stand before us and we said to him, "Who's going to say that a property is assessed as valuable or not?" You're going to have them -- every resident and neighbor. And it was decided at that moment that we would strike the word of assessed, and we would just keep it as designated historic properties. Now, if the City staff is short-handed, they're not properly funded to do their work, and therefore, not all properties that should be designated have been designated, that's really not our purview, and that really should not be our problem. I think then we can each talk to our fellow Commissioners and say that sufficient funds should be assigned. Maybe the community foundation can assign monies. But I think the wording here should be focused only on designated,

and I know that this entire committee agreed on that. But as I read the top of page 54, it certainly was not reflected like that, and it left the wording of assessed to be of historic value. Because remember, I said, "Assessed by who? Assessed by me?" And I think -- Glenn, I think I might have used, you know, comments about some of the things that you had to go through in other projects. So, I just want to bring that up because of the word "assessed" here. And this will create that. This -- with this, any property owner can designate himself or herself a historian expert, and show up and say, "I believe that this particular property has high assessed historic value." So, I think that's dangerous, and I recommend -- I think we had decided upon it, but it's back...

Board Member Pratt: No, we did.

Board Member Bermello: It's back here.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: It's on the redline.

Chairperson Pardo: And I think the example, Willy, was the San Sebastian Apartments that are not designated yet, but that -- and I think Robert said, but it's obvious that...

Board Member Pratt: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: It has value. So, I don't know if there's any wording...

Board Member Bermello: Yeah. The problem is that for every one that falls like that, I can -- there'll be 100 on the other side...

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah, I think we agreed.

Board Member Bermello: Where they have no value, and somebody will come up...

Chairperson Pardo: And I think we agreed to leave it as designated.

Board Member Bermello: And it becomes, you know, a free for all. I mean, every municipality of our size or larger with...

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah, I think...

Board Member Bermello: A Historic Preservation Office, that's really one of their number one goals, is assess the community housing stock and building stock and determine which are of historical architectural significance and get them designated. You know, and if they're of high significance, go to the Department of Interior or the state, et cetera, so...

Chairperson Pardo: And I think you are correct. What we did is we struck that out. We agreed to strike that out, which is not reflected in 54, so it should be Gables Commission -- adopted by the Coral Gables Commission.

Board Member Bermello: And it should read, "And buildings designated to be of historic value," is the way that that should -- so the word "designation" connotes a formal governmental, almost quasi-judicial registration of the properties.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: And I think staff and the City Attorney would know what that means. I don't think there will be an issue that would need -- I mean, do you agree, Mr. Ceballos? That limiting to properties that are designated to be of historic value -- I mean, designated is the term that is...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Yeah, that's fine. What we can do is I'll just strike the entire last part of the sentence, so it would read, "Compatibility of designated historic landmarks and the historic City plan adopted by Coral Gables Commission." Done.

Chairperson Pardo: Correct.

Board Member Bermello: Perfect.

Chairperson Pardo: Again, that's what we had agreed to the first time.

Unidentified Speaker: Perfect.

Board Member Bermello: The other one, my memory fails me, so you'll forgive me. I know that I had touched on it, but we might not have voted on it. I just don't -- you know, sometimes we discuss, we agree, but we may not necessarily take a vote. And it was just above Table 2. And the concept was -- and the way that the paragraph starts to read was, "The Board of Architects shall review all applications for compliance," blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. It's all related to the Board of Architects. And then there's a sub little A and sub little B. And at that point, the comment was eliminate the prescription of a minimum of six or a minimum of eight.

Unidentified Speaker: Correct.

Board Member Bermello: Simply say strive to perfection; you know, always try to do the most you can. But it's subject to the purview of the Board of Architects because there will be some projects where doing five or six may be impossible. And the architects will see -- the board will see it. Other projects, you should do all 12. It's not an issue; it should be done all 12. They'll start to say five or six. Well, which five or six, you know? So that was my suggestion. Now, the board, I don't think we voted on it, and maybe we didn't vote because there wasn't support of it. But I -- whenever I looked at this -- to me, as an architect, it's kind of like the kind of things that I do with

my kids, you know. You can pick two or three of the toys, but you can't -- you know. And it's almost like, it's -- you know what I'm saying? I mean, we're all professionals. And if you say this criteria is good, this criteria below here are things that we should have on every project, when you try to strive to the first level of bonuses. Try to do all of them. And if you can't do one or two or three, when you go to the board, you say, we were not able to do this because of this. And this one, we were not able to do it because of that. I think the board will say, "You know, you're right, you know. Okay, so you're able to do 10 out of 12, okay." So, I think that's different than saying, "You know what, you only have to do half of them, or you only do three quarters of them."

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: I think it's a mindset. You know, I'm sure that each of us in our offices with our staff when we give instruction or we set a mission or we set a series of guidelines, I know that each one of us tries in every area to go to the maximum and when we can't do something we say, "Well, this -- we tried our best, but this one we couldn't." And I mean, I don't have a problem with that. And just like the Commission said, give more definition or this is too subjective. I like subjectivity. I hate prescription on things that people don't know what the project is, what the program is, what the location is, and you got something that's telling you a lot of prescriptive stuff. I rely more on having very bright people that are well-intended sitting on a dais, looking at what you're doing. That's just my personal thing. I see Robert saying no, maybe he wants prescription. And...

Board Member Behar: I guess you were not in the Board of Architects today.

Board Member Bermello: No, and you know, I get it. Depending on the moment that you go and who's looking at it, but I think conceptually -- I mean, I think people that get nominated to professional boards and are giving of their time, I think their intent is to do good. Now, you may have a professional -- you know, a different opinion with someone on a particular issue. But I'm looking at this that everybody that's in good faith that sits on this dais on the Board of Architecture,

I mean, their heart is in the right place for this community. I'd rather give them as much latitude than to shackle and tie the architects to some prescriptive that is, number one, arbitrary and doesn't mean you're going to have good design, so that's my issue. When I see, well, if you do six of these, so much; or you can do eight of these, then it's in this district so much. That to me, you know, doesn't make any sense. So, that was the second. Now, you may not feel it's important, and you may want to leave it the way it is, and I'm fine.

Chairperson Pardo: No, I...

Board Member Bermello: For me, it was just a matter of conversation, dialogue between us here, and you know, so that...

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah, I don't disagree. One of the things that I still can't understand is why there is a difference between the residential uses and the mixed uses. They should -- you know, all uses should comply with these. And maybe the verbiage is...

Board Member Bermello: Yeah. I addressed the (INAUDIBLE) it shall substantially satisfy the 12 qualifications. And to me both are the same. If you're in a mixed-use district, I don't care; if you're in a residential district. You should do both, I don't care. I mean, it's like, is there better design requirements for mixed use than residential? You know, I mean, think of it. I mean, it's...

Chairperson Pardo: The requirements listed below shall be substantially complied with.

Board Member Bermello: You know, so you got to comply more in a mixed use than you do in residential? I don't think so. You got to comply -- I don't care if you do an office building in downtown, or mixed-use building downtown, or residential building in downtown. You want it to have every -- if these are elements of excellence, we should strive for all of them. And my point, Robert, is there are always cases where you have a hardship, where maybe the program just doesn't allow you. There's some restriction or some programmatic requirement that goes contrary to being

able to do something. For example, loggias or arcades, you know, personally, if I get a client that has a lot of ground-floor retail, I'm not going to recommend arcades. You know, I'm just going to say, your retail's going to die if we do the loggias. So, I would recommend not doing that. And I have no problem coming to this Board of Architects when it meets and say that's the reason we did not do a loggia. We prefer to have awnings that do not put in shade and in darkness and out of the view of the passerby, the retail. So, I mean, there's no problem in communicating that. And I think most architects that I've worked -- done retail projects would agree with you. Hey, it does impact the quality of the retail. I mean, the City of Coral Gables in the Museum Parking garage, had a heck of a time trying to -- I remember because we did that project, and it was black -- dark most of the time until they got the bicycle shop. Because very few businesses can survive behind those columns. So, there may be situations where a developer does not want to do the loggia and I get it. But I still think you strive for the concept. That was the whole idea. I hate to take up so much time. And if the board doesn't want to do anything, that's fine. I just wanted to have a discussion because I thought it was an important item that sets the tone that says, in the Gables we're not about minimums. We're about trying to do the best possible. I think it just sends a little bit of a different message.

Chairperson Pardo: The verbiage is going to be important. So, it'll be "The requirements listed below shall be substantially complied with," and verified by whom?

Board Member Bermello: I would say the Board of Architects. I mean, at the end of the day, we have different layers, right? We've agreed that in the process that there's going to be a conceptual design submission now. And then I would assume we go -- the applicant goes to the DRC, and then from the DRC, comes back to the Board of Architects. The Board of Architects gets three bites at the apple. I mean, that's, you know, pretty good. Now, some people might say that's pretty bad. But in terms of -- I'd rather have three bites at the apple and for somebody to give me a lot of freedom that I can do great design than for somebody to over-prescribe me and still force me to go through a process.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: My creativity is totally taken away when somebody has to tell me, "Well, you know, your windows have to be three feet wide and five feet high, and they got to be, you know, 30 inches from," you know. I mean, you know, it's -- when somebody starts to prescribe that, and that's the only way, you know, I -- it's -- you know, I tend to...

Board Member Behar: Well, I mean, again, Willy, it's -- if you -- and I'm going to use the example of today, the prescription. To be -- to follow the spirit -- if I recall the correct terminology used today -- the spirit of Mediterranean, your windows are going to be prescribed to be that small. Is that what you want to do or not? I went through it today, you know. If you follow the spirit of the seven examples that we have, and we use -- let's use either the San Sebastian or the Biltmore. Those windows are what, three and a half by five feet or less? So that's what the prescription is telling you, or that's what the Board is telling you to do. And that's what I find to be a contradiction in what you're saying and what we're asking -- being told to do. And that's -- I don't know the balance where it is because -- look at the record, which I'm sure it is today, so it's not coming one-sided. And I think we had two members of, you know, the City Architect and Board of Architects member here, Glenn and Juan, where an opening that we had says, "Note, to be more in the spirit of Mediterranean, those windows should be smaller." So, I don't know. From what I'm gathering you saying it's a contradiction of what you want to do and then what the Board is asking you to do.

Board Member Bermello: Okay, so I'm referring only to the items that start on page 57 and go to page 58. In those items, I don't think that the width of the windows are mentioned. So -- they're not. So, I don't know what happened to you this morning at the Board of Architects, so I feel for you. But I'm referring to these. There are a total of 12 items. And right now, the way that this is worded is you can do 8 out of the 12 if you're in a mixed use; and you can do 6 out of the 12 if you -- just to start with. Just think of it.

Chairperson Pardo: Willy, I think -- Robert is talking about...

Board Member Bermello: I think he's talking about...

Chairperson Pardo: Another issue.

Board Member Bermello: I mean, he's talking about the issue of prescription. I mean, his concern -- maybe he does not want to be prescribed on the size of the mullion or the width of the height of a window, and I...

Board Member Behar: Because that's limiting you as the architect.

Board Member Bermello: May be in total -- but at the same time, if you're doing Mediterranean and you have, I don't know, a 30-foot-long span beam and NanaWalls -- I'll give an example, a personal example. My wife wanted that in the house. And I said, "No, no way, Jose, because it's not in keeping with the style of the house." We're going to have separations in columns because of that. And so, I -- but imagine someone that is going through Mediterranean and then has that or has punchout windows that are -- I don't know -- eight by eight, that you may do in a different kind of setting. So, I think if you're playing within the space of Mediterranean style ordinance, there's some vocabulary that you need to work with. Now, I know here that in the Code, in some cases, it gets down to the inches, and to me, that's a little bit tough at times, you know, that a mullion can't be -- it has to at least four inches deep, et cetera. If not, it's not -- you know, that -- see that to me goes a little bit overboard, but that's kind of -- that's in a -- those are in different sections. And so, I was just referring to these 12 that if you look at them, it's sending a message, number one, that we're more demanding in a mixed use than in a residential area. You know, I think that's wrong. We should be demanding in both. And number two, we should try to get as many as possible when they make sense. And if an architect comes to me and says, "We don't want to use a loggia because we're trying to create a very active retail environment at the base of the building." I would say 100 percent, I agree with you. Now, if that building is an office building

and you have a bank, that doesn't fly anymore because banks -- first, they have -- they don't have multiple entrances. They have one entrance, so you know, it's not activating the ground plane the same way. So, I think the board would have flexibility by saying substantially, and substantially is anything that makes sense, try to do it.

Chairperson Pardo: Willy...

Board Member Bermello: If it doesn't make sense or it's not appropriate, you don't try to do it.

Chairperson Pardo: Let me do two things. First of all, the Chair is recognizing Mr. Salman that got here a few minutes late, so he's in attendance, Mr. Clerk.

City Clerk Urquia: Yes, sir.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. The second thing is, let me see if I could recap what Willy had mentioned before and other members had mentioned before, was to strike out the prescriptive 6 of 12 or 8 of 12 on page 5-7, which is right above the Table 2. And he had mentioned before about, you know, making sure that all of them are complied with, but there are going to be times where it may not be possible. So, the verbiage that I would suggest that we add -- if this is alright with the committee -- is the requirements listed below shall be substantially complied with and accepted by the Board of Architects. The Board of Architects will be able to see whether some of these things cannot be done physically.

Board Member Bermello: Right.

Chairperson Pardo: Because it doesn't apply to the thing. Okay, so that's what we were talking. And what Robert is talking about is a different -- specifically about the Coral Gables Mediterranean style...

Board Member Behar: And being so prescriptive.

Chairperson Pardo: Exactly.

Board Member Behar: That's -- you know, which is what you were referring to. You don't want to be...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Behar: That prescriptive.

Chairperson Pardo: Exactly.

Board Member Behar: And I brought it in at that point, but I think it plays to what he's saying.

Chairperson Pardo: And guys, I just -- the only thing I want to say right now is, Willy, when you touched on the historic, the only thing is that you also requested -- and some of the board members requested a simple definition under 5-4, where it talks about "C, compatibility with the view shed of historically designated buildings." He wanted a simple definition of what view shed was. So, I asked Warren Adams, our Historic Director, and he provided something that I think is simple and very useful, you know, so someone doesn't have to Google it, right, Glenn?

Board Member Bermello: Do you have that?

Chairperson Pardo: Doesn't have to Google the definition of view shed.

Board Member Pratt: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: So, the definition that Warren Adams gave me was "a view shed is the environment that is visible in all directions from a location." In other words, a view shed is if you're on -- at the entrance of Miracle Mile on the east side, and you're looking at our historic City Hall at the end, that is the view shed. So, the view shed is the environment that is visible in all directions for that location.

Board Member Pratt: But what if you only have a single façade or something that is only one plane or one -- that is -- you know, we have multiple buildings around town that are only viewed or only visible from a front elevation.

Chairperson Pardo: Correct, correct. And that is correct. That's why the view shed is -- some of the buildings will be just like a straight on shot. Some of the buildings have multiple, you know, areas. For example, City Hall, you know, you have a pretty good -- because of Biltmore Way, because of Coral Way, how it splits up and also the view from -- down from Miracle Mile from Coral Way, that would be the view shed. The back area has a parking lot. That would not be considered the view shed. The view shed is what...

Board Member Pratt: I think that the rear elevation of this building from the parking lot is just as important or even more important in some ways than...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Pratt: Other side street elevations. The other question that I had was with respect to how do you calculate or what -- yeah, we have a definition of what a view shed is, but what -- who sets the -- or what's your thoughts on who sets the parameters of that?

Chairperson Pardo: No. On the one that it says, "compatibility with the view shed of historically designated buildings shall be considered in site planning, massing, and step backs by the Board of Architects." In other words, the -- if you have a historic building and you have a building right

next to it and it's going to cover that view shed and possibly marginalize the building, you know, stepping it back, setting it back, the site planning, et cetera, would be helpful. Not saying that you can't...

Board Member Pratt: But again, how do you see that as being different from assessed -- One of the other things that the Board does is they review the contextually of what the project is both with respect to the adjacency of other structures and the neighborhood...

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Pratt: And all of the things. So, it's really -- the view shed is really just a part of looking at the context of the project.

Chairperson Pardo: Correct. And the thing is with the historic buildings, for example, not one of the best moments, I think, when the Plaza was approved, 2901 Ponce. When you look at that building now, it's been -- you know, it could have probably been done differently. I'm not talking about not building something, you know, around it, but I think it could have been stepped back differently, it could have been treated a little bit differently.

Board Member Pratt: But how do you...

Unidentified Speaker: How do you quantify that; I think is what he's asking.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, and how do you -- I mean, if you look at it from the standpoint that it is becoming essentially like an art piece or an art object, or say we use the idea of having a piece of art in a public plaza, how do you define what that view shed is for the piece of artwork if other people say that are within buildings that surround the Plaza that are also enjoying looking at the artwork, their view shed or...

Chairperson Pardo: Well, I think...

Board Member Pratt: It's...

Chairperson Pardo: I think what happened there with that particular example is that that building was -- the building around it was placed so close, and then you see the scale of what's behind it and the detailing. I mean, it's pretty bad. It's -- when you go out there and take a look at it, it's completely marginalized by the building, the way it was designed.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, but again...

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE) historic building.

Board Member Pratt: Okay, yes, but again -- I'm sorry, go ahead, Felix. Finish. I'm -- are you finished? No, but one of the other things too, though, that in terms of assessing the necessary space around an object or a historic structure like building, there was a lot of thought and care, and the Plaza project went through multiple, multiple reviews of not only the site planning and the size and massing of the buildings and the structures. But -- and I think that it's a series of trying to figure out what the correct and appropriate balance is between the project. If you say, "Okay, we want to make more space around the historic structure," where does that space translate to? Either it's going to translate to additional height or it's going to impact the adjacency of the single-family residents' home, the residential areas...

Chairperson Pardo: Well, going back to...

Board Member Pratt: Or it's going to go somewhere. And so, it's finding -- it's not a simple thing just saying...

Chairperson Pardo: No, no.

Board Member Pratt: Let's make more space around...

Chairperson Pardo: And it's not simple, and I think going back to Robert's comment before, making something like this prescriptive, you know, it shall be X amount of feet away or something like that, first of all, it depends on the building. It depends on -- again, going back to the view shed, it depends on what the orientation is, how it's been treated, how it's used. And that's why, you know, the definition doesn't have to be inserted.

Board Member Pratt: No, I don't mind the -- I don't mind it being inserted. I'm just wondering how do you quantify it.

Board Member Behar: How do you define that? How do you quantify? And I agree with -- you know, because when you look at that building, it is almost an object in the landscape. You know, what do you do? You know, what is the right distance to maintain? Because I believe that building has the right-of-way -- streets on both sides.

Chairperson Pardo: It has two streets.

Board Member Behar: So, they have kept it away. Is the backdrop of the Plaza too high? It may be, but what is good and what is not as good?

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Behar: And that's -- how do you quantify? Which is, I think, your point, which I agree with Glenn.

Chairperson Pardo: And looking at it -- you know, and hindsight is 20/20. Looking at it, I think that the backdrop behind the building -- as you said, Robert -- the scale, it almost looks like it's in

front of maybe -- what's the name of this place? -- Sunset Place. It looks like Sunset Place is behind it there. If the back part would have been done in such a way where the scale would have been -- not reduce the size of the building behind it, but if it would have been articulated a little bit more, it probably would have been a lot more successful compared to what's there now. And in other words, the one level, when you look at the massing there, the one level is bigger than the building. So, what it's done to the building is it's minimized it. If they would have just put a solid wall, it would have been better than what they have there now because what it's done is, it's really, you know, just -- the only word I can think of is marginalized that building. On the sides, you have the rights-of-way. But then on the back, that's the backdrop for the building. It gets completely lost in the size of what's behind it, just the way it's detailed, not even the height of it. So again, the whole point is for the view shed to be considered, you know. But trying to apply something very prescriptively would be very difficult because you can't do that, and you don't want to do that because each building is different. Some have multiple sides, some have only one side, and some of them, the scales are completely different. So, whatever the committee wants to do, if they -- it was requested by the committee to have a definition, and I asked Mr. Adams for the definition, very simple. But if you don't want it in there, that's okay with me.

Board Member Pratt: No, I'm fine with leaving it in. And I think that -- but I just also think that it's something that typically the Board of Architects does take into account when they review the projects.

Chairperson Pardo: Right, okay.

Board Member Pratt: And -- but it doesn't hurt to have additional ammunition in there to give the Board of Architects to -- if they feel there's something inappropriate about the massing or the...

Chairperson Pardo: And it could be -- sometimes it's not even the massing. It's simply, you know, how busy is it behind it? How, you know...

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, just whatever the...

Chairperson Pardo: Can it be more articulated? Can it, you know...

Board Member Pratt: Whatever the particular situation may be.

Chairperson Pardo: Exactly.

Board Member Pratt: You know, I'm fine with leaving it in.

Board Member Alvarez: I have a question. How would all of this evaluation of the view shed and all that, how would this analysis of the view and relationship would become creditable for bonuses, or is that part of the consideration?

Chairperson Pardo: No, it's not. What it's doing is it's -- this particular part of the historic has been inserted here because it was silent except for designated areas. So, the site plan or the master plan of the City, which was adopted by the Commission has been added here. And then it simply says that the compatibility with the view shed of historic designated buildings...

Board Member Alvarez: But I think the function of that statement is really almost an -- you could apply it in a negative manner by saying, "This is assumed to be a mandatory condition for dealing with this type of property." If it is ignored or it's not taken appropriately consideration, then it becomes a negative. Then you may reject the project or demand modifications. But in any manner, does not become a positive. Oh, I have the best view shed. That will not become bonus credit.

Chairperson Pardo: When you all...

Board Member Alvarez: You have to have it. If you don't have it, you're not eligible for the competition.

Chairperson Pardo: Correct.

Board Member Alvarez: But that doesn't give you points in the competition.

Chairperson Pardo: No, no, no. It's not considered points; it's more like protection for those historic buildings. In your case, when you did the Douglas Entrance and you put the high-rises right next to it, you kept separation, but you were able to control because you owned both the historic building and the rest of the area, and you gave it enough of a view shed that it did not destroy that.

Board Member Alvarez: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: And unfortunately, in the case of the Plaza -- in my opinion, in the case of the Plaza, I think there that it could have been handled very differently, so that's the only point I was trying to make.

Board Member Alvarez: (INAUDIBLE).

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah. And those are two separate -- or at that time, they had already bought the property and they could have done something maybe a little different. So, we have -- Gus, is there anything you want to say as far as --? I think we've covered everything that was said by the Commission, correct?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I believe so. For the purposes of just this meeting, I just need clarification. I think I'm making a small change to the subsection (a) and (b) and adding in the language that applications in residential uses and mixed-use districts shall substantially comply with all the qualifications in Table 2. And we will be adding a definition of view shed elsewhere

in the Zoning Code to reflect the additional language in the BOA -- in the Mediterranean standards section.

Chairperson Pardo: But that's it. Can the simple sentence be simply added after the -- where view shed is mentioned under (c) on page 5-4?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: The suggestion is to not add it to the definition section of the Code, but to...

Chairperson Pardo: Correct.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Simply add the definition...

Chairperson Pardo: Because it's going to be rarely used and you want to...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: We can do that as well. That's fine.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. I think let's keep it simple.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Okay.

Board Member Behar: And Mr. Chair, just again, for clarification in, page 6 -- 5-6, under the MX3, that 20,000 square foot minimum side area...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Behar: Is stricken out, but we agreed that we're going to keep it there.

Chairperson Pardo: Right, that is correct.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Behar is correct.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: So, MX3, 20,000 square foot, the one plus story, plus 13 feet, 14 stories to...

Board Member Behar: That stays. We...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Stays?

Unidentified Speaker: That's correct.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Sounds good.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you. And we were in agreement to the language on 2(a)(b) on 5-7, committee members?

Board Member Bermello: Where are we?

Chairperson Pardo: On -- going back to 5-7, we were in agreement to the requirements listed below shall be substantially complied with and accepted by the Board of Architects.

Board Member Bermello: What page are you on?

Board Member Pratt: 5-7.

Chairperson Pardo: 5-7, right above Table 2, where we discussed the residential...

Board Member Behar: Oh, yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: And the mixed uses.

Board Member Bermello: So, are you putting the words like "substantially," is that what you're saying?

Chairperson Pardo: Right. The requirements listed below shall be substantially complied with and accepted by the Board of Architects.

Board Member Bermello: Perfect.

Board Member Behar: Good.

Chairperson Pardo: Now, on the height, two things. We've been discussing most of the components and we haven't really discussed the heights. So, I had -- I made an observation and I wanted to see what the committee members think. I just used as an example, MX1. On the example of height allowed under Section 2-200, the height allowed, if you have more than a 10,000 square foot lot is 45 feet. The assumption is it would be four stories. It doesn't clearly state four stories there.

Board Member Behar: Page?

Chairperson Pardo: I'm not in a page. I just wrote the notes. But if you look at 5-9, that's where the bonuses are reflected.

Board Member Alvarez: Alright.

Chairperson Pardo: Under 5-9.

Unidentified Speaker: Yep, go ahead.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright. So, I used MX1 as an example. And I went back to Section 2-200, which is the Zoning Code itself. So, it allows 45 feet. Once the first level of bonus is implemented -- well, I'm sorry, let me back up. With the 45 feet, assuming four stories, you're looking at a floor to floor of 11.25 feet, simply dividing four into 45 feet. So that's 11.25 feet. And when you add one story of bonus to 63 and a half feet, you are -- in feet -- it's one story, but in feet, you're adding 13.5 feet. When you go to the next level, you're adding the 77 feet, which is...

Board Member Pratt: An additional 13.5 feet.

Chairperson Pardo: Exactly. So, with that you're adding 27 feet. So, when you have 77 feet, you're actually adding 32 feet; 77 minus 45 is 32 feet or two floors.

Board Member Behar: But I don't think it says -- I don't know where you're getting the 45 because you're starting with -- I see 50 feet.

Chairperson Pardo: No, the zoning MX1 in the Code says 45 feet.

Board Member Behar: But it says here allowable maximum feet under MZ1, 10,000 square foot -- minimum square footage for the site, maximum height 50 feet. Under the same table you're looking at, I don't see -- maybe I'm going blind, I don't see 45 feet.

Chairperson Pardo: I know what it says there, but when you go to the zoning under 2-200...

Board Member Behar: I think it's intended to be the 50 feet, not 45 feet. And there was a reason at some point where the stories were eliminated.

Board Member Bermello: In which table are you looking at?

Board Member Behar: Under the 5.9 -- 5-9, I'm sorry. In the middle, it says residential use multifamily. When you go to mixed MX1, the lot size is 10,000. Here it says 50 feet, where Mr. Pardo is saying that in the zoning calls for...

Chairperson Pardo: 45 feet.

Board Member Behar: 45 feet. So, something then needs to be corrected.

Chairperson Pardo: Correct.

Board Member Behar: Okay, but I think -- I'm not sure...

Board Member Bermello: Okay, what page are you on?

Board Member Behar: 5-9.

Chairperson Pardo: 5-9.

Board Member Bermello: 5-9?

Board Member Alvarez: Let me ask you a candid question.

Chairperson Pardo: I have that on 5-10 of the chart.

Board Member Alvarez: I have a candid question.

Chairperson Pardo: 5-10.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, I think -- well, we've got the old...

Board Member Alvarez: Any one of these tables...

Chairperson Pardo: Oh, you have the old?

Board Member Alvarez: If you relate to the point on the allowable maximum column, will you go, just for an example, the first line, MF2, 5,000 feet, allowable maximum 50 feet. When you get to 77 feet, you have already increased 50 percent over the initial. And on and on...

Board Member Pratt: If you use the comprehensive plan.

Board Member Alvarez: The percentage of increase is significant.

Chairperson Pardo: Correct.

Board Member Alvarez: Now the question is, how does this height relate to square footage or FAR or density. Because assuming -- and I don't know. This is just pure mathematic. Assuming you have a building that occupies a whole site, 10,000 square feet footprint, theoretically, and you increase that by 50 percent, or excuse me, at the MF4, you start at 150 and you end up at 190, you have increased significantly 40 percent. Are you allowing them to be 40 percent, which is 40 percent carries that level of increase in footprint?

Chairperson Pardo: Right, for the footprints, and that's the point.

Board Member Alvarez: And carries the level of FAR or density.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Alvarez: How does that relate? Or are you regulating the amount of square footage that goes with each additional foot granted on the bonus, or how do you read that?

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Trias.

Board Member Bermello: What is the item we're discussing?

Chairperson Pardo: The item of discussion is height because we've been discussing the FAR, you know, how you get to the bonuses there. But we have not discussed the height in the tables.

Board Member Bermello: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: Go ahead, Mr. Trias.

Board Member Alvarez: Just to completely clarification, I think if we start understanding that you're allowed a certain amount of increased density or square footage of construction, but as you go upward, it's a tool for design, but not necessarily to be perceived by the outside developer or the public at large, that this carries a multiplication of the total square footage added to the building. You still have to adhere to maximum you're allowed. And then maybe you might say, alright, by adding one story, I can embellish my building, and I can create a setback on third increase. If it's an instrument for design, that's good; but if it's taken verbatim without any reference or cross-reference to the issue of what I'm saying, the footprint doesn't carry the same footprint all the way. Meaning if you add two floors, don't take for granted that you're adding two full floors.

Board Member Bermello: But Mitch, I think the FAR that gives you the -- what you're talking about, and the density already set. The height may vary to give you the opportunity to do what you're saying. But just because you're going up higher doesn't mean that the FAR -- you're going to multiply it times 40 percent more. I mean, that's the way I see it.

Board Member Bermello: That's correct. I mean, you may decide...

Board Member Alvarez: That's the way I've always worked.

Board Member Bermello: For example...

Board Member Alvarez: I'm saying for the purpose of sending out a document, it should be in an appropriate wording, a clarification saying -- as a footnote maybe -- this does not imply a replica or footprint on building typical floor...

Unidentified Speaker: But it means...

Board Member Alvarez: It still adheres to the maximum permissible square footage, FAR, or density in terms of living unit. And this is just a tool for the designers. The public at large can interpret this and can hit you bad with a negative comment and opposition by not understanding what is the content really of this.

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Trias.

Board Member Bermello: So, I mean -- if I could make a comment. I mean, I don't see the tie between the two. I mean, let's say, historically in high-rise buildings, you know, the trend was, you know, nine-foot clear ceilings under the slab, and you'd have architects all over doing, you know, nine foot eight, floor to floor, blah, blah, blah. As the market gets more sophisticated and people are willing to pay for more, you know, today the nine feet in some buildings is 12 feet. That's a three-foot increase. You got a 10-story building and a 30-foot increase without increasing density, just because you want quality. You walk into a space that -- I mean, we all see it -- that has 12-foot-high ceilings and say wow. It feels grand. So, I'll tell you one thing, I -- none of the people that I've heard that are upset about some of the things -- they're upset about massiveness. And height by itself doesn't create massiveness and encroachments upon the public realm. So, I

mean, I sit here today, that's kind of where I'm kind of coming from. I feel, first of all, the Gables is not the highest location. There are projects that are cramping up on our boundaries that are really high, on US 1, just to the south of us. That's high and that's next to us. You have buildings there, 40 stories high. I mean, we're typically working with buildings that are a third of that. So, I mean, I -- again, I don't -- again, I'm not one of those persons that thinks that height is bad. I can think that height in certain ways done well can be excellent, can be beautiful, can be iconic. So again, I'm more in terms of looking at the other stuff, not trying to cut the height, I mean, I have yet to hear someone saying buildings are too high in the Gables.

Board Member Pratt: And I think to that point, Willy, that we saw this in the Commission in a reversal of what they thought down in the industrial section when they had the height limitation of 100 feet and developers were trying to put as many floors as they could, and so you wind up with the floor-to-floor heights being minimal and windows going up just to the underside of the slab, and you don't get the massing or the...

Board Member Bermello: You don't get the...

Board Member Pratt: Feel of architecture. It's just like an extruded sandwich of windows.

Board Member Bermello: Right.

Board Member Pratt: And it doesn't have a very good feel to it at all. So, I think that the addition of the height provides the cushion to create the headers and to create the feel and the mass of the building. And I see the height as being a good thing.

Board Member Bermello: Me too. So, I mean, I would like to keep it there. I mean, it doesn't mean that everybody will take advantage of it. Some people...

Board Member Alvarez: I am...

Board Member Bermello: You know, some people will not want to spend the money in doing something well, but I mean, imagine that you're willing to spend the money in doing something correct and then you can't.

Board Member Alvarez: I'm all...

Board Member Bermello: You know, we deal with at the City of Miami, where we have some silly rules there too that Robert and I have to deal with all the time, where you know, you do a floor that's more than 14 feet and it counts like two floors, crazy stuff, you know. It's only allowed on the ground floor. If you do it above the ground floor, it penalizes you. So, if you have a ballroom on a second level for a hotel and it's a little higher than that, it counts as two floors. I mean, crazy. So, I would not tinker with the issue of the height personally. That's my thinking.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, I'd like to ask Mr. Trias, on 5-200, can you tell us what the height is on the example of the MX1?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I don't have a copy of what you're looking at so maybe if I could borrow one.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah, we only have the Med bonus component.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: So, this is the issue -- and you have many questions that I'm going to try to explain conceptually. The Code, as I understand it, since the 1960s, since a very long time, had this arbitrary 45 feet, unless the parcel was 20,000 square feet, and then you could do more than that. That was what the simple rule of the Code had, right? I mean, many of you have worked on those issues. What happens is that, in the Comp Plan, it actually said 50 feet, not 45, so that's why sometimes there's that issue.

Chairperson Pardo: Wait a minute. The Zoning Code says 50 or 45?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: 45.

Board Member Pratt: 45.

Chairperson Pardo: 45, okay.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: The Zoning Code says 45, so that's...

Chairperson Pardo: So, I just wanted to make sure I wasn't crazy, okay.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah, no, no. You have raised a very, very good point. The fact that there's some inconsistencies.

Board Member Salman: Yeah, there's numeric inconsistencies, mathematical inconsistencies.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And what happens is, what I would warn you about is that if you make any recommendations that require adjusting the Comp Plan, then we're talking about a very long timeframe because it would have to go to the State and so on, so it would be much -- it will take much longer. Generally, the Comp Plan issues have to do with height. And changes on height have to be looked at closely to make sure that they're consistent and FAR. There's a question of why do buildings look big and massive. Simple, it's parking. Parking does not count towards FAR. Therefore, because it is not counted towards the FAR, it's in addition, so that's what happens.

Chairperson Pardo: But Mr. Trias...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah, I mean, you know...

Chairperson Pardo: I'm glad you brought up this point.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, so unless I've -- you know, over the years, I got this wrong, the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, I always refer to it as the ceiling.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: Because if the zoning says two stories, it's two stories. And the Comp Plan could say 100 stories, but the zoning says two stories, and it's two stories. I just want to make sure I got that right.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: You're completely correct.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: But...

Chairperson Pardo: Go ahead.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Keep in mind...

Chairperson Pardo: Go ahead, go ahead.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: That in addition, the Comp Plan has all this language that says according to whatever the Zoning Code may say. So, what happens is that then the Zoning Code has all these bonuses, so they're authorized indirectly.

Chairperson Pardo: Without a doubt.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: Because they're bonuses. And I have no issue with that. And look, let me be clear, in my opinion, there is a discrepancy in this particular table because the table says allowable maximum feet. Now...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: That's the Comp Plan. That's what the Comp Plan -- it's consistent with what the Comp Plan says.

Chairperson Pardo: But it doesn't say Comp Plan.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: What I'm saying is that it is consistent with what the Comp Plan says.

Chairperson Pardo: No, no. Okay, what I'm saying is it's very misleading because when you look at the table and the language that exists there -- and I want all the committee members to please look at this -- is that when you look at...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I mean, for example, just to make a very easy illustration.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, if you don't mind for one second. When you look at Table 1 up above on page 5-4, okay, 5-4, you will see that it says clearly that the required -- "application shall be and satisfy the requirements of Articles 2 and Articles 3." One is the zoning, Article 2, and the Uses, Article 3.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes, yes.

Chairperson Pardo: You go to the zoning first, and you see there clearly that it says -- for MX1 in this example -- and I'm glad I wasn't wrong -- MX1, 45 feet. But when you now go to the table on height under 5-9, it says "allowable maximum height," you have to go to the zoning. You don't go to the top part. That should say 45 feet. But when you add the heights that are allowed there to those feet, you're going to see it gives you different feet. I'm not saying...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Right, right.

Chairperson Pardo: You know, take away the height, but this is extremely misleading. That's why for me the math didn't work because when I did the math, it's allowable for Section 2 -- 45 feet. So, if you do four stories, you divide it by four, right? It gives you 11.25 floor plate to floor plate. So, you do a post-tension slab, you still get a pretty decent height inside the living area and you're good to go. But...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: In some areas...

Chairperson Pardo: When you add the Med bonus...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: In some areas, there's a minimum 15 foot for the first -- for the ground floor also in addition.

Chairperson Pardo: No, no, and I get that, and I understand. And the other thing is it doesn't say, you know, four floors. It says 45 feet.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: That is correct.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. So, they could have three floors of 15 feet...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: Or any combination thereof. So, the point I'm trying to make is that when you look at the bonus, in reality, the bonus is not that amount, it's actually 18.5 feet for the first floor of height -- additional height that you get.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And why is that? Why is that? Well, because it allows for the parking to fit in, because the parking is not being counted with the FAR. That is the logic of it.

Chairperson Pardo: I understand the reasoning.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: But the -- but what I'm saying -- I'm trying to say in a nice way that this is a mistake. This should be corrected. You either change here where it says allowable maximum feet per the Comprehensive Land Use Plan -- but in reality, the Comprehensive Land Use Plan is a different level for something different, which it does come into play when you talk about height. When you talk about -- when you're allowed already maximum height to 190 feet, and you're allowed to the amount of maximum floors...

Unidentified Speaker: Right.

Chairperson Pardo: Then what you clearly state in the Code is that you cannot exceed the Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah, and what happens it that it's very misleading because the land use says 150, but then it also says -- however, follow whatever the Zoning Code bonuses say. So even though the map says 150, if you do Level 2, you can do up to 190.5. However,

however, you can only do 16 stories because of the additional regulation. Extremely complicated, extremely misleading, absolutely, but that's the Code we have.

Chairperson Pardo: But it's funny what Mitch said. Because he observes -- he said, "Look, you're getting three," if you look -- "if you touch all the bells and whistles, you're getting 3.5 of FAR."

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Maximum, yes.

Chairperson Pardo: Maximum.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: With Med bonus Level 2.

Chairperson Pardo: So, the question is, do you really need the height to be able to...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: You need it for the parking, which doesn't count towards that 3.5. That is the reason.

Board Member Salman: But it does count towards your overall height.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: It counts towards the height, but not towards the FAR.

Chairperson Pardo: That's correct. But then there have been already -- there's been already two, three, four times that there's been relief on parking.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Well...

Chairperson Pardo: Eventually, we'll have no parking, but that's a different story.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: There is another section of the Code that allows, and it has a criteria and a process to do shared parking, if you're referring to that as relief. I think that was one of the recent projects.

Chairperson Pardo: Correct. And that -- so, anyway, the point -- I think Mitch made the point already on the high-rise component, which is the 190 feet. In feet -- not stories -- but in feet, you're increasing 40 percent of the allowable height. That's a lot.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Except that stories also are part of the deal in that case.

Board Member Alvarez: Let me just mention this. Let's imagine this for a moment outside. I'm not a design architect. I'm just a person that I know, a friend of mine whose name is irrelevant. And he said, "Well, you're allowing bonuses. You're creating bigger and bigger buildings." And he comes in with a negative perception of what a bonus is. It is an incentive, an ultimate reason to create a better project and a better design. However, he's perceiving it as some way, let's say, of favoring increased development. He's an enemy of development. He wants to use every possible argument or statement or Code line to oppose that. The result is not helping the cause, which is promoting better architecture. He's creating additional difficulty for everybody dealing with it, from the architect, to the staff, to the board, to the political body of the City. So, whatever we present as bonuses, they should be very transparent and very easily understandable, so we avoid as much as possible the negativity which is an initial perception that these whole thing started, and we've seen it in here. People don't care, they're not that sensitive. There's a few that are, but most of them, they just don't want any more bulk. Bulk is fat and height. Beautiful design, as for you, Mr. Architect, but I really hate to see one more monster going up. That's the summary. So, whatever we add in terms of height is very touchy, and it must be transparently clarified that this is an incentive to reduce either footprint or spaces in the typical floor, things like that, which is very difficult for the simple reason in commercial design, the smaller footprint carries a penalty in efficiency because all the exiting and transportation vertical circulation is fixed. And every foot you take away, it criminalizes the equation of money and development cost to significant amount.

I lived through an experiment comparing a building I was doing comparatively at the same time with 15,000 square foot commercial lease office and another one by the side that 10,000. The cost on the -- let's say the rentability of the square footage was significant. So, everybody's going to try to squeeze every square foot on every footprint from development. Now on residential, it's a different -- you're dealing with another quality level and you're selling to people that are humanly habitable for the residents, et cetera. But in commercial, this is mandatory. So, bonuses have to be very, very properly worded to be sellable. And at the same time, don't avoid creating negative reaction right from the start.

Chairperson Pardo: And you're right about -- you know, and Mr. Bermello said the same thing, you know. No issue with height. It depends on how you do the height and -- so if you could just...

Board Member Bermello: Yes.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Sure.

Chairperson Pardo: Listen to the rest of the -- this equation. So, I took 45 feet, divided it by 4, 11.25. If I take the 11.25 and then I multiply it times not one, but two floors, I get a total of 67.5 feet. That's 10 feet less than what's allowed now, which is 77 feet, nine and a half feet. That's an additional floor. Recently, an applicant came in with an application and said, "No, I want 77 feet." The zoning was an MX1, where you could only go six floors, but he came in with seven floors. Now, it's not six floors, now it's seven floors. Now, the Mayor is -- says, "You know, I don't have a problem with height," but the Mayor also -- unless I misunderstood him -- would like to be able to have green space for parks. So, you know, that's one of the things. If you give someone height -- and by the way, Mr. Bermello also brought up the point, what happens if you have residential and you decrease the density because the units are bigger, and we want to go higher. Well, and then maybe you have a park there. You know, maybe you have green space, which is usable. And I've listened to all sorts of residents. Not everyone's enamored with all hardscape. Some people want to have parks for their children to play or walk their dogs or whatever. So, the point I'm

trying to make is that part of this bonus, which is innocuous, the way that it's just gone through the system, is that I don't think anyone's ever brought up this mistake because it's a mistake of only five feet. And the point is, you are correct technically that the ceiling is five more feet, but those people that came in with that other application, they're now trying to use the Comprehensive Land Use Plan as their maximum for the amount of floors and all that. So, all of a sudden, now, it's not one story and two stories; now they're asking for three stories of bonuses. And I checked every single page of this Code, and nowhere did I ever see that you're allowed to have three more floors.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah. And in that particular case, what they're using is the PAD process, which is separate from the bonus program, to say that the Commission has the ability to waive some of the zoning requirements, such as the number of stories. That's the argument from the applicant. I'm not saying it's right or wrong. That's just what they're saying.

Chairperson Pardo: But you know...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: So, the point I'm making -- and I hope -- I mean, Mr. Pardo, you know this very well. There's so many different things. There are so many moving parts here. And the request of the seven stories actually has nothing to do with the Med bonus. It has to do with the PAD.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, I wanted to bring the height issue to this committee because I think it's extremely, extremely important for people to understand, because at the end of the day, you're going to be talking about mass, bulk -- as Mitch calls it and is correct. And then on top of that, going back to Mr. Bermello's comment about the setbacks.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: You know, I'm sorry, I'm not one for a lot of regulation, and I think it's great to be able to have tremendous imagination. But you know, some of the things that we see on US 1, you know, I just see bulk. I don't see a lot of imagination.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: But again, it's simple. The Biltmore is a very nice building. I think everybody would agree it's beautiful. What is the difference between the Biltmore and any building that you have to design today? Well, the Biltmore doesn't have a parking garage into it. The moment you put in the parking garage into the Biltmore, all of a sudden, it's a bulky building. All of a sudden, it's not as elegant. That's really the reality of it. So, we need to deal with the parking. We need to deal with the real issues of development from an aesthetic point of view.

Chairperson Pardo: You know, and I...

Board Member Bermello: I will say...

Chairperson Pardo: I respectfully...

Board Member Bermello: If I may say, Mr. Chair. You know, really Gables Station, which is project you're talking about -- and this is not a criticism to any of our City boards. I mean, we have, you know, the same architect up here before our board in the City of Miami, and we turned them down, and Mr. Behar was there. And it was the same massiveness concept that we got in -- particularly, in Gables Station. And because the building was not broken into -- you know, there's a point where it's not a mega structure that goes for miles. And -- because that does impact the scale of the neighborhood, and that may be fine in certain parts of Miami, but the Gables has its own -- and I know that the City Commission wants us to define "neighborhood compatibility." But you know, definitely building spacing, the massing, the height of the building, the openings, the breaks, all of that starts to define the (INAUDIBLE). And you know, we all love Regions Bank done by Mitch's firm. And I don't think anybody is opposed to the height of that building. I love it. A lot of people love it. It's articulation, it's wonderful setback from the road. And you

know, you can look at the building and you can say is the height a problem; it isn't. Actually, it could have gone three more stories. There will be no issue. It was still -- it's done so sensitively. So, height by itself, I think is the way the entire massing is resolved. If you're doing a full City block, you have a tremendous responsibility to not create a wall effect. And I know that's tough with clients. They want economy, but I think there's where, you know, we have boards that need to -- I just think the issue of bulk is a little different than just the issue of height, you know. And I realize what you're saying, Mr. Trias, that the parking in many cases becomes an issue, but that's what makes our life enjoyable that we get to work and try to resolve those to minimize those situations. I just think, Mr. Chairman, that the issue of height by itself is far from the issue here.

Chairperson Pardo: Oh, no, no.

Board Member Bermello: Because I just pointed to Mitch's project which has height. It could have even been taller and still, it would be...

Board Member Salman: Yeah, but the parking on that is behind the building.

Board Member Bermello: The parking is behind it, and it's also done, you know -- not only behind it, but it's done in a sensitive way that it does not make the building look on steroids.

Board Member Behar: But Willy, that building is very unique. Look at the -- contextually, you have an open space in front of it.

Board Member Bermello: Yes.

Board Member Behar: That is -- I don't know where else in the City of Coral Gables, you will have that much space.

Board Member Salman: He's doing one right now.

Board Member Behar: Huh?

Board Member Salman: In front of Kerdyk Park.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah, and that's a very good example of how to integrate parking into a good building, right? Mr. Bermello's office did that very well.

Board Member Behar: You know, so you -- that building is -- it is -- I mean, it is one of my favorite buildings not only in the Gables, but in Miami, the articulation and everything. But that has a very unique -- you don't (INAUDIBLE) the parking. The parking is in the back. So those are special circumstances that doesn't come around every day.

Board Member Bermello: Now, my only point is, as we look at heights and -- because I agree totally with Glenn. When you have the additional height, it allows you to do additional quality. It allows you. It doesn't mean that you're going to do it. It doesn't mean that the execution's going to be there. But my point, Robert, was more that the height itself -- and that was -- and we're using, I guess, Regions Bank as an example -- doesn't mean that something is wrong.

Board Member Behar: It's not a problem.

Board Member Bermello: You know, there's nothing wrong...

Board Member Behar: I agree with you.

Board Member Bermello: With that height. And so, I -- it's just, Mr. Chair, I just think that that -
- and when I talk to people around town, really, it's more bulk...

Chairperson Pardo: Oh, no, no.

Board Member Bermello: Than height. And by the way, you take a couple of floors out of Gables Station, and I still feel the same way. It's not going to help it. It doesn't help it at all one bit.

Chairperson Pardo: Exactly.

Board Member Bermello: And so that's what people -- you know, they react to it.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: So, what I would warn you is that you are asking for flexibility, which makes sense. And ultimately, the architect is the one who does a good job or not a good job. I mean, we all agree on that. The moment we leave this room, and we go into a different type of setting, people immediately try to have very strict guidelines that you can check very easily. That's what most non-architects would like to have. They are wrong. The process we have is much better, much better. But to explain that seems very difficult. So, I would encourage you to continue on that path. Because having deadlines, like when I was in private practice and I had to work in Palm Beach County -- and (INAUDIBLE) to tell you -- about the places that have Mediterranean architect guidelines applied to McDonald's and buildings like that, okay, very effectively. Check, check, check, check, and then you end up with the nice built-out roof -- right? -- and the -- that is not Coral Gables, and that is what intuitively most people who are not architects believe is a good thing. I've been -- I've had a chance to work on that years ago. I'm glad I don't do that anymore.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, one of the things, the next thing would be the setbacks or lack of setback, or the encroachment that we were talking about. So...

Board Member Alvarez: Very sensitive.

Chairperson Pardo: And that's very, very sensitive. And I think, you know, one of the issues I think that we all have dealt with is that now we have setbacks, and we have step backs. And I

have seen that step backs have been ignored sometimes. And again, one thing is that you have flexibility in certain things, but you have certain buildings that when you are directly across from residential, low buildings and there are no step backs there on a street, I mean, that's unconscionable. And I think that my issue with Table 3 is that when you read Table 3, it is basic -- in my opinion, and maybe I'm getting it wrong, it's almost like this is the Wild Wild West. It gets to the point where it's all about building step back reductions, which are already discussed in other parts of the Code. It talks about encroachments, the loggias, the arcades again. And I just truly can't understand reading through it, you know, how this could be an advantage.

Board Member Alvarez: I think we are inadvertently, as we all feel this thing strongly, inadvertently trying to modify behavior and Code regulations to make it better. I think we're out of our task. Our task is formulate, in the most sensible way -- as he was saying a moment ago -- the guidelines for people that simply can read bonuses that they can demand that they're entitled to, or they can aspire to be entitled. And inadvertently, every one of us has confronted situations in design that you said, "Gee, if I could convince the guy who wrote the Code, I'm sure he would agree because I'm presenting a better quality." And we get carried away. We need to create some document that is really related to the bonuses because we're not going to be able to formulate modifications seriously taken to existing Code regulations. We can suggest improvement through the bonus system, so...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And also, if we could define the problem, if we could know what problem you're trying to fix, we can probably be more effective, and let's try to think in those terms. What is wrong today with the buildings, and let's find some regulations and make it better. That would be my advice.

Chairperson Pardo: And I think that, you know, we're getting there, and there is -- first of all, Willy was very eloquently talking about the setback and step backs. You want to pick it up there where you left off the last time on that?

Board Member Bermello: Well, a lot of Table 3 -- and that I think that's -- I think some of us are in agreement to kind of get rid of it -- is introducing an incentive for, I think, what's brought us here, which is encroachment into the public realm, and basically, a violation of setbacks and encroachments, you know, willy-nilly, which kind of gives the owner, the private sector, that it's okay to encroach, and to not have setbacks, and to do kind of all the things that we're kind of reacting to. So, when I saw Mr. Chairman that you routed to us Table 3 basically, you know, being totally struck out, I'm all in favor of that. I mean, I don't see how not providing a protection of public realm can be interpreted as a public benefit under any definition.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: You know, when the original bonus ordinance started in New York City, okay, if you go back to that, and the first book that I think most architects read about that when that happened in the early 1970s, it was to create open space, to make sure that between buildings there would be best pocket parks, plazas, and not necessarily all in line. It wasn't prescriptive. It wasn't like everybody go back 100 feet. It was -- there was a going back and forth so in between buildings you'd create plazas just by the nature or composition of how organically the City grows. But it was all intended for the public realm. Here, we're kind of saying it's okay to forget about the public realm.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Let me give you a specific example. Mr. Behar's partner is working right now on a Publix on US 1. And that Publix is actually creating a much wider sidewalk on US 1, and they're using Table 3 to be able to comply with the requirements that they don't have to meet certain setbacks, but they do have to provide open space under Table 3. So, all I'm saying is the requirements are fairly subtle, and I don't think that the issue is no public space whatsoever. On the contrary, what it is, is you can have less public space here and more here. Why am I saying that? Well, because the success of that design has to do with the architect -- Mr. Font is working on it -- and the review, the Board of Architects. That is the highest level that we can aspire to in terms of regulation, the fact that you have professionals being able to evaluate whether or not it

makes sense to set back here and not set back over there. That is it. And I think the issue is really, we have a Code that is -- if implemented properly -- I haven't seen a better one. It's complicated, misleading, yes, yes, yes. But if you do a good job, frankly, you have every tool you want. Most of you have used them very effectively. So, let's just think about that before we make any changes. And the other thing is that the constant critique of buildings and the constant misunderstanding of how some buildings were actually -- because many of you -- for example, the Plaza has been spoken of critically many times, but several of you actually were in the Board of Architects and attended -- how many meetings did we have on that?

Board Member Pratt: No, I mean...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I don't even know.

Board Member Pratt: No, I don't re -- we -- but I know it was multiple times.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Multiple. So, what I'm thinking is, let's accept the good things we have. I mean, there are some things that are good and some things that are bad, perhaps. So, the things that are bad, let's try to fix them. But I can tell you, you can spend the next three weeks or however long you want to do, finetuning the wordsmith in here -- and that's a good thing and it's going to be better, but it's not going to fix the problem. Because the issue is implementation. The issue is that at some point you have to say no, and that has to be done by the Board or by staff, depending on the project, and that's what the Code needs to encourage.

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Trias, let me tell you something, that the Vice Mayor made a point when I addressed the Commission Tuesday. He said point blank -- because we were talking about the - - he was talking about the style and all that. And he said, "Well, the Plaza has all these details," and I said, "Yeah, they spent a lot of money, but could it have been better? Absolutely.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: And with all due respect, they came, you know, four or five times before the Board, and I get it. But the thing is, that project was even going to be larger originally than what it is.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah, but that had nothing to do with the bonus problem.

Chairperson Pardo: No, no, no.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: It had to do with other issues.

Chairperson Pardo: No, no, no.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: They wrote their own code.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: They wrote their own code and I've read it. And in there, they -- it's a great, prescriptive, you know, form-based code. That's what it is. It's a form-based code.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: And they identify the streets and the widths of the rights-of-way and all that. But the size, how it was massed, et cetera, and in my opinion, you know -- and I respect the Board of Architects, I respect all the boards that have to do with development in the City, but could it have been better? I think it could have been substantially better. And the point is -- and look, this is not taking a shot at the developer, but the point is taking a shot at directly across the circle, you

have Mitch's Regions Bank building, completely different scale, of course. But still could the largest components of that development been broken up into multiple buildings? It is possible that it could have been done. And the other thing is, how far along was it by the time it got to the BOA? You know, could...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Well, I'm glad you asked that question. Because in that process, actually, there were additional -- I mean, we actually had a special meeting -- remember that, Glenn?

Board Member Pratt: Correct. We had three special meetings, as I recall...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Board Member Pratt: And not only that, but they broke the project into smaller increments so that it was easier to review the elements. It obviously -- it's a large amount of information to try and understand and process in a review. So -- but -- and I heard you say four or five, but no, we -- the Board of Architects, in addition, we reviewed that -- they made several preliminary presentations for review even before coming through with the final preliminary that was presented for preliminary approval, design approval. So, it -- as a process...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: It was a conceptual -- the same thing you're suggesting, that's what they did.

Board Member Pratt: Yes.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Board Member Pratt: Yes, correct.

Chairperson Pardo: So, I think, going back to Table 3, that there has to be a much better way to rewrite this. And I know you're using it now in a positive light with one of Robert's projects, but when you read it, it just -- it's like there's absolutely no limit.

Board Member Pratt: Mr. Chairman.

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Board Member Pratt: You know, the thing that I would want to make sure that there's a clear understanding -- and in the time that I've participated in the Board of Architects, I don't -- aside from Robert's Publix, I'm trying to think -- this as a section of the Code is -- and the section of the Mediterranean tables is very, very rarely used. I -- Mr. Trias, I...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I agree, and it's used most of the time for good purposes. I mean, it's used because it does make sense to have -- from an aesthetic point of view, review by the Board of Architects.

Board Member Pratt: (INAUDIBLE) for the encroachments, I'm -- the only other project I can think of, or recall was the -- and I don't know what the status of it is, whether it's moving forward, but the hotel that was being proposed down in the Village of Merrick Park, that they were requesting...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Board Member Pratt: The encroachment for the front entry.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: But that -- the encroachment is different from what I'm saying. I mean, there's no encroachment in anything that Robert's partner is working on. It's simply the waiver of the setbacks.

Board Member Pratt: But the point I'm trying to make is that it's -- in my experience on the Board, it's something that is very, very limited.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Very, very.

Board Member Pratt: In terms...

Chairperson Pardo: I think also that -- this gives a very wrong impression to the developer, gives a very wrong impression to the designer. And in the case of the Publix project, it has to get approval by the Commission anyway, so the Commission has the ability...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I don't think that one has to for that. And what happens is that that most of the time, you're right. Most of the time, you're right. I don't want to point specifically to a project. I was just using that as an example. But I think that at the end of the day, the beauty of the Code is that it requires approval by the Board of Architects, and then most of the time the large projects require approval by Commission. Now, how many times do you have to go to Commission for your project? I remember sitting next to you right there.

Board Member Bermello: Many.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Okay, and so that is the process.

Board Member Bermello: But it had nothing to do with the design.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No, no.

Board Member Bermello: It's (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Pratt: But in the addition, you came to the Board of Architects a number of times to...

Board Member Bermello: Yes, we -- absolutely. And...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And that is...

Board Member Pratt: There's multiple levels that...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Where the...

Board Member Bermello: And again, I have absolutely no issues. I'll tell you, every time we went through the Board of Architects, I think the project became better, so I have no like misgivings at all. You know, I look at the Aloft on Le Jeune Road that is -- Robert, is the project you're working the Publix there on Le Jeune?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No, no.

Board Member Behar: No, no, no.

Board Member Bermello: Oh.

Board Member Behar: It's on US 1.

Board Member Bermello: Well, as I look at the Aloft, with zero lot line on Le Jeune Road, which has very small sidewalk on a very fast moving arterial...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Absolutely.

Board Member Bermello: I say to myself, "My God, what thinking came into this." Now I...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I can tell you exactly...

Board Member Bermello: Now that particular client...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: Happened to be my client on another project.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: And I know their thinking. They will go to a Code like this, and they would instruct their attorney and say, "If I can get this, I'm going to get it." I want to squeeze every square inch. And if you're a Robert Behar or a Glenn Pratt, or you know -- and you don't you're your client, you know, that's not a good thing to do here because of X, Y, and Z, you get what we got there in the Aloft, you know. And you know, and you look at that and people say, "How did that happen," you know.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I'll be happy to explain it to you but not on the public record.

Board Member Bermello: I'm sorry?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I'm not going to tell you in the public record in a public meeting some of the issues, but I could -- we could discuss them further. All of these projects, all these projects that you don't like -- or not you, but anyone -- the fault is not with the Code. That is not where the problem is, okay, and that is my recommendation as a professional of many years doing this. The Code could be better.

Board Member Bermello: And I -- Mr. Trias, I agree with you. And that's why really my comments here...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: Have been very limited to areas that are, you know, very surgical, because I agree. I mean, the Code doesn't determine a lot of the stuff...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No.

Board Member Bermello: That we see. You're totally correct.

Board Member Behar: Willy, you believe that Table 3 should be eliminated?

Board Member Bermello: Robert, there's...

Board Member Behar: I personally don't think that we should eliminate all of it.

Board Member Bermello: So...

Board Member Behar: I mean, I have a more problem when a minimum square footage allowable for ground story open space, 400 square feet, when you are so prescriptive. But I think there's 00 there are some good valid areas in this table that don't need to be taken out.

Board Member Bermello: So, let me put it like this. I think if in the Code we have the ability -- if you want to have a loggia encroaching into your setback and it's going to be right up -- you know, actually, in some cases could be, over the sidewalk as the Museum Garage, right?

Board Member Behar: Well, that's a different...

Board Member Bermello: No, but that's encroaching into the -- and there was no way to do it.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: That's encroaching five feet into the right-of-way.

Board Member Bermello: Other than by encroaching into the roadway...

Chairperson Pardo: Exactly.

Board Member Bermello: And also encroaching into -- but those projects go to the Commission. They go to the Planning and -- and they get approved...

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: And they get reviewed and they get approved.

Chairperson Pardo: And on that...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Or they're not or denied.

Board Member Bermello: Or denied.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: The project can also -- could have been denied. I -- my -- Robert, my thinking was that when you put -- I mean, you're talking about bonuses. Bonuses should be for something good. And you're saying one of the things I'm doing is I'm going to have a reduction in setbacks. I'm going to have an encroachment on the public right-of-way. It's like, wait, I'm missing something.

Chairperson Pardo: And the other thing about your building...

Board Member Bermello: Usually, the bonus should be, I'm providing a public open space. I am increasing the setback. I am -- I don't know. It's -- if someone were to say, where's the public benefit? I would have a hard time...

Chairperson Pardo: Well...

Board Member Bermello: I think it's an accommodation to the developer, and I have no issue with that because there may be times where you may want to have a relaxation on a setback in one area because you're doing something else somewhere else, and then you have that give and take.

Board Member Pratt: And I think that's the intent of what it's trying to produce. It's giving flexibility for those types of situations.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, keep in mind also that in your building, which is very nice, the parking garage across from Books & Books, it encroaches (INAUDIBLE). But it's the one building, and it activates the street level because it has both a theater and it has storefront.

Board Member Bermello: And it has also a little through connection to the other side.

Chairperson Pardo: And also, where's it located? It's located in the heart of the CBD, across from Books & Books. It's just like -- the CBD there is like a normal CBD anywhere in the country. You could take this, and you could apply it in mixed use. You could apply it anywhere across from residential, et cetera, where it would be inappropriate.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And that's what I need to say now.

Chairperson Pardo: And that's why I think this, in my opinion, is a mistake. It has elements there, but it depends on where the elements are. If you're doing the Publix on US 1, on US 1, you're okay. But this can be applied everywhere, anywhere, at any time.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: But that's what I'm saying. The issue is the application, the board review, the staff review...

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Trias.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: (INAUDIBLE) times.

Chairperson Pardo: But Mr. Trias, once you have it here, the developer thinks it is his matter of right.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: True.

Chairperson Pardo: And depending on where it is. It's definitely not right. It's very wrong. So, in the case of Willy's parking garage, that's the only area, the parking garage, where it encroaches. It's not from one side of Aragon to the other. It's only there -- in fact, then you cross the street and then you have Mitchy's building, which is the Colonnade.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah, but...

Chairperson Pardo: And the Colonnade only has the front entrance that goes out. It's very clear.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Table 3 is not about encroachments necessarily. It's about setbacks, reductions, and you get a little open space. Encroachments, I don't know of any project that encroaches, except the parking garage -- right? -- I mean, that I think of. Maybe...

Chairperson Pardo: Well, you -- on the Plaza, you have encroachments there also in the (INAUDIBLE).

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: On the upper stories, yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: That's correct.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: But not at the...

Chairperson Pardo: But it's still an encroachment.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: -- ground level, yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: It's still an encroachment. And...

Board Member Bermello: And by the way, there's some encroachments that I've -- for example, the -- not the Plaza or this Plaza, the plaza of the old folks' home there on Anastasia. I believe that the canopy encroaches into...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Sure, balconies...

Board Member Bermello: Which makes sense, and you take those to the City Commission, and you get them approved. You know, you do a nice...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Balconies, awnings, great idea.

Chairperson Pardo: And the Giralda building...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Pedestrian amenity.

Chairperson Pardo: And the Giralda building and the Hyatt both have porte cocheres. They encroach, but you know what, it's only one little section and it's on probably the widest commercial avenue in the entire City.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And they're very well designed.

Chairperson Pardo: And they have -- they're innocuous here. The point is that this is a blank everywhere anywhere type of thing. That's why I'm opposed to it.

Unidentified Speaker: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: And I understand Robert's point that there are certain elements in there that are good elements that could be rewritten and put somewhere else, but not as a blanket statement like that. This is almost encouraging people. And this has nothing to do with the bonus.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah, what happens is that -- what I would tell you is that from my point of view, from the point of view of any staff reviewer, the less of this -- the more you take out, the better.

Unidentified Speaker: Yeah.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Like I -- listen, I would love it, you know. 25-foot setbacks, 5-foot setbacks, we're done. That is not Coral Gables, and that is not what we have. So, I'm just saying, don't throw out things that may be better written in a different way. Certainly, the Code could be much better.

Board Member Behar: I think we should give it one -- and I'm not saying, you know, one good look and...

Board Member Salman: One good read through.

Board Member Behar: Huh?

Board Member Salman: One good read through.

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Ceballos, let me ask you this. Is it possible for us to simply rewrite, you know, some suggestions, send them to you so you could send them to the rest of the board members, or could we send them to the board members, just like on this particular table, this section?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: So, the issue with communications outside of the Sunshine, you as an individual board member can make edits to the Code and then distribute it to all the board members. What we cannot have is the board members then receiving that, making modifications, edits, comments.

Chairperson Pardo: No, no, no.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: And then sending it back to you.

Chairperson Pardo: No, right.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: So, in theory, every single board member here could draft up some notes and send it to me if you prefer, and I will distribute it to all the Board members before the next meeting -- assuming we have a next meeting -- which I believe I think we're going to probably need. And then discuss those changes at the next meeting.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright.

Board Member Salman: Through the Chair.

Chairperson Pardo: I'm sorry, yes.

Board Member Salman: If I may. Mr. Trias brings up an excellent point in that, you know, the City is blessed to have been from its initial conception, the wisdom to have professionals helping, guiding professionals that serve the City in the form of public or private architecture to promote and reinforce the architectural principle by which the City was founded. Having said that, my problem with Table 3 is the legislation of reasonableness. And I think that when you start to legislate through this Code, and every section begins with reduction, encroachment, encroachment, you know, it's all about creating a certain amount of freedom to be able to take from here and put there, to give the Board of Architects a little bit more freedom, which I think that they already have. And I think that the legislation of this is actually superfluous to perhaps -- somewhere else in the Code, we had a section that allowed the Board of Architects a little bit latitude with regards to that within reason, where we were trading one for another, where we had that ability to do that. And I think we struck it out. The importance here is that when we have those kinds of trades, when we have to have an encroachment into a right-of-way to satisfy the needs, the physical geometric need of being able to get two cars to back out and not hit each other and have to take five feet out of an alleyway, 10 feet in the air, 20 feet in the air, that makes sense. But it goes in the Commission. We have processes for that where those reasonable arguments can be made, and they have to go to the board and have to be approved before they go to the Commission. Just like when you go for a variance, the first request is that it be improved by the Board of Architects before it even gets there. So, the Board of Architects has a lot of power and a lot of ability to make positive recommendations even on issues which are not technically within the Code for a recommendation to the appropriate legislative body to approve. And by creating this tit for tat, 45 percent here or 80 feet of that encroachment and getting into that needless legislation, which is my objection and why I immediately accepted "Okay, let's remove Table 3," yeah, there's some good ideas. Robert, let me finish. But you are setting yourself up for failure when you go try -- because

you're never going to include everything you want, every possible option that you need, and you take away from the reasonableness and the professional integrity of the boards that are -- and the architects that are presenting before those boards to have the ability to make those kind of adjustments to have then positive recommendation or approval by the legislative body in charge. So, therefore, I think it's okay. There are some ideas here. I would like to give it a good read and I would like to start the next meeting with that and see -- so that we don't -- because we all read it and we already knew it. And when we came to it, it was suggested, "I want to strike it all." Nobody said -- I said, "Yep, let's strike it." That was my reason for striking it. So, I agree with Robert, let's give it a read. There may be some sections in here that we want to glean and keep. But I have a general objection to it in its totality just the way it is.

Board Member Behar: The way it is.

Board Member Salman: Correct.

Board Member Behar: And we're going to -- I'm going to agree with you. You mentioned encroachment. How many projects really benefit from the encroachment that...

Board Member Salman: Very little.

Board Member Behar: Okay. So, there are some good points and there's some that I think that -- but to -- for me to say, "Just strike it out," without really going through it...

Board Member Salman: And I agree, let's read it. Let's read it and go through it line by line, and say, "Hey, you know what, I don't like this, I don't like this. Hey, this is good. Let's keep this."

Board Member Behar: And at the end of the day, we may take it off completely.

Board Member Salman: Yeah, but we did remove it cavalierly. And I think that that's probably part of your objection because we all know what the Code says, and so we were all tacitly in agreement without even having talked. So, because this is also a public forum, I think that to be transparent about why we're taking it out is just as important as any additions or changes we make.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Salman: So, my suggestion is through the board, through the Chair, is that we start our next meeting by careful review of Table 3 and its -- the reasons for its inclusion.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chair, if I can just add. I think the first meeting that I -- we attended and I had seen this section, I had struck it out myself after reviewing it and reading it. And just for the record, the reason for that then and still now is that I think that bonuses should be given -- or should be considered only in those situations where you have a public benefit that is being provided, where you have a hardship, where you have a condition of your site or your program or your -- whatever is a hardship. I think the project needs to take a different route, and the route is one that goes for a waiver or variance, depending on the municipality. So, I'm all for reviewing it one more time, and I'm also all for if one of you want to do a new rewrite or an edited version. I'm kind of petered out on this section because, conceptually, I just have a tough time giving out a concept that you're going to reduce setbacks, you're going to allow encroachments, and then you get a bonus as a result of that. That's some -- just conceptually, I'm having a philosophical problem, but I'm more than open to consider it next meeting again and to review some different wording. I do have a question. Where it talks about the 25 percent residential density bonus -- since I've never used this -- is this in addition to all the others? Is this another .25 in addition to the .2 and the .3?

Board Member Behar: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah. First of all, I'd like to recognize the City Manager that is leaving. Goodbye, City Manager. Mr. Trias.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: (INAUDIBLE). The issue with Table 3 is that it deals with too many different things. Table 3, the first section is the one that I was speaking of, which allows for waivers of setbacks if you provide open space. That has been used and I think that's a very good thing. Then the second one talks about encroachments, which is really bizarre, and I don't think it has been used that much. And if that -- in the ways that you have said, in very small increments and so on. And then it talks about residential density. Parking except -- I mean, a lot of stuff seems to have been thrown into this at the very last minute, for whatever reason. I don't know, I wasn't here.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I think it's not well written in terms of language for a Zoning Code. And I think that the residential density, for example, makes no sense to include here, right? We already deal with it in the other places. So, I would -- what I would encourage you to do is to consider keeping some of that flexibility for the setbacks, right? I mean, I'm sure you've used it.

Board Member Behar: And that's the only one that to me, after going through and reading it -- encroachment, strike it out.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes, yes.

Board Member Behar: I agree, concur with everybody here.

Board Member Bermello: My only problem with that is that I look at Gables Station and the ability to not provide setbacks is one of the reasons that that project, that Aloft and others generate...

Board Member Behar: Willy.

Board Member Bermello: The animosity that puts us here. And I realize, listen, that you may need a waiver in a setback in an area for a particular need, okay. And I don't even think you have to -- you should, you know -- I mean, if -- there should be sufficient that if you're providing enough public good, there's -- in other words, if you have a problem in the setback, it's a hardship. And I think the route to getting that resolved is called a variance. It's called a variance. If -- and I agree that there may be a setback that it may be -- I don't know -- on an alley. Let's say a rear setback in an alley and the conditions are such that it's not adding any quality to the alley, and that reducing that setback that might be five feet, let's say provide no setback on the alley does not create a problem for any neighbors. You know, I get that, but usually the problem with what I've seen is not the alleyways. It's on the front facing on major arterials, Robert, and that's why the (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Behar: Willy, I agree.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I don't think Gables Station waived the setbacks though.

Board Member Behar: No, they do provide the setback. I walked it the other day because I was like, you know...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Board Member Behar: I walked it, but the problem with the Gables Station is they did provide a 10-foot setback on US 1. The massiveness...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Board Member Behar: Of that pedestal...

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, it's...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Exactly, that's the point.

Board Member Salman: It's the parking pedestal that's killing -- right.

Board Member Behar: They did go back, but it's very...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes, the problem is the parking, by the way.

Board Member Salman: It's what creates that mass that hangs over the street.

Chairperson Pardo: Right, and that...

Board Member Behar: It feels like it's over the highway.

Chairperson Pardo: Robert hit it on the head. Because the thing is that the step back...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No, no.

Chairperson Pardo: Is not sufficient...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Good point, good point.

Chairperson Pardo: To break the mass.

Chairperson Pardo: So, the issue is the Code has a distinction between setback and step back, right. Step back happens upstairs...

Chairperson Pardo: Forty-five feet, right.

Chairperson Pardo: The Board of Architects probably could look at the step backs more closely because that -- I think that's what everybody's objecting to in those projects, right?

Board Member Behar: That podium is going to be 80 feet.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah.

Board Member Behar: You know, and...

Chairperson Pardo: Completely out of scale.

Board Member Behar: The scale of that is totally out of scale, and that's what -- I walked it. I crossed the street last week and said, "Can't be." It can't be -- and they are providing a setback. Unfortunately, the massiveness of that podium...

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, it's...

Board Member Behar: Takes it away.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And I hate to say this, but Aloft actually provides a setback also, a small one, but it's like -- that is really not the issue. The issue is that it's just big and massive, which is the step back question.

Chairperson Pardo: I just wanted to see if it would be possible -- because you know, we're already at 6 o'clock. And I just wanted to get to the end. And with respect to Robert's wishes, we're all going to take a look at it. I know the way I feel. I feel the same way as I did before. As far as that entire Table 3, I'd throw it out the window.

Board Member Bermello: No, me too, but I'm willing to look at it again. And there may be areas that...

Chairperson Pardo: With all due respect...

Board Member Bermello: May make sense keeping so I...

Chairperson Pardo: I think we should all take a look. And if there are key elements, they could be brought in and maybe put into another part of this chapter, which, I think...

Board Member Behar: And that may be the answer.

Chairperson Pardo: That's where it should be.

Board Member Behar: And that may be the answer.

Chairperson Pardo: And that's the whole point. So, at this time, I'd like to recognize the City Manager. He's already been cleared through security. He is an engineer and...

City Manager Iglesias: Yes, yes, structural engineer, by the way.

Chairperson Pardo: Welcome, Mr. Manager.

City Manager Iglesias: No, I apologize. I apologize to all of you. I just had a call. I've been involved today in the -- with Code Compliance and the County in dealing with some changes for the 40-year recertification. I just got a call from Code Compliance, which I had to take. I think everything went fairly well. We're looking at getting some, I think, stronger Chapter 8 of the Florida -- of Dade County, which handles that, and I think we're looking at maybe going to a 30-year process, going to a more stringent process, looking at making sure that the recertification

whether it's an architectural engineer, are certified to do it. If you're doing a 30-story building, you better be -- you better have experience on a 30-story building. We're also looking at making sure that the Building Official is aware of what's going on, because you can provide that recertification from -- to the homeowner's association and they can hold that thing for years, like just happened to us on one of the buildings, the one on 730 Coral Way. Nothing like that, because it was really the fact that it had no maintenance, no maintenance for 34 years. So, I apologize for taking that...

Chairperson Pardo: That's fine.

City Manager Iglesias: Call, but we're trying to work something out because we have another meeting tomorrow to try to get this pushed along and get to the County Commission. I just wanted to thank -- I haven't had a chance to come by and I wanted to thank the Committee for helping us with this. I think our Board of Architects does a fabulous job. We're the only city that has a Board of Architects, and it's so important really for the branding of the City. And as an engineer, there's nothing better than working on an outstanding building, there's nothing better. And so, I just wanted to thank all of you really for putting the effort. We want to -- and looking at our Mediterranean bonus. I know there's been talk about looking at bonuses for good architecture, and it's something that I actually talked to Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk when we first started doing the actual Zoning Code, talking about maybe going back and looking at that. Also looking at the Mile and some of the areas in the downtown district where the storefronts are kind of poor and looking at better standards for that because I think the Mile and Ponce and so forth, I think need better upgrades there. So -- but it's so difficult to do. You know, what is outstanding architecture and what gets this. And so, you know, the fact that you're all doing this and -- concerning Mediterranean architecture is great because if we start adding too much, then we'll have mission creep and we'll never get this done, and we just have another zoning in progress to the next September 28th meeting. So -- but it's something that we can consider later, I think, because you know, should we look at outstanding architecture. And having been involved in the City of Miami and a number of those buildings, and actually I was involved in a new one that may be 105 stories

that was designed -- that was a competition that was won by Foster architects. You know, it's just outstanding work. But I just wanted to thank all of you for the job that you're doing. It's much appreciated. And I want our City Architect to know that we appreciate him very much. We appreciate the Board of Architects very much. That's what separates us from other cities, that we've got outstanding architecture. We've got, you know, a good Zoning Code that actually provides for just really fantastic structures here, and the fact -- when people complain, I say, "Go across the street and have your house valued at half less," right? And that's pretty much it. So, thank you all very, very much for this. Thank you.

Board Member Bermello: Thank you, Mr. Manager.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you for your kind words.

Board Member Bermello: Thank you.

Unidentified Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Manager.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, so right now we've been able to conclude with the third one, so why don't -- since we have the comments, the one last thing -- Does anyone --? You know, it's pretty simple the way -- we didn't change the format or anything. On Section 5-202, are there are any objections with the redlining in there? On Section 5-202, on page 5-12.

Board Member Bermello: Five dash?

Chairperson Pardo: And it goes to 5-13 also.

Board Member Bermello: What page are you on?

Chairperson Pardo: 5-12, 5-13. It's the Section 5-202. Because if we could get this one out of the way, we've gone through the whole -- you know, the whole gamut, and then we could go back and study Table 3, and see if there are any comments. Come back, fine-tune when Mr. Ceballos sends us the new redline with today's comments, and then maybe at the next meeting, we basically can wrap it up. Willy, I know you're going to be having surgery.

Board Member Bermello: On the 14th.

Chairperson Pardo: On the 14th. So, you won't be here for the 15th meeting.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, I'm having surgery for next Thursday, so I won't be here.

Chairperson Pardo: Are you the donor for Willy or --?

Board Member Bermello: They're taking one tendon from one place and then the other. I've got no donors, internal donors.

Chairperson Pardo: No, what I was saying is, if we could get it to the comments, you know, and get those through to Gus on the Table 13 (sic), and Gus can clean up the...

Board Member Bermello: Table 3, you mean.

Board Member Pratt: Table 3, yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: In Table -- sorry, Table 3, and then Gus can clean up the last version, I think maybe he could email it to us. We'd still have a quorum, but then both, Glenn, you, and Willy can, I guess, send in any comments.

Board Member Pratt: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah. Do you see us going beyond next Thursday?

Chairperson Pardo: No. I'm trying to wrap it up next Thursday.

Board Member Bermello: So, I mean, I'll be here next Thursday. I mean, I...

Chairperson Pardo: I'm hoping to wrap it up on Thursday, if we can get -- I know we had a little bit of an issue with the verbatim record last time. I think Gus just got it a few days ago.

City Clerk Urquia: I mean, we'll try to get it to him a little bit sooner, but it's a lot of typing.

Chairperson Pardo: I know, I know.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: At least for the purposes of today's meeting, I don't need the transcript. There were very few minor changes which I was able to do on the fly.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: So, I don't need the transcript.

Chairperson Pardo: That's great, that's great. And then the only thing would be the comments as, you know, was suggested by Robert, you know, that we just take one last look at that Table 3. And then if not, then we could then try to come up and basically hash out the last final point.

Board Member Behar: And to make it easier, I would concentrate, I think, on number one, building setbacks reduction.

Chairperson Pardo: To leave it in or take it out?

Board Member Behar: No, leave it in, but modify that.

Chairperson Pardo: Modify, okay.

Board Member Behar: You know because every case may be different. I -- the encroachment, as far as I'm concerned, we could take that out completely.

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, I agree.

Board Member Behar: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: You guys agree?

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, because if you have an encroachment...

Chairperson Pardo: Juan, you good with that?

Board Member Bermello: You're going to go up to the City Commission, let's face it, right?

Board Member Behar: But...

Board Member Salman: Yeah.

Board Member Behar: Willy...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I don't think it's ever been used in my time, so I think it should be taken out.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Behar: Yeah, the -- number three...

Chairperson Pardo: That's already in the Code. This is the part that I don't understand.

Board Member Bermello: Let me ask you, Robert. Let me ask you, how many buildings have you had to do where you did not respect the setbacks?

Board Member Behar: Willy, I don't think this is -- if you incorporate -- and in some building it may be appropriate to put in an arcade. That means that you're going to go to zero setback and bring the arcade...

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: To the property line.

Board Member Bermello: I get it. I get it with an arcade, and I said -- I mean, arcades, we have them there already.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Or a wider sidewalk also.

Board Member Pratt: No, but the arcades still have to comply with setbacks...

Board Member Behar: Right.

Board Member Pratt: Regardless. So, this is strictly an allowance for...

Chairperson Pardo: But the arcade...

Board Member Pratt: Making better architecture and...

Board Member Bermello: I think the issue is that an arcade, just because the Code says in a certain area will be the wrong thing to do.

Board Member Behar: But Willy...

Board Member Bermello: And it should not be read as a license to do it wherever you so desire. You have the ability to do an arcade and go into your setback.

Board Member Behar: So, if I want to reduce a setback and I don't use an arcade, I got to go for a variance. I'm going to go through the Board of Architects; there's no hardship for the variance, it gets denied.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: But that's where the Code could be enhanced.

Board Member Behar: Well, that's -- either we make it -- we -- but the way it is today, this is the only mechanism.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I don't think so because it does talk about courtyards. It does talk about adjacent to the...

Chairperson Pardo: That's correct. That's already in the Code.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah, and what I'm saying is that maybe we can be more specific and say, "in any public space that is adequate and approve by the Board of Architects." For example...

Chairperson Pardo: I'm going to look (INAUDIBLE)...

Board Member Behar: Everything else, I don't have a problem with.

Board Member Bermello: Maybe do a little bit of rewriting there.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: When -- is that -- are you going to work on that for the next -- next Thursday?

Chairperson Pardo: So, everybody's good with taking out 3 and 4?

Board Member Pratt: The only thing about 4 is that if you're -- if you do -- I think what happens is there -- or what I've seen from experience is that the unit sizes become so large that you can't really make the economics work.

Board Member Bermello: Which is number 4?

Board Member Pratt: Number 4 is the increase in density.

Board Member Behar: That may -- let's look it. May not want to remove that.

Board Member Bermello: But this is the issue. This is not -- density is different than FAR.

Board Member Pratt: No, no. It's -- the FAR still remains the same, but what happens is that if you keep the density the same and you're -- but you're increasing the size...

Chairperson Pardo: But it's the density across...

Board Member Bermello: That's good, this is bad.

Chairperson Pardo: The board is 125 units per...

Board Member Behar: Not everywhere.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, this is increasing the number of units per acre, which in fact would be a violation of the Comp Plan.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: That is an excellent point.

Board Member Bermello: Because the Comp Plan regulates exactly this. The Comp Plan doesn't regulate FAR, as far as I know. And so, what this is doing is increasing the number of dwelling units per acre. Listen, when Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk was doing her review -- and Ramon knows this -- she agreed with me that there's no business of FAR in residential districts. It's a misnomer. It's a misapplication.

Unidentified Speaker: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: But it stayed. It's one of those things -- it's like an unwanted guest that stays later. Well, it stayed. But when you talk about density here, you're talking about dwelling units per acre, and I think that's not what we want to do. That's just going to introduce smaller and more little units, not bigger units.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: In addition, what happens is that...

Board Member Bermello: The wording that I was trying to introduce that I'd like to...

Chairperson Pardo: Is the opposite.

Board Member Bermello: Discuss later talks about bigger units and less units.

Chairperson Pardo: And height.

Board Member Bermello: And less height and more setback. I mean, as I talked to residents, they all talked -- we want more greenery. We want less height, and we don't want these overcrowded places that attract -- I mean, traffic is usually -- at every election time, the Gables were blessed with very little problems. The only one problem always is through-traffic through the Gables. And you get that with density; let's face it. You get it with density. So, I -- the one item that I'm recommending that we haven't discussed is, one that addresses that by having less density, bigger units, not as high and with more frontage in the Gables. That's what people are looking for. This year, this 25 percent is talking about dwelling units per acre. So, if you have 50 dwelling units per acre, you're adding 25 percent to that. That's the way I read it.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah, and what happens most of the time, in most projects, it's not relevant because in the downtown, there's no density limit...

Unidentified Speaker: Yeah.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: For example.

Board Member Bermello: It's a crazy thing that stays there that it's not -- I mean, some people -- then I think, you know, a resident could -- may equate FAR and density, but they're not the same. And that's why I struck this whole thing out. But I -- listen, I agree. I'm willing to look at the setback, Robert. And you know, I realize there's a little bit of horse trading, that if you do certain thing that are of more -- sometimes a setback really doesn't add a lot. I get it. I think with -- you know, I used the example of a setback on an alleyway, you know. Other than moving traffics or

getting trash in and out, you know, it's better to have setbacks on frontage, on the front of a building. But even -- but I could sense that if the courtyard is a courtyard enjoyed by the public, then my premise, Ramon, is that bonuses should be in exchange for a public benefit.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes, yes.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: It's not in exchange for having a larger private pool or for having a...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Maybe...

Board Member Bermello: Private garden, right?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Maybe that should be language that is included, that specific language.

Board Member Bermello: When I struck this out was because I was failing to see, you know -- sure, if you provide a public courtyard; sure, if you provide through-block connections for the public. Those are benefits.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: But that's done already I think very well by the Board of Architects.

Board Member Bermello: I'm just not seeing why necessarily do you have to reduce the setbacks. What if you do both? In other words, what if I provide the courtyard? What if I provide the through-block connection?

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: And then I get the bonus. What we're saying is, in order for me to do this, I'm going to give up the setbacks, and that's where I had some philosophical issue, although I could sense that there could be a project where maybe the setback that's required does not do any good for anyone. And I keep using the alleyway as an example. So that was kind of like...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Board Member Behar: Let's analyze it and let's, you know, look at it. And next week, we'll finalize this. I think we're almost over.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, that's what I'm trying to get. So, we're okay with 502 (sic)?

Board Member Bermello: 502?

Chairperson Pardo: Which is standing by itself, page 5-12 and 5-13 is the last...

Board Member Bermello: So, I just have a comment or question.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: In item one, where it says, "include design elements of the Coral Gables Mediterranean architectural style or characterized by, but not limited to," now, I love the "but not limited to the following buildings." And I just wanted to make sure we're all -- that the way I'm looking at it is the way that the board is looking at it. Does that mean that --? I'm an architect and I really don't like any of these examples. What I have in mind is something that maybe is more tied into a Mizner building done in Palm Beach that I really like. And I come into the Board of Architects, and I say, "This is what I have in mind." This is what I have in mind and that building is not listed here.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I think that the added...

Board Member Bermello: Is that -- was that the intent?

Chairperson Pardo: That was the intent.

Board Member Bermello: Or what does the "but not limited to" mean?

Chairperson Pardo: That was my intent.

Board Member Bermello: That was your intent?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I think...

Board Member Bermello: Robert, you were going to -- were you going --?

Board Member Behar: No. I like -- I agree with you. I would like "but not limited to," so you know -- and these are great examples, but just not let us limit ourselves just to these seven examples.

Board Member Bermello: Well, the "but not limited to" does that. To me, it opens the door, but I just wanted to understand the intent because I know that Ramon is going to be on the other side when they're looking at projects, and I'm going to remind him. "Remember that we had that discussion and Jose was there on the board?" And the "but not limited to" means that I can in fact...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: We had a very productive discussion on that, right? But one thing that -- I've had this discussion with Mr. Behar before -- is that if you look at the Biltmore,

there are some areas that have a lot of glass, a lot of glass. We've had this discussion years ago, and that would have been able to -- you would have been able to use that as an example when the board were saying that the contrast between the massing of the windows and so on, for example. One last thing, I think that this last paragraph that talks about the document Coral Gables Mediterranean architectural style is a good idea. I think that we also did a best practices manual - - staff did -- which collected all of the original drawings, basically just the information. Those are things that we can certainly use for reference. In the 1920s, that's the way the Biltmore and all those great buildings were done. Okay, I have the books. I have the books. They had books that had style very clearly defined. My favorite one is the one that talks about lesser known -- lesser known, not masterpieces -- lesser-known architecture of Spain, a wonderful book from 1924. I have it in my office. And what happens is that if we have references like that that can help all of us, designers and reviewers, we can get better architecture because that's the way they did it in the 20s. That's the way that all the people that worked with Merrick did it. And what I'm saying -- I've been saying this for years. I spent several chapters in my Ph.D. dissertation talking about it, and apparently, I'm the only one who cares about those things. But the technique is well known, well documented, and we should encourage that.

Chairperson Pardo: It's just...

Board Member Bermello: So, that's the intent of the "but not limited to"?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Hmm?

Board Member Bermello: That's the intent of the "but not..."

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: Limited to"?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes, yes.

Board Member Bermello: Okay.

Board Member Salman: If you want to be original, you have to find an obscure source.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: There you go.

Board Member Salman: I think that's what Mr. Trias is actually going to tell us.

Chairperson Pardo: So, are we pretty much good with that so we can polish this off? You could change (INAUDIBLE)...

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, I don't have any issues at all with what you have here, as long as the "but not limited to" is that. You know, I'll give you a quick -- we've talked about the Museum parking garage, and you know, if I had to do it over one area that I think does not work well -- not because of the architectural, but because of the functional -- are the stairwells. If you are -- I don't know -- an elderly or a woman going into that garage and you're going down the stairs, they smell. They're ugly. They're dark. They're not conducive to people going up and down, even waiting for an elevator. And the problem is that the architecture, you know, it's Mediterranean. What would you want there? A lot of glass. You know, that's what -- if we were doing anywhere in the United States car parking garages, which is kind of a misnomer with Mediterranean style, you'd want to have a lot of glass into your vertical circulation course. You want to make people feel safe.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: At night they're lit up, et cetera, et cetera, and we did not do that. So, for me, that's a little failure there. But I wonder, taking that project through putting it under this kind of rigorous definition, how would you accomplish that unless you have a lot of little, small

windows creating kind of a greenhouse effect. But then you'd probably have a hard time finding anywhere -- I don't care, Salamanca, anywhere -- to find anything that you could say, "Look, I have an example." So, you know, there may be some areas, Mr. Chair, that, you know, flex -- I get it. I'm all for the flexibility on the Board of Architects to say, you know, within the context of the entire garage in these two areas, it's okay to depart because the public benefit here is providing visibility, safety for the users, and light in an area that -- the only place you spend time in a garage really is when you're waiting for the elevator, right?

Board Member Pratt: Well, I'll give you an example. Actually, because the Board of Architects just approved it, the building that is being proposed and is going to be constructed, the new garage facility for the Public Safety Building. That has a completely open glass garage and really follows the example that you were just recommending. And that's thanks to the City Manager also, so...

Board Member Bermello: As long as that would not fail -- or I guess what I'm bringing up, I would not want an architect to fail on that because it may not meet, you know, the rigorous definition, Mr. Chair, of...

Chairperson Pardo: No, no.

Board Member Bermello: You know...

Chairperson Pardo: And that's...

Board Member Bermello: You know, so...

Chairperson Pardo: The intent has never been to do a replication.

Board Member Bermello: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: That has never been the intent.

Board Member Behar: And you mentioned that in the parking garage you wanted more glass, which I agree. Wouldn't you not want the same thing today in a residential building, that you're spending -- especially after the last year and a half -- that you're spending more time. Don't you want to be able to have for the benefit of those residents, those users, more glass?

Board Member Bermello: Absolutely.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: But the point I'm making is, if you look at the Biltmore, there are areas of the Biltmore that have a lot more glass. So even that example that is listed here would help your case. Now, the last thing, if you don't mind, if you're finished with the discussion, I would like to have a clear idea of your expectation of the process of adoption. And my concern was that in the discussion that Mr. Pardo had with the Commission that was mentioned earlier today, there seemed to be a rush to do first reading on September 14th, then going to the Planning and Zoning in between first and second reading, et cetera. If that is your recommendation as a board, please make it. Otherwise, I would advise you to perhaps take a more gradual process, going to Planning and Zoning first, and then going to Commission.

Chairperson Pardo: No. The reason that the -- the Commission actually, they discussed that specifically. And the reason that they went back on that -- Mr. Ceballos, if you could correct me if I'm wrong -- is that they thought that they wanted to take a look at it the first shot to make sure they're in agreement.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Then what I would advise...

Chairperson Pardo: In other words, why go to Planning and Zoning, if they're not in agreement and then come back.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: What I would recommend...

Board Member Behar: That's what I took from the goal.

Board Member Bermello: So, if they're in agreement, do they plan to send it to Planning and Zoning?

Board Member Behar: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: Yes, but...

Board Member Bermello: After they -- so they're going to give it a green light?

Board Member Behar: Correct.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't be here talking about this if it wasn't a critical issue in the sense that we have deadlines for noticing. I don't know how we're going to notice this in terms of the community as a whole. It would be advisable -- and that is my recommendation to you and to the City Manager and to anyone -- to follow a more typical process, if you don't mind. I think that would give us a much better outcome. And like I said, you make the recommendation you think is appropriate, but I...

Board Member Behar: I'm going to speak...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Wanted to raise the issue.

Board Member Behar: As a Planning and Zoning board member. I would prefer that it went to Commission...

Chairperson Pardo: Absolutely.

Board Member Behar: Before it came to us, because if there's a change in the Commission, it's going to have to come back. So, I think that the Commissioners should have the blessing before it goes to committee.

Board Member Bermello: That makes sense.

Chairperson Pardo: They could strike out...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I...

Chairperson Pardo: A sentence and they could add things, and why waste the Planning Board's time?

Board Member Behar: And have a special meeting just for that. I mean, so...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: September 14th is two weeks away. I mean, we don't have a document yet. I'm just saying, you know, we...

Board Member Bermello: We're getting close.

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Trias, I think -- and I said it to the Commission. And by the way, I complimented both our Assistant City Attorney and our City Clerk for spending the amount of time that they have here, you know, before this committee.

Board Member Bermello: Actually, you recommended a raise for both of them, didn't you?

Chairperson Pardo: I didn't quite go that way; the Manager wouldn't have that.

Board Member Behar: We could make a resolution.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah. So, the point is, I think it doesn't look like much to maybe some people, but we've covered a lot of ground. And I don't want to take the foot off the pedal. I want to get it right. And I think because we've been able to get this meeting under our belt today, I feel confident that once Mr. Ceballos sends us the final things and we could take a look at it, we're going to wrap it up next week. So, we wrap it up next week.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: My...

Unidentified Speaker: Mr. Trias, is your concern...

Unidentified Speaker: (INAUDIBLE) proper notification so that this happens correctly.

Unidentified Speaker: What was specifically your concern?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Well, I'm concerned about notice. And the main issue is that this is not a project that we're going to notice within 1,500 feet. This is a change of the Zoning Code...

Unidentified Speaker: The Code, right.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Which affects the whole city, affects every architect, affect every neighbor that is interested in these issues. We need to be able to communicate all this in a reasonable way. I would think that we would have to prepare a staff report that deals with the technical issues of the review and so on. That may take a little bit of -- a few days. We can do whatever you want. I mean, I don't have any issue with doing what you are suggesting. All I'm

saying is that it is more likely that we will do a better job if we take a little bit more time. That's all.

Chairperson Pardo: And the other thing, Mr. Trias, that I want to be very clear about is that there are a lot of people on hold in this community right now, businesspeople because of the moratorium. And I think we have discussed this among the committee members, also with public, although there's no public here today. And by the way, Mr. Clerk, is there anyone on Zoom today?

City Clerk Urquia: There are members of the public on Zoom, yes.

Chairperson Pardo: And would they like to speak?

City Clerk Urquia: I can ask. I can send a message through Zoom to see if that's their wish.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Like I said, I just wanted to raise the issue. If you are not interested in that...

Chairperson Pardo: I appreciate your concern.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: (INAUDIBLE). Thank you. Thank you very much.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chair, may I have a --? Before we -- are we going to open the meeting for public comments?

Chairperson Pardo: Well, I...

Board Member Behar: I don't think today is necessary.

Chairperson Pardo: I don't know how many people there...

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, I...

Board Member Behar: I don't think it's necessary.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah. Mr. Manager?

Board Member Pratt: I don't think it's necessary.

City Manager Iglesias: If I may say, it would be, I think, appropriate that if we're going to take this to the September 14th meeting, that the entire board come to that September...

Chairperson Pardo: Oh, absolutely.

City Manager Iglesias: 14th meeting so we can hear the Chair's comments and...

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah.

City Manager Iglesias: All your comments.

Chairperson Pardo: I actually expressed that to the Board at the very beginning, that at the day of the presentation not only are they invited, you know, they're welcomed.

City Manager Iglesias: And if you feel confident in the document that you're preparing then we can have a special Planning and Zoning -- P&Z meeting after the first Commission meeting. We just have to -- Ramon has an issue because he's got notice -- we have notice...

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

City Manager Iglesias: Requirements...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

City Manager Iglesias: That we have to work with. And the second meeting is September 28th, so it's only 14 days from that. But depending on what -- on how it goes on the 14th, we really would -- we really have an issue creating a P&Z meeting between the 14th and the 28th because one is the notice requirement for the -- if we were to do it -- it's 14 days, correct, Ramon?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah. And the issue is that (INAUDIBLE).

City Manager Iglesias: Right. Our process requirements have to be on the money here.

Board Member Behar: We might not make it.

City Manager Iglesias: And as our City Attorney...

Unidentified Speaker: Then we may not make it.

City Manager Iglesias: If you feel that -- so I think it's going to be difficult because when will we have to notice the meeting, two weeks before, correct? So that would be...

City Clerk Urquia: Ten days.

City Manager Iglesias: So, it'll be...

Board Member Behar: It doesn't look like you're going to have the time to make it.

City Manager Iglesias: Well, that's what I'm saying. If we notice it, let's say, on the 21st, then we would have to notice it two weeks before that, which would be on the 7th, approximately. So, it doesn't look like -- it doesn't look good for the second reading on the 28th.

Board Member Behar: The 28th.

City Manager Iglesias: With an intermediate -- so...

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Manager.

City Manager Iglesias: And the reason I'm talking to you about now is because it's something I would like to discuss with the Mayor and the Commissioners because maybe the 28th might be better. I believe the first meeting in October is the 12th -- correct, Ramon? -- October 12th?

(COMMENTS MADE OFF THE RECORD)

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Manager...

City Manager Iglesias: No, no, no. I'm talking about...

Board Member Behar: For Commission, Commission.

City Manager Iglesias: The first Commission meeting is the 12th, I think.

City Clerk Urquia: No, it's the 14th.

City Manager Iglesias: The Planning and Zoning is right after that. I believe it's the...

City Clerk Urquia: City Commission meeting is the -- oh, you mean for October?

Board Member Behar: October.

City Manager Iglesias: For October. I think it's the 12th, right?

City Clerk Urquia: October 12th is the City Commission meeting.

City Manager Iglesias: And P&Z is the 13th, so P&Z for...

City Clerk Urquia: The 13th.

City Manager Iglesias: October is over. So, unless we decide to go to the second meeting in October and have another zoning in progress until then -- which I'm really not keen on doing, and I don't think anybody...

Board Member Behar: But Peter.

City Manager Iglesias: Any of you are too.

Board Member Behar: If we got -- if we have a special meeting in September 21st for P&Z...

City Manager Iglesias: We would have to notice it on the 7th before the Commission meeting, and that -- and those documents would have to be available at that time.

Board Member Behar: And so, the earliest you could do, the week of the 28th for P&Z, and then two weeks after that...

City Manager Iglesias: Well, the week of the 28th, the Commission meeting is on the 28th, Tuesday, the 28th.

Board Member Behar: But this will not be able to go to Commission on the 28th; it would have to be October 12th.

City Manager Iglesias: And that's what I want to talk about. That's...

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

City Clerk Urquia: So, Peter, what you're suggesting is...

City Manager Iglesias: Because I can discuss that with the electeds because their expect -- the ZIP, the zoning in progress, is to the 28th.

City Clerk Urquia: So, Peter, what you're suggesting is the meeting of the 14th, perhaps, set the Planning and Zoning Board meeting for the week of the 27th. It'll give you enough time, and then you can bring it in the first meeting in October.

City Manager Iglesias: That would be...

Board Member Behar: That's what I was saying.

City Clerk Urquia: Correct.

Board Member Behar: That's what I was trying to...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah, yeah.

City Manager Iglesias: So, I think that what I -- since we do -- since you all are going to present on that and the whole board, and I appreciate that -- the whole committee, excuse me -- present on the 14th, I can relay to the Commission that there is a notice issue as far as the 28th. So maybe on the 14th, we can extend it to the 12th, and we have time to go to the meeting of the 14th, go to P&Z, and then hopefully finish it on the October 12th meeting. Does that sound good to you all?

Board Member Bermello: Sounds like a plan.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah. The whole -- logistically, you know, that works. I mean, and right now, we don't know how the Commission is going to react to the document...

Board Member Behar: But if we have to give...

Chairperson Pardo: To begin with.

Board Member Behar: Notices, we have no choice.

City Manager Iglesias: And also, it would allow you a little more time because you could work until -- you have until the 14th really, you know. Actually, let me not -- Billy's going to faint on me if I tell them it will be up to the 14th. You have until the Thursday.

City Clerk Urquia: You have 'til the 7th.

City Manager Iglesias: Thursday, give them two more days.

City Clerk Urquia: Alright, 'til the 9th then.

City Manager Iglesias: Give them two more days, until the 9th. I'll give you as much time as possible, you know. So that -- because if it has to be ready for the 21st, everything has to be ready by the 7th, it doesn't give the Commission time to really look at it, which this is what they wanted to do.

Board Member Behar: But I think you know, from what I've seen tonight, we're going to be completed by the second, next week, so that gives, you know, Billy plenty of time.

City Manager Iglesias: But if anything happens on the 14th -- I guess we could set it up, but if anything happens -- any changes happen on the 14th, that's a problem with notice for the P&Z. You see what I'm saying? So, if the Commission decides to change anything or work with you all on that 14th, it doesn't allow for those changes.

Unidentified Speaker: (INAUDIBLE) can't control that.

City Manager Iglesias: You think it's going to be 100 percent?

Unidentified Speaker: We can't control (INAUDIBLE).

City Manager Iglesias: Oh, you can't control that.

City Clerk Urquia: Mr. Chair, before you...

Unidentified Speaker: You're planning for a contingency that may or may not happen.

Unidentified Speaker: That's right.

City Clerk Urquia: Mr. Chair, you do have a member of the public wishing to speak.

Chairperson Pardo: How many?

Board Member Bermello: Before we do that and before we -- can I make a simple request? We made a couple of changes today to this final redline. Is there any way that we could instruct the City Attorney to make those modifications to the redline?

Chairperson Pardo: Oh, he said he was going to do it on the fly, yeah.

Board Member Bermello: I'm sorry?

Chairperson Pardo: He was going to do it on the fly.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: They're already done. I can send it to all the board members.

Board Member Bermello: Is he also going to do Table 3?

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Unidentified Speaker: He's already made the changes, he said.

Board Member Bermello: Okay.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: But the changes that have been suggested today have already been modified in the document.

Board Member Bermello: And you're going to send those back out?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I can send that literally at the end of the meeting to all the board members.

Unidentified Speaker: Perfect.

Board Member Bermello: There was a wording on an additional item that I had sent out. Is there any way that we can put it for discussion for the next meeting?

Chairperson Pardo: Which one is that?

Board Member Bermello: It was on what I recall the reverse bonus, which is to provide an incentive for larger front setbacks, lesser density, and lesser height, about what it does is gives you an allowance for large units in exchange for doing all of that.

Chairperson Pardo: I thought we were going to do that in another...

Board Member Behar: Section or...

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah. It's -- Willy, I think it's another section to do that.

Board Member Bermello: Would be where?

Chairperson Pardo: I think it's -- because this way...

Board Member Bermello: This will be for -- you're doing Mediterranean bonuses...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: And you, in exchange for wider setbacks, not going as high, and not putting as -- number of units, you're decreasing density, but you're being allowed to put bigger units, still respecting all the setbacks and all -- and actually doing less height and doing larger setbacks. Right now, the Code penalizes larger units in exchange for smaller units. That's the truth right now.

Chairperson Pardo: And that was one of the things I was going to read in the record at the last meeting, and I was not able to.

Board Member Bermello: Right now, the Code pushes you to the highest number of smallest units possible.

Chairperson Pardo: Can you put something together and send it to the City Attorney?

Board Member Bermello: Yeah. I just -- well, I...

Chairperson Pardo: And then he could distribute to all the members, so we could discuss it at the next meeting?

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, I'm going to have it here.

Unidentified Speaker: Perfect.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you.

Board Member Bermello: It actually was in what I sent out last night. But I'll give it to Gus and maybe he can send it out to all of you.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: Now, the idea was to put that in the section right after H.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: Because it fits right in. I mean, I don't think it needs to be -- this is all Mediterranean. It has nothing to do with any other style.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: It's within the style of Mediterranean. I mean, everything here that we were talking in Table 3, in reality, none of it added to the public realm.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: That's why I struck it out entirely.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: And the reason that we're facing what we're facing is because the buildings are too large, high traffic, low setbacks, and you know, I think we need to do something that starts changing the direction of where we want the community to go.

Chairperson Pardo: Is the -- do you have it already in a format of a --?

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, I have it in a format -- the only thing I realize that I made a mistake and I -- in a typo, but I'll give it to Gus before I leave...

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: And I'll resend it tonight to everybody.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright.

Board Member Bermello: I mean, if we send out a message at the end of the day that we did very little, there's going to be some people that think that we did very little.

Board Member Alvarez: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: And I think we need to send -- in my opinion -- a strong message. And so, that's just what I put out. There's going to be people sitting in there and they're going to say, "What did you guys do? What's the message?" And I think part of the message is, number one, we have to protect the public realm.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: This issue of massive bulk without open space, just can't be had. And I realize that what Mr. Trias says is correct. The Code is not the only reason those things happened, okay. But I think if we throughout here -- just like if we sprinkle messages of what is the mission, what is the intent, you know, everybody will start getting it, and that's part of adding that into the Code.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: You know, I'll distribute it.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you. And Mr. Clerk?

City Clerk Urquia: Yes, sir. Ms. Maria Cruz is on Zoom, and she would like to...

City Manager Iglesias: Mr. Chair, can I --?

Chairperson Pardo: Is she the only speaker?

City Clerk Urquia: Yes, sir.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright. Yes, Mr. Manager.

City Manager Iglesias: Well, I will let Maria Cruz speak, if you wish. And then I would like to kind of finalize our discussion...

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

City Manager Iglesias: Concerning how we move forward. Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, can you put Ms. Cruz through?

City Clerk Urquia: Yes. Ms. Cruz?

Board Member Pratt: Can it be really short?

Maria Cruz: I'm here. Good afternoon. I would like to say, in retrospect, I did not think this was going to be a worthwhile setup, but I'm really impressed. And I am sure that most of our residents will agree that we see that you all have heard us, that you have taken into account what we, the residents, would like to see happen. And we are very, very grateful of all of you giving your time and your treasure and your minds and allowing this City to become a little better. So, thank you. Thank you very much.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you, Ms. Cruz. Mr. Manager, you...

City Clerk Urquia: That's it, Mr. Chair.

Board Member Behar: With that, I make a motion to adjourn.

Chairperson Pardo: Wait, the Manager wanted to...

City Clerk Urquia: No, wait. The Manager wanted to make some comments.

Board Member Behar: (INAUDIBLE).

Unidentified Speaker: (INAUDIBLE).

City Manager Iglesias: As far as process is concerned, we could set up a P&Z meeting and then cancel it. Or we could look at going to the Commission meeting, the entire board, looking at what the Commission -- the Commission comments, and coming back and then going to the P&Z again, but that would be -- that would not make the Commission meeting of September 28th. It would make the Commission -- we could make the Commission meeting of October 12. So, if that's what the committee chooses and needs, and then certainly, I can certainly discuss that with the Commission and see if we can -- we could extend the zoning in progress until that October 12 meeting. And it's -- as long as the committee feels that -- I just want -- I want you to feel that we have not put any kind of impediment for you to get it right. That's all. And so, what -- how do we proceed, or how do you feel comfortable in what you've done? And by the way, excellent discussions I was hearing here today. And I'm glad that the residents were able to watch on Zoom. So, we have two options: one is to set up the meeting, and depending on how it goes on the 14th, go with it, or cancel it; or do we go with -- do we go on the 14th, set up the P&Z meeting between the first and second reading, and the second reading would be October 12?

Board Member Behar: Peter, I would -- if I may, I would recommend doing that and sending the notices immediately to the P&Z members to make sure that we could meet. I mean, I'm available; personally, I'm available.

City Manager Iglesias: You mean to meet when?

Chairperson Pardo: For a special meeting.

Board Member Behar: As a special meeting.

City Manager Iglesias: No, no, no. It's going to be a special meeting either way. We don't make...

Board Member Behar: But the day that we need to...

City Manager Iglesias: We don't make the October -- I believe that the October P&Z meeting is the 13th. It's after the Commission meeting.

Board Member Behar: No, no, but in September.

City Manager Iglesias: So, we would need a special meeting no matter what.

Board Member Behar: In September. September, what day are we talking about the special meeting for the P&Z?

City Manager Iglesias: Well, are we look --? But yes, it's going to be a special meeting anyway because we don't make the October meeting. The October Commission meeting, I believe, is the 12th? Yes, Juan?

City Architect Riesco: What he's saying is that (INAUDIBLE).

City Manager Iglesias: No, no, I understand that. Yes, yes, assuming that the quorum works. But the option is setting the meeting ahead of time, ahead of the 14th. Is that the wish of the --?

Board Member Behar: Yes. I mean, I think it's -- right?

(COMMENT MADE OFF THE RECORD)

Board Member Behar: I think so. I think that -- and if we could cancel it, perfect.

City Manager Iglesias: And then we could cancel it.

Board Member Behar: If we don't...

City Manager Iglesias: So, I'm going to instruct Ramon to set up that meeting in between -- after the Commission meeting, and then if we have to cancel, we will cancel. If everything goes well on September 14th, we have the meeting, the P&Z meeting before the 28th, and then it goes to second reading on the 28th. If that's what the committee wishes, then we will work on that. Is that correct?

Board Member Bermello: That makes sense.

Board Member Behar: I'm in favor of that.

Board Member Bermello: I mean, the worst case, if the Commission kicks it down the road...

City Manager Iglesias: Mr. Chair, is that --?

Board Member Bermello: Then we can -- we basically postpone that.

Board Member Behar: Do we need to make a motion to adhere to those dates?

City Manager Iglesias: It would be good if you did because I would like to get consensus on it if possible.

Board Member Bermello: I so move.

Unidentified Speaker: And I'll second.

City Clerk Urquia: I'm sorry. Who seconded?

Chairperson Pardo: Clerk?

City Clerk Urquia: Okay. All in favor?

The Board Members (Collectively): Aye.

City Manager Iglesias: Fantastic, fantastic. Then Ramon, please set up the meeting prior to the 27th, provide notice as required. And then again, we go on the 14th; the entire board presents. We go to P&Z before the 28th, and we go second reading -- with proper notice -- and we go second reading on the 28th of September.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Manager.

City Manager Iglesias: Much appreciated. Thank you all.

Board Member Bermello: Motion to adjourn.

Board Member Behar: Second.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright.

The Board Members (Collectively): Aye.

**City of Coral Gables Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting
September 22, 2021
Public Safety Building
Community Meeting Room
405 Biltmore Way, Coral Gables, FL**

Blue Ribbon Committee Members

**Chairperson Felix Pardo
Board Member Aramis "Mitch" Alvarez
Board Member Robert Behar
Board Member Willy Bermello
Board Member Glenn Pratt
Board Member Javier Salman**

City Staff

**Assistant City Attorney, Gustavo Ceballos
City Clerk, Billy Urquia
City Architect, Juan Riesco
Planning and Zoning Director, Ramon Trias
Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director, Warren Adams
Development Services Director, Suramy Cabrera**

Public Speaker(s)

Sue Kawalerski

Chairperson Pardo: I'm sorry for the tardy -- late -- the late start today because we have three

Chairperson Pardo: We're going to start the Blue-Ribbon committee at this time, although two of our board members are not here again. I'm expecting at least...

City Clerk Urquia: Felix, let me interrupt you. I spoke to both Mitch Alvarez and Javier Salman.

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

City Clerk Urquia: Javier is not going to make it, period. And Mitch, said he's going to try to be here.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. We do have a quorum, so let's continue. As far as the agenda, we received the minutes of the -- the verbatim minutes of the September 2nd meeting. Is there a motion to approve?

Board Member Bermello: So move.

Chairperson Pardo: It's been moved...

Board Member Pratt: Second.

Chairperson Pardo: By Mr. Bermello.

Board Member Pratt: Second.

Chairperson Pardo: Second by Mr. Pratt. Any comments? All those in favor?

The Board Members (Collectively): Aye.

Board Member Behar: Mr. Chairman, should you -- should we call a roll call? Just to -- for the record who's here.

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Clerk, please do so.

City Clerk Urquia: Absolutely. Board Member Behar?

Board Member Behar: Present.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Bermello?

Board Member Bermello: Present.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Pratt?

Board Member Pratt: Present.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Salman? Board Member Riesco?

City Architect Riesco: Here.

City Clerk Urquia: Chairman Pardo?

Chairperson Pardo: Here.

City Clerk Urquia: Sir, you have quorum.

Chairperson Pardo: So, I know we had a staff report coming up, but I wanted to bring something to the committee's attention, the public -- the members from the public here, also and staff. After going through the September 10th final document provided by Mr. Ceballos, I found a couple things that - a few things that were not quite accurate in some cases, and there was one particular item. So, what I did was I made a copy of it and highlighted it in writing in blue, so you could see the difference. It's got the date on top of 9/22. If you can please go to Page 5-2. So, (INAUDIBLE) conversation during our earlier to deliberations about number four on 5-2.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chairman, may I have some clarification?

Chairperson Pardo: Yes, sir.

Board Member Bermello: Why are we here?

Chairperson Pardo: We're here to listen to staff's report and...

Board Member Bermello: My understanding was that we had a meeting scheduled that was cancelled (INAUDIBLE). And then we ended up here.

City Manager Iglesias: May I say something, Mr. Chair?

Board Member Bermello: I just want to...

City Manager Iglesias: We -- yes. And the issue was we (INAUDIBLE) the meeting too close. There was not enough time to really review it, what we had done. I mean, there was a lot of work to do. We felt that it needed a little bit more time. So, the idea was to have staff review it. Ramon is here - - Ramon Trias is here, our Assistant Director of Planning, to go over staff comments, (INAUDIBLE) with the committee, and then meet with the Commission on the 28th; go to the October 13th P&Z, then finalize it in the second meeting in October instead of rushing everything. So, that meeting -- the special meeting (INAUDIBLE) on the (INAUDIBLE) 28th. I thought that was not enough time to really look at this thing and let staff analyze it, come back, talk to the committee. And let me just -- before I start, I just want to thank all of you for the work you've done. Much appreciated. You've put a lot of effort into it. And I can tell you, the Commission, the Mayor, the Commission appreciates this very much and so do I. And so, I did not want to go (INAUDIBLE) the staff report that you do not -- have not seen, that was not analyzed. And ideally, it would be great to go with one comprehensive document. What this does, it puts into one document the existing ordinance, the committee ordinance, and staff comments into one document. And it allows you all to go through this document. And hopefully, Mr. Trias will explain and hopefully come to some meeting of the minds. If you agree, that's fine. If you disagree, it's fine. I think what we want to do is get staff comments to you before it goes to the Commission meeting next Tuesday.

Board Member Behar: Mr. Iglesias -- and through the Chair -- I understand why we're here today.

But we've been working on this for the last seven, eight weeks, I believe. Why was staff's recommendation not provided to us sooner? Why --? Because had the meeting not been, you know, postponed, it would have gone through Commission. And we -- I think all of us (INAUDIBLE) -- we never even got a chance to read that.

City Manager Iglesias: Well, I do think that -- I think what the committee -- the committee report should be your committee report, right? It should be your committee report that staff reviews. And I don't want anything that can say that the Administration had their thumb on the scale on anything here. So, we looked at your report. I think your committee report is excellent. I hope that some -- maybe some issues that staff has can make it -- maybe make it better or maybe not. It just depends on you, but this is your report. And I wanted to make it clear that staff has had no thumb on the scale for this report. This is yours. We have some comments on it. And so that's the idea of that, okay? So, we have these comments. We have the meeting on the 28th to get the Commission's comments. Then we go to the P&Z on the 13th, and then we go to the Commission meeting -- the second Commission meaning in October. It means that we have time to review these comments, time to organize them. If you think these comments are good, we will adopt. If you feel these comments are not, we won't. But to answer that, Mr. Behar, it is -- this is your -- I do not want anybody to think that we had anything to do with what this commission did, and we have our thumbs on the scale as far as the architectural bonus program is concerned. Okay, and that's -- and I think it's important that the committee acted on its own, and then we come back to discuss and then present something to the City Commission. So, that was the reason. It was purposely done so that the -- so there would be no question as to what the committee wanted. And I think (INAUDIBLE) doing it. You come up with your report. Mr. Trias can come up with certain things here, and then we optimize and go to the City Commission. We can also get some of their feedback, some of the City Commission feedback in the Commission meeting, and then we've got time until October 13th for P&Z to make further revisions. Then we come back on the 28th. So, I think there's enough time to look at your comments, hear what the staff has to say, optimize the ordinance and proceed forward. Okay, so it was really done out of respect for the committee and the fact that we wanted this process to be independent, completely, completely independent. Again, let me thank all of you for the work that you've put in here, which has been substantial. Much, much appreciated.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Manager.

Board Member Bermello: Did I understand from Gus that you have a couple tweaks, clarifications?

Chairperson Pardo: The...

Board Member Bermello: Would you want to go through that first?

Chairperson Pardo: Right. I would like to get that out of the way. That's why I made quick copies here for...

Board Member Behar: And I also have, you know, a couple (INAUDIBLE) that I want to bring out. And once Mr. Pardo finishes, I want to bring, you know, a couple of them out.

Chairperson Pardo: So, if you go to Page 5-2, number 4. This paragraph was taken out. It seemed

to be completely arbitrary where it was located to begin with. And we had staff and asked staff specifically about the MF3, although there isn't a lot of MF3. One of them, an MF3 project, literally just came up recently. And one of the things that this paragraph did do is that as far as Mediterranean bonuses, the MF3 is exempt from receiving height bonuses. And I simply wanted to put that back into the thing. Because there was an example -- I had personally asked staff about whether this can apply or not apply. I was told, "No, it could not apply," and it just so happens there was an application that went before the Board of Architects last week where it did apply. So, therefore, for me, the reason that the MF3 needs to have the restriction of the additional height even with the -- even the Med bonuses is because normally they're adjacent to single-family or duplex areas. And therefore, that's why it was envisioned not to apply the additional height, you know, there in those areas. There are other safeguards that exist there when it comes to height when you're abutting other types of zoning, but I thought it would be best to put -- to leave it back where it was, and that's really the most technical of all of them, of these issues. The second one -- I circled the pages in blue so it would pop out easily so we could go through this quickly. If you go to Page 5-4, I just wanted to add the word "Table 1" before "Required Standards" because it does not state what the paragraph is talking about. So, by simply saying "Table 1 Required Standards," period, "Application shall be," and then continue. That's fine. The word "in" should have been removed; it was not. And also, the designation multifamily, MF, somehow was removed, but it applies to Table 1 MF and MX districts. And those were the only changes there. That's on Page 5-4. You skip to Page 5-6 under D; this is the Level 1 height table. The tables are not labeled, so you don't know which you're looking at. You could figure it out, by simply by putting in there and labeling it as Level 1 Height table. Then there's no doubt. That's on Page 5-6. 5-7, it looks worse than what it really is. If you go up to number 1 up above all application design Level 2 bonus because now you have Level 1 in the rearview mirror, but it's not telling you -- it's saying "bonuses" so it's confusing. It's not saying the next step. The next step should be Level 2 bonuses shall meet -- and then the minimums. That's making references to the, you know, 8 out of 12 or 6 out of 12, which is out the window. And the reason I showed the dotted arrow dashed line there is because it conflicts. We had all agreed that the applications for residential uses and mixed used districts shall substantially comply with all qualifications in Table 2. So, therefore, that was just a point of clarification of making sure because the reference of minimums being a minimum of how many and we took out the how many because we said they're going to comply with all of them, and that what is Table 2. Down below in the -- in Table 2, we still have the three and the two checks and the building setbacks crossed out, although they were not intended to be crossed out. So, I'm just saying take out the strikeouts. And if you notice, we had left the BOA of architects may allow for variations to the underlying zoning setback requirements. So, it should be replaced to take out the strikeouts on Page 5-7. Go to 5-8, these should become (INAUDIBLE) because we added the Table 2 on the page before because it was out there in space. And by adding E -- making E F, the other thing is that we've already clarified that Level 1 bonus is .2. And the one additional floor under the Level 1 has to do with Mediterranean style. That's already, again, in our rearview mirror. So, now, Level 2 bonuses are for the architectural and pedestrian amenities, which are what make up Table 2. So, it says bonuses of architectural and pedestrian -- because it's referring again to the style, not the heading of Table 2. Then it says an additional bonus up to .3 floor area ratio and one additional story if Level 1 bonuses are awarded and all architectural and pedestrian amenities for Table 2 are utilized in the application design. So, therefore, now it ties everything together. These are Level 1 bonuses, which you have to have the standards. You have to have the style of architecture. Level 2 bonuses: you're going to have architectural and pedestrian amenities based on Table 2. So, now we've (INAUDIBLE). And then finally, 5-9 -- or not finally but almost finally -- Page 5-9, G, Level

2 height table. Again, the height table is now coordinated with the Level 2 bonus. And then we added the letter G, changed H, I, J. And then finally, on 5-10, up above is Table 3. It should be I. Table 3, Other development options, which we had stricken out. That is the building setback reductions, and then added the larger units, and that is all. And I just wanted to try to get it as right as possible. This doesn't mean that, you know, it won't change, there won't be, you know, additional issues. I know that Mr. Behar has some...

Board Member Bermello: I move that we adopt these changes as presented (INAUDIBLE) cleanup and clarify, make it easier for the reader to identify where he or she may be going. So, I thank you for (INAUDIBLE). I will endorse these changes. And if we can adopt them, then we can move on to Mr. Behar's points and then to staff. But I'm all for it and I thank you for it.

Board Member Behar: I'll second.

Board Member Pratt: Just a quick -- before we do, just a point of clarification, Mr. Chair. We have two quick questions in regard to your proposal that has been moved and seconded. The first large removal or addition back, do you want to include all of the language or just the bonus height shall not apply to MF3?

Chairperson Pardo: The entire language.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: The entire language. Okay, and also in regard to Page 5-4, the reference of the MF that was removed, I'm looking at the existing language in the Code and MF was never there. It does say applicable residential, which MF would fall under.

Chairperson Pardo: Correct. It was always missing.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: It was always missing.

Board Member Behar: He wants to add it.

Chairperson Pardo: I'm adding...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Perfect.

Chairperson Pardo: Though it was -- I would call it a scrivener's error.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Perfect. Okay, just wanted to confirm.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you very much. And so, can we adopt this and then --? Okay. Will you call it, Mr. Clerk?

City Clerk Urquia: Roll call.

Board Member Bermello: Yes.

Board Member Pratt: Yes.

City Architect Riesco: Yes.
Board Member Behar: Yes.
Chairperson Pardo: Yes.
(Vote: 5-0)

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you. Mr. Behar, you have the floor.

Board Member Behar: Thank you. We -- on the number 2 from Page 5-2, maybe we could go back to the document you presented to us and let me look for it there. The Public Pedestrian Amenities Purpose and Applicability. We -- under 2a, we put compatibility with the surrounding project and subject to compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood.

Chairperson Pardo: Page 5-1 on the document.

Board Member Behar: On your document, 5-1.

Board Member Bermello: 5-1?

Chairperson Pardo: Item 2a, the top one.

Board Member Bermello: Oh, the top one, okay.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. That sentence where it says, "and subject to compatibility with the surrounding neighborhoods."

Board Member Behar: My concern -- and I agree with compatibility with surrounding neighborhood -- is that I think we should reference something with the existing zoning for that particular area. Because you may have an area that is zoned for X, but you have existing buildings that may not -- that may be, for example, one or two stories and they're not going to be compatible with what's being proposed.

Board Member Bermello: For example, you're thinking, let's say, the industrial district before it became mixed use residential.

Board Member Behar: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: And if you have (INAUDIBLE) simply the wording abstracted from zoning or regulatory framework for that district, there could be an incompatibility just simply because of the state of transition of that area that might have gone to a redevelopment plan approved by the citizens, et cetera. So, I think it's a good point because I can think of that area particularly where you have, you know, all parts and places that were not in conformance, let's say, with the residential or mixed-use building. And if you go by this, you could say, "Hey, this building is not in conformance with what's next to it."

Board Member Behar: Or the new proposed...

Board Member Bermello: In height or in bulk, or you know, whatever. I think maybe -- it's a good point, particularly in areas that are being redeveloped.

Chairperson Pardo: I think you hit it on the head because this is the transition period between -- it's really redevelopment, but I would very much like to keep the verbiage in there but somehow interlace the existing zoning...

Board Member Bermello: Of the neighborhood.

Chairperson Pardo: In other words, the zoning, not the Comprehensive Plan, but the zoning. In other words, the zoning, let's say, is now midrise and it's midrise across the board. Therefore, you have both. Now, by having both phrases in there, then you would have to be very careful with the step backs, the massing of the building, you know, what you would do...

Board Member Behar: But that is addressed in this document.

Chairperson Pardo: Correct. Well, what I'm saying that's why I want to add not...

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Board Member Bermello: In the form of a suggestion, if we say, "surrounding neighborhoods and municipal ordinances in effect." Because like that, you address zoning. There could be an ordinance that's accepted by the City Commission addressing a particular area that (INAUDIBLE) amendment to the zoning. So, I mean, it would make it, you know, actualized so that at that point incompatibility is not just what's next to you but also what are the land use regulations enforced at that point in time. That would be one way I think you address your point, which is a very good one. You could be next to a gas station, you know (INAUDIBLE) compatible but not within the concept of the district guidelines that are in place.

Chairperson Pardo: Would "and existing zoning in the adjacent area" --? The adjacent area could be across the street, next to...

Board Member Behar: It needs to be clarified.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Behar: So, to -- you know, whether it's adjacent or, you know...

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE) across the street (INAUDIBLE). What you don't want is someone two blocks away...

Board Member Behar: No, no, no, no, no. Within the area.

Board Member Bermello: I think the point you're making, I believe, is that if you're complying with the zoning guidelines a hundred percent but because of the state of development of that district, there's a lot of uses that may be non-conforming to the scale or the use of the building and you're not allowed

to -- that somebody can't come across the street and say, "Based on this, they're not compatible..."

Board Member Behar: Correct.

Board Member Bermello: "With the neighborhood," and you know, I get it. I mean, that could be, you know...

Chairperson Pardo: You know, here is -- I agree with you on the issue because then, you know, conceptually you could basically bring any redevelopment to a halt and that's not what we want to do. But on the other side, the thing that I've never been able to understand on Malaga, immediately east of Ponce, you have on the south side, right behind Christie's, single-family residential areas. Then directly across the street, we have the last phase of the Plaza site. Now, the part I can't wrap my head, truly can't understand -- and it's water under the bridge now -- but what I truly can't understand and what I think we have to safeguard against, and I think we would all agree, is that one of the things that we have in the Code that we've always believed is a safety net when we're abutting single-family residential is that, "Well, you can't go any higher than 45 feet for the first 100 feet." And unfortunately, when you drive there and you're just sitting at the light waiting to make a left-hand turn on Ponce and you're looking straight down this tiny, tiny, tiny street and you have the single-family residential on the right, and then you have a very tall building on the left, much greater than 45 feet. They're totally incompatible. And what I can't understand is normally the zoning would be the buffer to protect. Yes, Mr. Iglesias.

City Manager Iglesias: My concern is -- and I just discussed that with the City Attorney -- that that should be a function of the underlying zoning adjacent to those areas. And if you have the Board of Architects changing underlying zoning, you have a Bert Harris issue and you have all kinds of issues that -- so we have to be -- so, I just want to say that we need to be very, very careful. Because if you have the Board of Architects reducing height, reducing things like this, you get into the Board of Architects is now dealing with zoning issues and that can be a serious problem.

Board Member Bermello: I agree. That's why I was saying it -- that could be respected by -- in other words, the zoning in the district that you're developing assumes that the zoning was done through a public process...

Board Member Behar: Right.

Board Member Bermello: It went through a whole vetting process with the neighborhood and with the City and City staff. So, I think the comment coming from Mr. Behar is that (INAUDIBLE) incompatibility with a use that is immediately next to it, but you're complying with the zoning, the zoning trumps that incompatibility not the other way around.

City Manager Iglesias: And -- yes.

Board Member Bermello: Not that you can use the incompatibility to modify or amend the zoning. That would be like spot zoning.

Board Member Behar: This is more of -- my comment is more of a clarification. That is if zoning

allows it, then it will be compatible. What exactly the point you made is what I'm concerned that they could come and say, "Well, you're allowed to do a midrise building," let's do as an example, "because the zoning allows it." But maybe the board says, "You've got existing one-story buildings. It is not compatible what you're producing."

Board Member Bermello: It may be the board. It could be a citizen. It could be one of the Commissioners.

Board Member Behar: And exactly what I'm trying to avoid is that we -- the City gets into one of those predicaments that we get sued for taking away development from a property owner.

City Manager Iglesias: Well, that's really not the Board of Architects' issue.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

City Manager Iglesias: Really, and the Chair brought a very interesting project up, but that should have been taken care of from a zoning perspective, where you do have 45 feet and they have a 100 footstep back. Or you may have some other issue that you provide some type of liner or some other zoning criteria. But we just have to be careful that -- and I've discussed this with the City Attorney - - that we don't get caught in rezoning and developing spot zoning. It's a Bert Harris issue.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Mr. Chairman, if I could answer the specific question. It's a PAD and that is why it happened, and the process had to come.

Chairperson Pardo: And that is exactly where the problem is. You are 100 percent correct. But I would -- and again, I'm not endorsing for the Board of Architects to, you know, get into zoning. But I think that the particular PAD that was approved there definitely left those single-family homes hanging. I mean, out to dry. There's no doubt in my mind. There's no one on the face of this earth that could say, you know, those people have got to feel really good opening their front door of their single-family home and looking at something that could have been stepped back, could have been done differently at that time.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And...

City Manager Iglesias: Mr. Chair, I understand that but that has to do with not looking at the underlying zoning and not sticking to the underlying zoning. The PAD -- it may be a PAD, but it still has to meet the underlying zoning and other issues that Mr. Trias can talk about.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

City Manager Iglesias: Now, so we are looking at a project that really, if you look at the prior project, this is a totally completely different project.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: What I want to point out is...

City Manager Iglesias: You may have a PAD, but that PAD doesn't allow you to work

indiscriminately is what I'm saying.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: As we discussed last time, that had a conceptual review by Board of Architects, multiple meetings by the Board of Architects. It did go through a very thorough process and so on. And unfortunately, some of the results are not what some people may like. But I don't want to have anybody have the impression that there wasn't a very thorough process and Commission approval multiple times, et cetera, et cetera.

Board Member Behar: And I don't want to deviate from the intent that I think -- my point is that was a project most of us would not -- you know, may not be in agreement with the project, but we cannot -- I don't think we should use that project. I'm concerned exactly what Mr. Iglesias -- we cannot get in a predicament, the city, that we take away and we get into a litigation process. And I think this language needs to be clarified. And maybe with Mr. Bermello's suggestion if -- you now, so long as it's compatible with the underlying zoning or something, that -- because this -- to me, this language could say, you know, the zoning may allow you to do it, but you got a one-story building next to you, you cannot do it; it's not compatible. And that's the clarification I want to make sure...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: (INAUDIBLE) compatible in the context of planning allows exactly (INAUDIBLE) what you're saying. That's what that means.

Chairperson Pardo: I added one word that the Manager brought up, which is underlying, as in underlying zoning. So, what I would suggest is, one, we just incorporate it now to get this out of the way -- is that on 2a, Page 5-1, where it says a at the last line -- "and subject to compatibility with the surrounding neighborhoods and existing underlying zoning in the adjacent area." Does anyone had any comment that they would like to change that?

Board Member Bermello: I just (INAUDIBLE) teacher would tell me that you don't use "and" twice.

Chairperson Pardo: Comma, comma.

Board Member Bermello: I would say "and subject to compliance with the underlying zoning district as well as compatibility with the surrounding neighborhoods." I think the zoning district needs to have (INAUDIBLE) of compatibility, which we all endorse. I think one is going to be a subjective estimation, and the other one is you're either in compliance with the zoning or you're not in compliance with the zoning.

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Ceballos.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Pardon my interruption. My concern is, I don't believe that this language you're adding adds any (INAUDIBLE). We've reviewed this for certain Bert J. Harris claims and we're comfortable with the language as you've already added. Adding language "applicable to the Zoning Code," of course you'd have to abide by the applicable Zoning Code. And once again, we have to remember what this is. This is a Mediterranean bonus. So, this is not to suggest that if I am as of right -- I can build 45 feet or to 100 feet and the abutting property is a single-family home with a cap of 35 feet, that I wouldn't be able to build as of right to 100 feet. This is simply saying, if you're going to build more than the as of right under this Med bonus, you need to

comply -- you need to be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. Does that make sense to everyone? I don't think that the language you're trying to add does the intent. And I don't think it makes it any better than what it currently states. I think it's just going to confuse the issue more.

Board Member Behar: With all due respect, Mr. Ceballos, I consulted two land use attorneys today, okay, and they both had a little bit difference of opinion, not one, but two. So, it could be up to interpretation. And I do believe -- and I did not ask, you know, to give me a language to propose. I asked the concern. So, that's something that we really need to look at because what we don't want is to get in a predicament, you know, for the city that we get -- and then you're saying you feel comfortable. But when I, you know, hear from two different land use attorneys that do a lot of work in the Gables, you know, it brings that point to light.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Understood. At the end of the day, the Committee is within their right to make any suggestions they want to the committee. But just for the references, I by trade am a land use and zoning attorney. I consulted with other land use and zoning attorney, and we feel comfortable with this language. So, it's just a difference of opinion.

Chairperson Pardo: What I would like to do -- if the Committee is in agreement -- I would like to have a legal opinion from the City Attorney's Office on specifically this paragraph. If there's something that they would suggest, you know, or that they feel that the development rights are not in jeopardy...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: As they currently stand, I am not concerned. If the board wants to make an amendment and a suggestion or a change to the Commission, it's well within your power. I recommend that you follow whatever you believe is appropriate.

Board Member Bermello: You know, I want to button it down because I agree with my colleague, Behar. (INAUDIBLE) really (INAUDIBLE) establish a (INAUDIBLE) issue of noncompliance simply because of the transition in a particular area where you have certain urban fabric that is historic, it's been there forever, but you have new underlying zoning districts approved by the City, approved by the Commission, which are different. And you know, I could come up (INAUDIBLE) and say this says it must be conforming. This is obviously not in conformance. They'll bring photos. They'll show the difference, and you know, you don't have to be a rocket scientist to figure out that there is a nonconformance when you put a ten-story building next to a, you know, one level warehouse. So, I get what you're saying, but here given with the issues that we're dealing with, I'm looking at the opposite. What is the harm? I can't see it. I realize that it's obvious that, you know, (INAUDIBLE), but this is introducing the concept of nonconformance of a neighborhood. And at any given point in time, (INAUDIBLE). There could be nonconformance. And this to me is establishing the number-one provision (INAUDIBLE) is neighborhood compatibility. The number one. It wasn't the last one. It was the first one. And it's one that the Chair, when he gave his kind of introductory remarks of why we're here and et cetera was dealing with that subject. So, I think the fact that you brought this up, you know, (INAUDIBLE). And just think of it, what do we lose by saying that -- I can't -- I don't...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: My only concern, like I stated before, I don't think it adds anything. I think what you just stated is exactly the issue. If your property is in compliance with the underlying

zoning code, neighborhood compatibility only would apply for a bonus. The property already has to comply with the Zoning Code. So, although, yes, there's a new Zoning Code regulation, now you can build 100 stories next to a one-story building, that's the Zoning Code. I cannot say -- unless they're applying for a bonus -- that they can't build that.

Board Member Behar: But that's just the (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Bermello: I get what you're saying.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I understand, I understand.

Board Member Bermello: I get what you're saying.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: But that's why I don't think that adding the language really adds anything to it. At the end of the day, if it's the will of the Committee, please.

Board Member Bermello: Gus, let me tell you what this is saying. You're asking for bonuses, and yes, you're complying with zoning but you're not being in conformance with the neighborhood, so we're not going to give you the bonuses. That's what this is saying.

Board Member Behar: Yeah.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: But that's what that says right there.

Development Services Director Cabrera: Yeah.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: That's what it currently says.

Development Services Director Cabrera: That's not what they want.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Yeah.

Development Services Director Cabrera: They want the bonus to be treated the way that as-of-right would be treated. That's what they want, which is exactly the opposite of what you're saying.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Mr. Bermello, I would use the word "compatibility" instead of "noncompliant," just because in the Zoning Code they're very different.

Board Member Bermello: It's fine. The issue here that we're saying is if you are complying with the Zoning Code in the district -- complying fully -- if you happen to be nonconforming with your next-door neighbor, it's not an issue. It should not be an issue. The way that it's written now without that would be an issue.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: If you were seeking a bonus.

Unidentified Speaker: (INAUDIBLE) with a bonus ...

Development Services Director Cabrera: Or (INAUDIBLE).

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Which is why I'm saying adding that language does nothing (INAUDIBLE). We're not even in the standards.

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Development Services Director Cabrera: What he's saying is that you do not have a right to get the bonus. They can decide on the bonus no. What they can't decide is on the zoning no additional -- (INAUDIBLE) you can't do that height because it's not compatible. You don't get that height. If it's allowed in the zoning, it is. Now, the bonus -- get extra whatever number of fee -- they could say no, it's not compatible with the neighborhood.

Board Member Bermello: That's the problem that (INAUDIBLE)...

Development Services Director Cabrera: Which is exactly what they're trying not to do because they want it to be like an as of right.

Board Member Behar: Not as of right. As long as you meet all the requirements that are set forth in this, you know, because there's no sense of meeting all these requirements...

Board Member Bermello: The way that you're putting it is you could be totally in keeping with the zoning in the district and be nonconforming.

Development Services Director Cabrera: No.

Board Member Bermello: Yes.

Development Services Director Cabrera: What I'm saying is you'll be in compliance with...

Board Member Bermello: No.

Development Services Director Cabrera: The zoning but you won't be in compliance with that list.

Board Member Bermello: Forget about the list.

Development Services Director Cabrera: You'll be in compliance...

Board Member Bermello: This entire paragraph starts with that provision, and this entire thing has to do with the bonuses for the Mediterranean style. So, any project in any district where they're going for these bonuses, they could be compliant perfectly with all the zoning requirements but not be able to aspire for bonuses simply because in that district there are uses that are not in keeping with the zoning. They're still lagging behind and there's an issue of no compatibility between the original

existing and the current being proposed. That's the issue.

Development Services Director Cabrera: And I can hear you clear. And what you want is -- what you're arguing is that the Med bonus should not be something that is arbitrary, like it's not compatible -- not arbitrary, that it's not compatible. You want it to be that if they meet the list, they get it, even if it's not compatible with the one-story home next door. And that's exactly what Gus is saying. It's not the way it's written and maybe it's not the way it should be.

Board Member Bermello: If your project meets the guidelines of the district that you're in, MF3, MX, whichever one it is, you meet that and there happens to be next to you one or two properties that are older properties that don't meet that, would never aspire to meet it, the issue of non-conformance or lack of neighborhood compatibility cannot be used if you're meeting zoning. That (INAUDIBLE)...

Development Services Director Cabrera: And Med bonus is not zoning. Is that a way of putting it? Med bonus is not really the underlying zoning.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Correct.

Board Member Bermello: But Med bonus is a zoning item. It's not comp plan. It's not something - it's in the zoning.

Development Services Director Cabrera: It's not the underlying zoning.

Board Member Bermello: No, of course not. It's an overlay, like you have different overlays. But the issue here is what is neighborhood compatibility. And someone could say that a 7-story building in the industrial area next to (INAUDIBLE) is not compatible with -- now they're about to become extinct. But what of the older buildings that are there? I could own the -- there was a school there. I could come up and say, "I don't want these buildings. It's not compatible with the scale of this area." And you would have to say, "Yes, it's true." Everything that's been built there wasn't compatible with what was there before.

Development Services Director Cabrera: But if seven stories is allowed in the underlying zoning, that's not a question. If you want to get the additional stories because of the Med bonus, that's the part that's still up to...

Board Member Behar: But you could be...

Development Services Director Cabrera: Measure of compatibility.

Board Member Behar: You could be complying with every point in this document (INAUDIBLE) in compatibility with the neighborhood.

Board Member Bermello: That's the point.

Board Member Behar: Right?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I agree. I believe that's the desire of the Commission (INAUDIBLE) the point of this committee (INAUDIBLE) to not make it a simple check, check, check, check, check.

Board Member Behar: No, no, but that "check, check, check" -- you do -- in order to achieve this, you have to do more than a check. But then you could do all the checks and do exactly what these documents are requiring, but you're not going to be in compatibility.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: For the bonus, yes.

Unidentified Speaker: Yeah. That's what...

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE) underlying zoning.

Board Member Behar: But then we take away the incentive to do this, right?

Chairperson Pardo: Wait. Which is the --? Wait a minute. Let me make a proposal here. Right now, this should be promoting an assortment of street-level public realm and pedestrian amenities in order to earn development bonuses and special allowances through the structured discretionary review process in compliance with the underlying adjacent zoning and subject to compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood.

Board Member Pratt: And I think that's the point Mr. Bermello...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Can I...

Chairperson Pardo: Exactly.

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Board Member Pratt: Yeah, and I think that that's a good compromise. I think that gives flexibility to the Board of Architects to review. And if you could be adjacent to some structure that may in the future be changed. And so why -- to limit the development of a project based on something that may change in the future.

Chairperson Pardo: And I'll tell you. I think the language states it, reinforces it. I don't think we get into a legal issue.

Board Member Pratt: No, I think (INAUDIBLE).

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Chairman, if I can remind you that the challenges of compatibility have to do with the Comprehensive Plan most of the time. So, don't forget that that is the way that a third party can challenge.

Chairperson Pardo: I really take issue with that, specifically, when you use the vehicle of a PAD. When you read the PAD and you see what it's supposed to do in theory and what I have seen it do in practice, sometimes they're very different. And that compatibility issue, that's where you see a lot of the compatibility issue clashes.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I'm informing you. It's just information for you. the challenges usually are of compatibility with the Comprehensive Plan, so let's not forget that level of...

Chairperson Pardo: Oh, no, no. I haven't forgotten.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: And that is true. But the point is that where the zoning fluctuates is once you meet that magical 43,560 square feet and you get into a PAD, and then all of a sudden, the reliability of the Zoning Code sometimes does not achieve a compatible situation with the existing neighborhood.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No, you're correct. I had nothing to do with the PAD, so I don't know how that was developed.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: But you are correct. That is a special item in the Zoning Code that you may want to make some suggestions on at some point.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Behar, does what the Chair just said, does that satisfy...?

Board Member Behar: That sounds good. And in defense, I agree. He's not responsible for the PAD.

Chairperson Pardo: No, no, no.

Board Member Behar: That was there before and (INAUDIBLE). You know that we cannot blame on him.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Chairperson Pardo: I really feel that...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Can -- just because -- can you repeat it again so I can try to write it down?

Chairperson Pardo: I wrote it. You know, I feel like -- to quote Rodney Dangerfield, I feel like I went to a fight at a hockey game. There's something about this particular meeting.

Board Member Behar: And we haven't even begun yet.

Chairperson Pardo: We're almost at the beginning. Number 2a, "Promote an assortment of street level public realm and pedestrian amenities in order to earn development bonuses and special allowances through a structured discretionary review process in compliance with the underlying adjacent zoning and subject to compatibility with the surrounding neighborhoods."

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: My apologies again. But the land use and zoning attorney in me, I have -- I'm going to start poking holes in that language. "In compliance with the underlying adjacent zoning," what does that mean? So, if I am a commercial property and I face MF2, I now have to comply with MF2? Because that's what that says.

Chairperson Pardo: No.

Board Member Bermello: I would (INAUDIBLE) the word adjacent to the underlying zoning.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: And then if you do that, complying with the underlying zoning, that's inherent in the entire Zoning Code. You always have to comply with the underlying Zoning Code.

Board Member Bermello: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: So, what are we adding once again? I don't -- I'm trying to understand.

Board Member Bermello: You're reinforcing that. You're reinforcing that.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Okay, so if that's the case, if you just want to reiterate the fact that you need to comply with underlying zoning...

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I don't think it adds anything because obviously you're in the Zoning Code and you have to. But that's perfectly fine. But the word "adjacent" makes it even more problematic in my opinion.

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Chairperson Pardo: Because it's the same thing as saying surrounding neighborhoods. The neighborhood is (INAUDIBLE)...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: But you're comparing the compatibility. You're not making -- my property has to comply with the abutting zoning. If you do that, then me as a commercial now what?

To get the bonus I have to comply with MF2 across the street? That doesn't make any sense.

Board Member Behar: I see where the adjacent is...

Board Member Bermello: I would take the word "adjacent" out.

Chairperson Pardo: Under the (INAUDIBLE). Alright.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: But just to confirm, I'll try to read it back. A structured discretionary review process in compliance with underlying zoning and subject to compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright, we all agree?

Board Member Behar: Alright, Clerk, let's move on.

Chairperson Pardo: We're going to add that to...

Board Member Bermello: Now, we've come to the main event? We're done?

Chairperson Pardo: Well, we're pretty much done. Let's take a roll call on this.

City Clerk Urquia: Can I have a motion on this?

Board Member Bermello: I make the motion to...

Board Member Behar: I second.

Board Member Bermello: Adopt the wording of our Chair.

Board Member Behar: I'll second it.

City Clerk Urquia: Okay.

City Architect Riesco: Yes.

Board Member Behar: Yes.

Board Member Pratt: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

(Vote: 5-0)

Chairperson Pardo: Alright. So, Mr. Trias, we all received your staff recommendations to the work we've been working on. And I had a few issues, and I didn't want to send these to you at the time. I'd rather hear your...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I think I got a memo -- I don't know if you sent it to me, but I

did get your comments. And on Monday, I tried to clean up some of the language based on your comments. And I think it got better. However, what I would like to say is this, thank you very much for all the work you've done. It's great to be working with fellow members of the American Institute of Architects on architecture. That's very rare, but in this business, it's very special. And the comments from staff are not meant to influence anything that you may want to suggest. In fact, I support everything that the City Manager said. You should make your own recommendation. And I even advised Mr. Ceballos to just let them say whatever they need to say because the fact of the matter is that that is what you were tasked with. Now, if you want my opinion, you can ask at any point. And certainly, I'm available to say that, but I don't really like to hear myself talk that much, so I'll try to keep to as little as possible.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chair, may I?

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: I have not read (INAUDIBLE). And I didn't want to read it on purpose. And the reason for that is that this process, I think, has been a very good process and a long process. We had gone painstakingly by every word, comma, phrase, definition of terms. We have the city historian discuss what is this versus that. And all of that was done with the cameras on, with citizen sitting in front of us hearing the back and forth between us. We were not always in agreement. I mean, that's what democracy's all about, ventilating in public discourse, weighing opinions, et cetera, et cetera. So, what I would like to do, I would like to hear from Mr. Trias on every single point, on every comment. He's someone that I respect highly. He knows and he has gone through many, many wars (INAUDIBLE). So, he brings a very unique perspective, but that's not to say that, you know, one versus the other. What I would like to -- if he has comments on any area, I'd like to hear him out and question him because I was not aware that there was like a minority report being prepared. That kind of took me by surprise. But if there is a minority report, so be it. I just think that the minority report should be ventilated publicly the same way that our thoughts were. I mean, we did ours, you know, not home. We didn't meet in my office and structure something and then bring it all cooked. So, I'm not saying that this is -- but I'd like to hear it, just like we ventilated our -- Do we have the time to do that or...?

Board Member Behar: I agree with you, Mr. Bermello. And I -- as a matter of fact, I called Mr. Ceballos -- was it yesterday?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: We've spoken a lot recently. I don't know.

Board Member Behar: Okay, but -- and I asked, "Is there a report from staff? Because I had heard. And you sent it to me yesterday. I truly -- I started going through it. I have not gone through all of it.

Board Member Bermello: You know, it may be the best thing since apple pie, and we may adopt everything and say, "Wonderful. I wish we had done it beforehand." So, it's not -- I'm not -- just I can tell you, I have not read it. I'm not aware of any of the items. I just think that I would, you know

-- and first, you know, your company is always enjoyable, and he's a very learned person, so I'd like to hear his positions. I mean, he's good. We're blessed to have Ramon Trias in the City of Coral Gables. I'd like to hear, you know, all these comments, his experience and his critique and additions. I would -- I don't think it should be underplayed is my opinion.

Board Member Behar: I started reading some of them. I would like to see if we could somehow incorporate them, not all of them, I would say. And that's why I want -- I agree with you. Let him present it to us.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah. I think that would be the best way. I mean, I think -- I'll do whatever is best for you. I think probably it's easier like Mr. Pardo said, ask questions since you have reviewed it. In a nutshell, I feel that there's a need to talk about architecture in the Code, really talk about architecture. And I don't think that the Med bonus text did enough of that. And that's one of the things that we have been working with the update, but we never presented that as part of the update because we knew that it was a controversial aspect of this. So, you know, we've been working on this for a while. It's not something that just came up the other day. But I think in my -- maybe the easier thing for me is just to answer the questions from the Chairman.

Unidentified Speaker: (INAUDIBLE).

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I think it's a very lengthy document.

Board Member Behar: It is very lengthy.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Board Member Behar: But you have made, and you said -- you had made reference particularly to architecture, which is what I want you to tell -- you know, for example, if we go to this document, Page 5-17 and just -- I'm just going to pick one of them where -- number 3 under the...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: That's a good one, yes.

Board Member Behar: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: How do we know which is the document? I mean, I...

Chairperson Pardo: I think Robert is talking about the one that (INAUDIBLE)...

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Board Member Bermello: What does it say on the top?

Board Member Behar: Comparison.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Comparison.

Chairperson Pardo: Comparison, on the very top.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah, and the document is structured in the three sections.

Board Member Bermello: And what is this?

Chairperson Pardo: This is just the staff comments, which are these. Here they copied and pasted the existing language, the Blue-Ribbon committee in red, and then the staff's (INAUDIBLE)...

Board Member Bermello: So, this has your comments?

Board Member Behar: No, no, no, no. This is not...

Chairperson Pardo: This is -- that's staff's.

Board Member Behar: That's his latest comments.

Board Member Bermello: That's ours.

Chairperson Pardo: No, these -- this is staff comments only. This is staff comments right here...

Board Member Bermello: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: And goes straight back.

Board Member Bermello: So, why don't we take their list of staff comments and just go one by one?

Chairperson Pardo: Well...

Board Member Behar: That's what -- I was going to reference to something that, you know, I don't think it's necessary because in that particular one, Mr. Trias, you referenced "based on classical systems such as double square or the Golden Section." I think that is taking it a bit...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Board Member Behar: Too far.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And I'm thinking -- but I'm thinking that all the buildings by, let's say Le Corbusier, that he took the time to explain the Golden Section and so on. So, it's not even a Mediterranean or classical concept.

Board Member Bermello: But that's definitely not Mediterranean.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No, absolutely.

Board Member Behar: No.

Board Member Bermello: I mean, we can go back to (INAUDIBLE) and discuss...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: (INAUDIBLE) is great.

Chairperson Pardo: They did.

Board Member Bermello: And (INAUDIBLE).

Chairperson Pardo: They did, they did. They have it as a (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Behar: We have.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No, we did.

Chairperson Pardo: Wait, wait, wait, wait.

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: This is really more of a polemic more than an actual alternative to your very good proposal. The issue is I believe the Code will be stronger if we have language about architecture that people can talk about architecture in those meetings and really make a -- and that's why we -- in number three, we talked about the overall building form, massing, roofline, location and scale of architectural features, details of these eaves, cornices, moldings, column bases, et cetera. For example -- and I'm just picking something that Mr. Behar has explained. That language allows that detailed conversation about design. I think that's helpful. I think that's helpful. And what I would say is that what you have done with the Code is very good, but I don't think -- I think the process is what has -- because for example, the one that -- the Plaza that you were unhappy with, that went through a very thorough process, and yet because some of these things about architecture were not there, maybe the process went the wrong way. That's my thinking. That's my thinking in terms of my critique of the existing code. In addition, I think that the PAD is too much of a loophole clearly, but that's a whole different story. So, that's one thing. Mr. Behar, do you have any other questions for me?

Board Member Behar: Well, for example, Mr. Trias -- and what I'm concerned -- and when you go, for example, on Table 5-202.2 on Page 5-27, under the arcade and/or loggia, you introduce a specific order for columns to be incorporated.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Well, you may not agree and I'm not...

Board Member Behar: Because what I'm concerned -- at the moment I read this, I thought about downtown Boca Raton. When you look at it and all the buildings start looking the same, and that's what we don't want to be so prescriptive that we force the architect to have to do that, and that's what I think...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: That was Mr. Pardo's comment also. And what I said was -- I

added some language saying this is not meant to be prescriptive. And I know it may sound like that but having had a chance to -- I did do some work in Palm Beach County under some of those guidelines that the people have, those are prescriptive. They tell you, "Oh, you have to have molding at ten feet," and then, "You have to have barrel tile only," and so on. We shouldn't do that.

Board Member Behar: But Mr. Trias, I read this -- okay? -- and that's what came to mind, that it was going to be so prescriptive that we're going to force the architects to do that.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And that's not the way it's meant to be, so maybe we need to tone it down so it's clear.

Board Member Behar: Okay.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Because it is not meant to be prescriptive. I want to make it very clear.

Board Member Bermello: Are we going on the 28th before the Commission?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: Is the idea that we're going to consolidate staff's comments with ours?

Chairperson Pardo: Not necessarily, no.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No, I -- it's up to you.

Chairperson Pardo: And...

Board Member Bermello: I mean, I would like to hear -- if we have time, maybe not -- but I would like to go (INAUDIBLE) by word...

Chairperson Pardo: I think...

Board Member Bermello: All the comments.

Chairperson Pardo: I think that Mr. Trias is asking for questions because it'll be easier.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes, yes.

Chairperson Pardo: It'll be easier to defend compared to...

Board Member Behar: In order to have questions -- with all fairness -- we need more than one day to go through this.

Board Member Bermello: No, absolutely.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Behar: Because you know -- at least I do. I got this yesterday.

Board Member Bermello: So, I thought we were going to get -- in other words, when we made changes, we deliberated and we discussed publicly every word, every sentence, and then we went through it a second time. Again, I feel uncomfortable diminishing the importance of Mr. Trias' work, which is very valuable. But I don't want to accept it without studying it and reviewing it with him and also with dismissing it without also doing the same. So, I haven't read it but I'm a quick learner. So, if we go one by one...

Board Member Behar: I will tell you. I agree with you. And I went through it, and I may not agree with all of them, but there are some that have very valid points that I would like to go through it. And if it takes more than today, you know, I know our deadline is the 28th. Maybe perhaps we have one more session next week, by next Tuesday, whatever. But I want him -- I want you to go through it because otherwise to ask the questions, I need more time to review this.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: This is a very substantial set of comments. Basically, what I'm saying is you did a fantastic job. Go further. I mean, that's really what I'm saying. Go further and really talk about architecture. If you're ready to do that, if you want to do that and spend that type of -- the time it takes to go through this, then I think we should do it between today and maybe Monday or Tuesday. We need a couple of days to -- probably to go through it.

Chairperson Pardo: I don't think that kicking the can down the road is a good idea, and I'll tell you why. When you took Table 1 and made it into 5-202.1, I was really surprised because the things that were important as basics were basically stripped from the original table, and it did become prescriptive. And in fact, what I did was I actually went back to Appendix C of the Plaza PAD, and I saw certain phrases completely intact from that portion of the zoning. So, the problem that I have is that although taught in college of these proportions and the different books and this is part of what we study, we've gone now from the original problem that was heard by the entire Commission the evening of the Sunshine meeting, which was that we had gotten to the point where it became paint by numbers. Now, it's all become -- the architecture's all based on formulas. This is what is written. I read every word, read every comment, compared it to ours. And to be quite honest, I was taken aback that now all the architecture is going to be based on this type of specific classical design, although these components exist in all architecture. The funny thing is that when you look at 5-202 and it has the examples of Coral Gables architecture and specific buildings and the elements of, I also went back to the original guidelines and although simple, this is when everything was pretty low tech and photographs were made, and then elements were actually called out and described as those elements of each one of these buildings that influenced the development of Coral Gables. Therefore, that was one type of document. Then about in -- I don't know -- seven, eight years ago, there was a similar document, but now of course, where computers and everything can be Photoshopped and that kind of thing, it was a similar document created by staff again. And then there was just the pictures, no analysis, no...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Sir, those are the original...

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE). No analysis. The elements weren't called out as they were in

the original document that was done 35 years ago, and it's not very helpful. Then what happened was that when I went back to the staff recommendations, the original document is being -- which is available at the Historic Department and was adopted by Coral Gables Commission -- that's basically been put on the side and then this newer document is the one that people are supposed to look at and understand what those elements are. But when you look at this and there's no analysis of the elements, then it becomes problematic because there's no direction for the architect. Now, I tried to take that and then throwing in certain formulas to create great architecture to me is why we have a Board of Architects. And if we have a Board of Architects that does their job and if we have a representative of the board here, and we've all sat on the board, then you have the ability of understanding what should be approved and should not be approved. Those architects that are seasoned architects that sit on the board and have sat on the board, they don't have to go back to college, and they don't have to go get certified for this. The whole point is that my concern now is the reason that we're having this conversation is because these bonuses affect what we build and what we live with. And what we live with is more density, more height, and unfortunately recently, (INAUDIBLE) the type of architecture that we were promoting to begin with. I think we're back on the track of where we're supposed to be, but by changing this, I disagree 100 percent with these formulas. I disagree with the proposition that this is something that anyone can do. And that is for me very unfortunate because I think that it diminishes the strength of the Board of Architects, the City Architect, and the city in general. And it diminishes what we -- there are seven representatives here of seasoned architects that know what has to be done. And the problem that I see is that we've taken three steps forward, and now we've taken four steps backward. I went painstakingly through every word. And when I went through every single word of these documents, one of the things that popped out is that changes to the approved design before, during, and after the construction shall be reviewed by the Planning Director for compliance with the original approval. Now, I've heard complaints from the Board of Architects -- members of the Board of Architects that they've seen and approved something, and then all of a sudden what gets built looks completely different. And so...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: But that would correct it because...

Chairperson Pardo: If I may finish.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: The problem is that the way that this has been written by your department now making the Planning Director the overseer of this cuts out the ability of the Board of Architects to receive a revision for whatever reason, whether it's value engineering or whatever the reason is. But once you change that, you should go back to the Board of Architects and the City Architect for them to do their job.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: But they do, they do. What happens...

Chairperson Pardo: No, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait. They don't, Mr. Trias. I have...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: (INAUDIBLE).

Chairperson Pardo: What is the name of the project that you mentioned before that when you saw it

go up it was different?

Board Member Pratt: Oh, Paseo.

Chairperson Pardo: Paseo.

Development Services Director Cabrera: Can I make a comment? And I'm trying to be impartial here. But the Paseo changes did not go through Planning. It was actually approved by the previous City architect. That's what we're trying to avoid, to leave it in the hands of the one -- not one. But when Ramon did see what was going on, he said, "Wait a minute. This is really different from what the board approved." The Mediterranean items that we feel are really required to be on there for this to be a Mediterranean building and have gotten the Mediterranean bonus. So, that's the intention there.

Chairperson Pardo: But don't you think that the Board of Architects should review this the same as a revision to anything? I mean, if anything would have been done structurally, it would have gone back to the (INAUDIBLE)...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: We can add that language.

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE).

Development Services Director Cabrera: We can make it that...

Chairperson Pardo: It didn't happen.

Development Services Director Cabrera: That it...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: We can add that language.

Development Services Director Cabrera: If it's significant, it should go back to BOA. Or we can make it that it always goes back to the BOA.

Chairperson Pardo: The language is already there.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No, that's not...

Chairperson Pardo: The point (INAUDIBLE) is...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: It's not.

Chairperson Pardo: That this was inserted, completely new, above and beyond.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I understand your perspective. And I'm very disappointed that that is the message that we have given to you because that was not the intent at all. In fact, I'm puzzled by this because we were trying to actually be helpful. What happened in Paseo is that I went on site,

and I realized that certain changes had been made that were aesthetic and they had to do with the fact that they had not been reviewed by the board or by anyone else, except perhaps a staff member at some point. We are trying to add some language that will make it clear that changes have to be reviewed. Now, whatever language you feel comfortable with, that's fine with me. But we need to say that because otherwise things may happen.

Board Member Behar: May I? Because I -- what I think you're saying is because -- in reference to the Planning Director, but if that says the Board of Architects...

Chairperson Pardo: And the City Architect.

Board Member Behar: And the City Architect and...

Chairperson Pardo: And...

Board Member Behar: The Planning Director, then what I'm thinking...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I have no problem with that.

Board Member Behar: I think it's really semantics there where you -- who -- the point is, it needs to be reviewed.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, it's not...

Development Services Director Cabrera: Or maybe it should be reviewed by (INAUDIBLE)...

Chairperson Pardo: Excuse me.

Development Services Director Cabrera: Because I think the issue is (INAUDIBLE)...

Chairperson Pardo: Let me add one more thing so you understand -- you, as the director, understand clearly what is happening. The people that grant these bonuses is not the Planning Director. It's the Board of Architects. Once we understand that if there's a change to the plan, it has to go to the Board of Architects, not to the Planning Director. I can't make that any clearer. And let me say one more thing. The night of the Sunshine meeting, there were over 80 people from the public here that were upset and there 300 people on Zoom there because they were upset. Something didn't work very well. And we're not talking about in the last 12 months. We're talking about for quite some time because now is when people see those buildings that have gone up. So, it's not just one instance. So, I'm sure that the previous City Architect can't be to blame for everything.

Development Services Director Cabrera: I'm not -- I'm sorry. I was not blaming the previous City architect. I was just explaining to you that it wasn't Ramon Trias who had made those approvals.

Chairperson Pardo: No, no. What I'm saying is...

Development Services Director Cabrera: (INAUDIBLE) Planning Director. But I would agree with

you that the best thing probably is that it has to good evening the approval of the board and planning, period.

Chairperson Pardo: And that was...

Development Services Director Cabrera: (INAUDIBLE) Ramon (INAUDIBLE).

Chairperson Pardo: That was already in our document and that was the problem. I'm sorry.

Board Member Behar: No, I think it's not -- I think this has a simple solution, in my opinion, okay? The problem comes is that who is going to go out to look at what was proposed, approved, and actually built because that's where they're going to do the switch and bait.

Development Services Director Cabrera: That's exactly how it happened.

Board Member Behar: That's the problem that we have.

Development Services Director Cabrera: That's exactly how it happened.

Board Member Behar: Okay.

Development Services Director Cabrera: The master set matches exactly what the board approved, and what went through Planning, went through DRC, and went through Commission; the whole thing. But then when they come back and make a little revision here and a little revision there, it's in the Permitting Department and...

Board Member Behar: But a little revision may be not noticeable.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Behar: But when you get a revision of that magnitude is the problem that we have.

Chairperson Pardo: Robert, take the balconies off. Oh, it looks a little different. They just took off all the balconies, and that's what the BOA and that's what the City Architect approved.

Board Member Behar: (INAUDIBLE) to see that. That's the problem.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, then that's on existing buildings. But the whole -- the point I'm trying to make is you cannot assert the people that gave the bonuses with another department, the same thing as Public Works or some other department. That's not who should be involved with it. And the other thing is -- speaking of departments -- when we're talking about -- in these proposed comments, we were talking about historically designated buildings. We put in there very carefully -- and you were present that evening -- we put in there very carefully that the Historic Department would be involved, the Board of Architects would be involved, and the Planning Department would be involved. All of a sudden, our historic buildings guess what? Gets taken out in your proposal, the Historic Department. How can you do that with a historic building? It's completely stripped out of this. So,

what I'm saying is, going back to what Mr. Bermello said, we looked very carefully at every sentence, every word, every concept. And the thing is that we had certain tables, certain things to be addressed. And the point is that, as I said before, if you just change a few words here or there, if you take -- you change the intent. And one of the things that I saw from the staff report was that whoever wrote the staff report should have listened to the hours of taped public conversations that this committee had with the public, both in person and on Zoom, so they could understand the intent. And the intent was, for example, with historic, we spoke about the viewshed. It's been stripped out completely. How can you strip out the viewshed and say, "We don't care about the viewshed." So, right now, it...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: We can (INAUDIBLE) the language. There's some other language.

Development Services Director Cabrera: On the historic, it's not historic buildings. It was that every development -- I mean, the entire city's a historic plan -- right? -- so we (INAUDIBLE) every single development.

Board Member Bermello: No, no, no, no, no, no, no.

Development Services Director Cabrera: Historic buildings always go to Historic. That process is...

Board Member Bermello: We're talking about...

Development Services Director Cabrera: Codified elsewhere, correct?

Board Member Bermello: Designated historic properties, not the entire city.

Development Services Director Cabrera: No, but we can now remove that because the process for historic buildings is codified elsewhere...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Development Services Director Cabrera: Under historic (INAUDIBLE) zoning.

Board Member Bermello: But we cannot have every Tom, Dick and Harry say, "My house is historic, and therefore," blah, blah, blah.

Development Services Director Cabrera: That -- and that is what we removed. Because the way it read is that -- and we didn't remove it. I mean, there is (INAUDIBLE)...

Board Member Behar: They clarified it. I took it -- when I read it briefly very quickly, I read it to that. I mean, I...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: That was the intent.

Board Member Behar: Okay, I -- to me...

Development Services Director Cabrera: Could we get to that? Because it's important that that be clear.

Board Member Bermello: Personally, again, I'm not going to vote tonight for anything here. I am not -- I can understand that you don't want to present it, and that's fine. Well, then I got to read it and I got to compare it page by page, line by line, word by word. Because I think the day that we stand in front of the City Commission and we say, "This is what we're approving," I got to be able to say if I got a call that I've read this, I considered it, I meditated on it, and it's my best professional opinion. I'm not going to rubberstamp anything that I'm just given that I'm looking at for the first time, so...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: That was never the intent.

Board Member Bermello: And I know that's not your intent. By the way, I also realize that as staff, this was your opportunity to address a lot of the things that maybe you've been dealing with for a number of years, so I get it.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Thank you, sir.

Board Member Bermello: I wish -- the only thing that I think should have been done differently, Mr. Manager, is knowing that we really should have taken longer. And every day, we should have spent more time with you, so that when we prepared the first document, it really should have incorporated your ideas and thoughts as an ad hoc member of the committee so -- as opposed to coming in and doing kind of a retrofit, you know, after, you know, we just finished.

City Manager Iglesias: Mr. Bermello, I don't think it's a retrofit. I think it's just throwing ideas to the Committee to make sure that the document is everything that you think it is, that's all. The idea was not to have it retrofit.

Board Member Behar: It's not a retrofit, but...

City Manager Iglesias: It's not a retrofit.

Board Member Behar: I understand, but...

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Board Member Behar: My first point today...

Unidentified Speaker: And if we need more time...

Board Member Bermello: I think...

Board Member Behar: (INAUDIBLE) prefer to have him here since the beginning to give us his input.

Board Member Bermello: I think we need more time.

City Manager Iglesias: But I don't know about that. I'm not -- I don't agree with that because I do think that this document -- you guys -- I think the board -- the committee should have prepared this document, and then we -- my problem was that there wasn't enough time and we tried to do it (INAUDIBLE) which creates a lot of pressure.

Unidentified Speaker: (INAUDIBLE).

City Manager Iglesias: No, no, and this is a very important thing, and we want to make sure that the committee started fully up and then we -- we did not -- the idea here is not to strip the (INAUDIBLE). Is there any point that we should add...?

Board Member Bermello: Absolutely.

City Manager Iglesias: That we need to go for? And look at the committee and look at the committee's report. This is your report. We have nothing to do with -- this is (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Behar: I understand but let me be -- Willy made some valid points, that we could have done it and incorporated, you know, at the right time, maybe not at the very beginning. I retract my statement at the very beginning. But at some point, I think the collaboration would have been good.

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Unidentified Speaker: Can I say something?

City Manager Iglesias: (INAUDIBLE) a lot of valid points here. And if we're not ready on the 28th, then we're not ready on the 28th. (INAUDIBLE) discussed because (INAUDIBLE) go very quickly because (INAUDIBLE). And that's something that we need to discuss now because I think it should be thoroughly addressed, all the issues. And I'm not saying to change your document. I'm saying there may be some issues, some valid point that we might want to add to this document that doesn't affect your underlying document that you came -- that you prepared.

Chairperson Pardo: I would make the following suggestion. First of all, I'd like to recognize Mr. Mitch Alvarez there. He got here a little late, but he had a previous engagement since we changed the date from Thursday to Wednesday.

City Manager Iglesias: You're always welcome here, sir.

Board Member Alvarez: I didn't know where your meeting was. It took me 15 minutest to figure it out.

City Manager Iglesias: We're trying to show off our new building.

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE).

City Manager Iglesias: But Mr. Chair, the idea is not to circumvent the Committee. The idea is to bring this -- to bring a certain thought process and that's it. And I think that -- I think staff was well served by having your document to start off with to look at the committee's thought process and then come back with something. I just think that we're trying to discuss too much at one time and that's something that I was concerned about. We were just trying to (INAUDIBLE) because the idea is to get your thoughts, get your document; come back and say what do you of these issues, and discuss them, and then come back. I would prefer to go to the Commission with one document.

Board Member Bermello: Absolutely.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

City Manager Iglesias: Okay, with one document that we've all had time to really discuss and -- but I think it's important that the committee did their document, that you did your document and now we have comments on your thought process.

Development Services Director Cabrera: Peter, can I make a point? Because on the historic, I just want to say that the way it was written was that compatibility with the historic City plan shall be reviewed by the Planning Department in consultation with the Historical Resources Department. That says nothing that it's related to historic buildings. Med bonus, I would probably -- I would say I can't think of a situation where Med bonus would apply to a historic building, so you're talking about every new building because our entire city is a historic...

Chairperson Pardo: No.

Development Services Director Cabrera: Is a...

Chairperson Pardo: No, that's not...

Board Member Bermello: That was not the...

Chairperson Pardo: That is not what we wrote.

Development Services Director Cabrera: What you don't understand -- the Med bonus...

Chairperson Pardo: That is not what we wrote.

Development Services Director Cabrera: Is made for new construction. It's not written for historic. So, when you say that for compatibility with the historic City plan, you don't say the zoning historic structures. And typically, the majority of the buildings that will be reviewed here are not historic. They're new construction.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: So, the changes of that nature that we made were meant to clarify those issues. They were not meant to change your intent.

Development Services Director Cabrera: No, it's just that -- I'm assuming that you do not want

every...

Chairperson Pardo: Let me read this to you.

Development Services Director Cabrera: Development to go -- sure.

Chairperson Pardo: Let me read this to you. Compatibility of designated historic landmarks and the Historic City Plan adopted by the Coral Gables Commission. And it says Compatibility of designated historic landmarks...

Development Services Director Cabrera: But that's what I just said.

Chairperson Pardo: And the Historic City Plan adopted. So, when you...

Development Services Director Cabrera: But that's (INAUDIBLE)...

Chairperson Pardo: A perfect example (INAUDIBLE), going back to the Plaza, if you look at 2901 Ponce...

Development Services Director Cabrera: I understand but that's the viewshed issue.

Chairperson Pardo: Sorry?

Development Services Director Cabrera: You're on C, not on B. C is the viewshed, which Ramon is going to address why the viewshed was also modified. That's on the viewshed.

Board Member Bermello: Which item are you on?

Development Services Director Cabrera: The viewshed...

Board Member Bermello: (INAUDIBLE).

Development Services Director Cabrera: On every historic building.

Board Member Bermello: What are you on, what page?

Development Services Director Cabrera: We're on 5-10 of the one that has the city and the...

Chairperson Pardo: Look at ours. If you look at the markup that we approved...

Board Member Bermello: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: Take a look at Page 5-6.

Board Member Bermello: 5-6?

Chairperson Pardo: 5-6. Oh, I'm sorry. It's actually 5-4, Willy.

Board Member Bermello: 5-4?

Chairperson Pardo: Yes, the very top.

Board Member Bermello: (INAUDIBLE).

Chairperson Pardo: Yes, compatibility of designated historic landmarks and the Historic City Plan adopted by the Coral Gables Commission.

Development Services Director Cabrera: Exactly. So, C is a viewshed for every historic building, which means that pretty much anywhere there's a historic building, they're going to have a viewshed issue. And then D is...

Chairperson Pardo: No, no.

Development Services Director Cabrera: Every building with the Historic City Plan.

Chairperson Pardo: Do you know how many designated historic buildings there are in the city?

Development Services Director Cabrera: I don't know.

Chairperson Pardo: Very few.

Board Member Bermello: Do you know how many?

Chairperson Pardo: Very few.

Unidentified Speaker: I (INAUDIBLE).

Chairperson Pardo: But you know what the designated -- what designating a historic building entails?

Board Member Bermello: Isn't this gentleman the Historic Preservation Officer?

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Adams.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: There are 1,200 in the city, but that includes the districts. Individually designated, there are far fewer.

Chairperson Pardo: And many of those are single-family homes.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: Individually designated are not many.

Board Member Bermello: How many? I mean, there should be a finite number.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: Yeah, I mean, I can get that number.

Board Member Bermello: We should know that, right?

Chairperson Pardo: Correct.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: Well, there are 1,200 buildings that are affected by the historic preservation ordinance.

Board Member Bermello: I get it. But we were very careful here to say "historically-designated properties."

Chairperson Pardo: Correct.

Board Member Bermello: And I'm sure there's a finite -- (INAUDIBLE).

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Mr. Bermello, for example...

Board Member Bermello: (INAUDIBLE).

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: For example...

Development Services Director Cabrera: But that's not the way it reads.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Let me...

Board Member Bermello: No, no, no, no. That's exactly the way it reads.

Chairperson Pardo: That's what it reads.

Board Member Bermello: If you look at it, it says compatibility...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Can I give you one example?

Board Member Bermello: Of historically designated.

Unidentified Speaker: Right.

Board Member Bermello: Why did we do that? Because before, it said something like...

Chairperson Pardo: Historical significance.

Board Member Bermello: Historical significance. That could be every property here.

Chairperson Pardo: Exactly. And we put in...

Board Member Bermello: Okay, and then...

Development Services Director Cabrera: Did you read B?

Board Member Bermello: So, you were not at that meeting, he was. And we said discuss this. He said I don't have the resources to spend time to finish all the designations. We said that's not our problem. This is only going to apply to historically designated -- if it's not designated...

Development Services Director Cabrera: Can you read B and tell me how you interpret B? It says compatibility with the Historic City Plan shall be reviewed by the Planning Department in consultation...

Chairperson Pardo: That's if you're going to change it.

Development Services Director Cabrera: With the Historical Resources Department and the Board of Architects.

Chairperson Pardo: That's if you're going to change it. For example...

Development Services Director Cabrera: So, every single revision to a new building will have to be reviewed by Historic?

Chairperson Pardo: No, no.

Board Member Bermello: No.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: (INAUDIBLE) Historic City Plan's right-of-way.

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: So, unless you're vacating right-of-way, this doesn't fall under that category.

Chairperson Pardo: For example -- again, the example of 2901 Ponce, a historic building that was built in 1925 for the City's architect, in other words, George Merrick's architect...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: How would you (INAUDIBLE) that one?

Chairperson Pardo: And that particular building had two streets on either side.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And (INAUDIBLE)...

Chairperson Pardo: It was designed like this, which is part of the architecture. It was never ever reviewed by the Historic Department.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No, the PAD.

Chairperson Pardo: When the PAD was done.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: First of all...

City Manager Iglesias: How would you deal with that particular project? What would you do in that particular project if you were -- you had that site to actually develop and you had a viewshed? I understand that you have the (INAUDIBLE) -- you have a viewshed right down the -- to the capital.

Unidentified Speaker: We did (INAUDIBLE).

City Manager Iglesias: So, if I have a capital building and I have a viewshed on that capital building, I don't want (INAUDIBLE).

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

City Manager Iglesias: How do you deal with a building of that size and a project of half a million dollars.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Can I...?

Board Member Bermello: We did the original masterplan for Ralph Sanchez on that.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Mr. Bermello.

Board Member Bermello: I think our plan was very different. I think our plan...

City Manager Iglesias: Yes, it was.

Board Member Bermello: Our plan did a much better...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: It was, it was. I have to say that.

Board Member Bermello: (INAUDIBLE) of respecting that property. And I think the Chair has kind of, you know, (INAUDIBLE) quite often since we've been meeting. And I think that's what led to the viewshed concept that...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Can I --? Just for history's sake, one of the very first meetings I had with the prior City Manager -- that we may not remember -- was about me insisting that we keep those two streets. Because at the beginning of that discussion, there was discussion about just get rid of the streets.

Chairperson Pardo: Again...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: So, we kept it.

Chairperson Pardo: I'm not blaming you.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No, no.

Chairperson Pardo: What I'm saying is, I was trying to answer the director's question, why is it important? Why? Think of this. Look at City Hall down Miracle Mile. Let's say someone says right now, let's put a bunch of high-rises here. Do you think that's going to affect...?

Development Services Director Cabrera: No, I understand.

Chairperson Pardo: The historic...

Development Services Director Cabrera: I understand.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: So, I...

Development Services Director Cabrera: I was there when you explained the viewshed.

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE) that we have.

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE) a historic...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Can I...

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE) that we have.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: So, if they...

Chairperson Pardo: We'd lose it...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Actually...

Chairperson Pardo: Forever.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I added some language which says, "terminated vistas and aesthetic enhancements of the urban context." That's something that you need to...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And the viewshed is very specific. To answer your question, Mr. Manager, going back to 2901, what Mr. Bermello did was (INAUDIBLE) because what he did was, he understood what that grid looked like. George Merrick was a very, very, very smart person. If not for his vision, but his selection of the great people that planned the city, and the great people that designed all these elements after 100 years that have influenced the City Beautiful from the City Beautiful Movement. The thing about this is that what you see now -- and I took a picture that I showed the Commission when I gave the update for the committee to the Commission -- the last

picture I showed was the -- facing east from the south part of the circle looking at 2901 Ponce. And it looked like it's got the Shops at Sunset behind it. It destroyed it completely. So, to answer your question, Director, one of the things that I look at is if we don't put viewshed in there, then everything is capable of being destroyed forever.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: How would you regulate the viewshed discussion (INAUDIBLE)?

Chairperson Pardo: It's not a formula. What they would do, like any plan is, for example...

City Manager Iglesias: Mr. Chair, you do realize that Mr. Bermello's concept versus the concept that was there are completely, completely different.

Chairperson Pardo: I understand.

City Manager Iglesias: Totally completely different.

Chairperson Pardo: And again, I don't mean to pick on the Plaza, but I'll tell you that -- in my opinion -- was a mistake. And just a little further south, you have Malaga. That was another mistake. They could have still developed that little part in Malaga by simply having a step back 100 feet at 45 feet of height. It would make all the difference in the world. And when it comes to that historic building, 2901 Ponce, which is the oldest building in that area because Charade burned down and the old (INAUDIBLE), we had to tear it down because of the salt entrained sand and build the Bank of Coral Gables there. That building would have been perfect not only for the city to have to actually buy and use it as a museum if they wanted to.

Development Services Director Cabrera: I guess the question is, do you want the viewshed to be checked on every historic building or only certain...

Chairperson Pardo: Some build...

Development Services Director Cabrera: Certain buildings that are worthy because...

Chairperson Pardo: That is a legitimate...

Development Services Director Cabrera: Otherwise, it...

Board Member Bermello: No.

Chairperson Pardo: No, that is a legitimate question because -- (INAUDIBLE), Mr. Bermello.

Board Member Bermello: See, the question is: What is worthy? According to whom? So, that's why we said historically designated. If they're designated, it went through a process. The City has a process for designation and it's a formal process. It shouldn't be just anybody that wakes up one day and says I think this is worthy.

Board Member Behar: That (INAUDIBLE)...

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: (INAUDIBLE).

City Manager Iglesias: If I may say -- if I may just say one thing. There is historically designated and then historically significant. We have building like the Biltmore that are on the National Register. That includes historical designation.

Board Member Bermello: Oh, absolutely.

City Manager Iglesias: (INAUDIBLE) that we want to keep the viewshed for the Biltmore, I completely agree. So, there are historical designations and there are major historical designations.

Development Services Director Cabrera: Right.

City Manager Iglesias: We have a lot of local designations, and we have some buildings that are fantastic and some of our structures are nationally designated. How many national designated structures do we have?

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: I believe there's about 10 or 12. There's not many.

Chairperson Pardo: From Venetian Pool to -- you name it.

Development Services Director Cabrera: (INAUDIBLE).

City Manager Iglesias: (INAUDIBLE) national designations too so...

Development Services Director Cabrera: (INAUDIBLE).

City Manager Iglesias: So, Mr. Bermello, there are -- there's 1,200, but there are 12 that are nationally designated, and then there's another group that go below and then there's...

Board Member Bermello: There are 1,200 properties in districts. There are not 1,200 designated -- I've asked him, and I've never gotten a response.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: They are designated. They've gone through a process. They're in a recognized district so they're designated. That's your number, 1,200.

Development Services Director Cabrera: Unless you want to limit it to the nationally designated.

Chairperson Pardo: No, no, no.

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Development Services Director Cabrera: That might be a compro -- no?

Chairperson Pardo: No, no, because 2901 Ponce is not nationally registered. Okay, and it is an integral part of the history of Coral Gables. But the point I would...

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: It'll follow the process, which is what you seem to be concerned about, so they all follow the process.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: For example, the San Sebastian Apartments. Would you say that that's an important building?

Chairperson Pardo: It's an important building and it's not designated.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Exactly.

Chairperson Pardo: And the point is, again, if they were going in there for a demolition permit, it would be denied, and they would be forced to do something about it.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: But it's not designated.

Chairperson Pardo: But wait a minute but wait a minute. That's the point. But the point is that -- let's think about that example. All of a sudden, you want to put a -- that building is on a corner -- okay? -- but not every historically designated building is on a corner. So, therefore, 2901 had a very sharp angle and it had...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And it still has it. I mean, that hasn't changed, right?

Chairperson Pardo: Well, (INAUDIBLE)...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: (INAUDIBLE) there's something blocking it?

Chairperson Pardo: The background, you know, it's like we're in Dubai, you know. It's...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Would you say that the background should be four stories? Is that what you're saying?

Chairperson Pardo: The background could have been more nondescript instead of what they did. If you take a look at the photograph of looking directly east there, after they take down the construction fences and everything...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And they put the landscape in.

Chairperson Pardo: And they put the landscaping, they've destroyed the viewshed. They've destroyed the importance of that particular building.

City Manager Iglesias: Mr. Chair.

Chairperson Pardo: Yes, sir.

City Manager Iglesias: Mr. Bermello's project is a completely different project (INAUDIBLE) lower scale and that's the point I was trying to make.

Chairperson Pardo: No, no. I agree.

City Manager Iglesias: That if you do -- if you do this -- and I'm just -- but this is, by the way, a great discussion that we're having so far, and we should -- I think Mr. Bermello (INAUDIBLE) more. That would be -- Mr. Bermello's project, which I thought was a fantastic project and I agree it was less impactful certainly and less impactful to the viewshed. But when you have to (INAUDIBLE) a number of things to that project, so that's quite an impact on a historical building. (INAUDIBLE) only historical building impacting his site, but it's impacting the entire surroundings. So, you have to look at that very, very carefully that you don't have other legal issues involved -- right? -- because now it's not just the building site. Now it's all that's surrounding.

Board Member Behar: Or...

City Manager Iglesias: And (INAUDIBLE)

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Chairperson Pardo: Look...

City Manager Iglesias: Because Mr. Bermello's project was a four-story building -- was a four-story project. (INAUDIBLE) telling us was more than four stories.

Chairperson Pardo: I got to tell you, when we analyzed buildings when I was on the Dade Heritage Trust and we analyzed buildings, historical buildings, you know, they have tremendous purpose. And the purpose that they have is from not only history, but they go all the way to economic impact on our city. There are destinations where people go to Charleston, they go to Savannah, or they go to New Orleans. They go to Boston specifically to enjoy those historic buildings. And Boston is a great example because there you have a huge plaza in one of the areas and you have this very historic church that was designed by a famous architect. And there's a high-rise right next to it. But what they did with that high-rise is they put reflective glass so everyone could see the image of every point of the viewshed of that particular church. What I'm saying is that there are many ways that architects can enhance the view. But unfortunately, by putting it in the Code, that makes people think about it. By taking it out and putting abstract language, then people forget about it. In fact, they forget about the intention of it.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Trinity Church by H. H. Richardson is a classic example of that. But I would wonder if in Coral Gables we would want to have a...

Board Member Behar: A glass tower.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: A glass tower...

Chairperson Pardo: We already have them.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: (INAUDIBLE) was very smart and that's what he did because he wanted to do exactly what you're saying. I mean, that's a classic example of something that worked over there, but I'm not sure that would be in compliance with the Med bonus.

Chairperson Pardo: I didn't say to do it here. What I said is, for example. In the specific example of the Plaza -- not to discuss Mr. Bermello's proposal -- but at the Plaza, what they could have easily have done is -- without taking away their development rights -- would have been to simply simplify the background, indent where those termination points of the street were, possibly create an arch where they have one of the entrances into one of the garages there. It could have been lined up with the original bridge. The reason that the grid was put in there is it was -- or the plan, the Plaza was adopted by a previous Commission. It is part of our history, and you see over and over people wanting to develop, and it's like we're going to -- they're not taking out an alley. They're taking out streets or they're changing streets.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah, and we all agree with that. But the thing that I'm frustrated with is that there were many meetings with the Board of Architects on that particular project, many more than required actually, beyond, and yet the outcome is still something that doesn't satisfy you. So, what I'm thinking is, there's something wrong here, but it's probably that we're not giving enough information during the process. That was my perspective.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, I also...

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: I still think -- and I said this at the meeting -- of what should be in here is that the setting of historic buildings and districts should be considered. If you consider the setting of a building at which they'll allow something larger to be built near it or something more appropriate in style or some -- the viewshed theoretically can be taken to mean if you go up to it, if you can still see something. But if you consider the setting of historic buildings in your determination, you're considering the materials, the height, the setbacks, the scale, the massing. It doesn't mean to say something very modern couldn't be built next to a historic building or something slightly higher than the historic building, but it has to be compatible with the historic building. And I think what the Board of Architects (INAUDIBLE) staff are always at these meetings, especially where historic buildings are concerned, then between Preservation and the Board of Architects and Planning, if you consider the setting of the historic buildings, that would still allow for...

Chairperson Pardo: And that is why I asked Mr. Adams to attend our meetings. And that is why we put in language and did things by adding Historic, the Board of Architects, and Planning, not one over the other two, not two over the third one, but all three. Because if you guys can't figure it out, we're all in deep trouble. And that's why I wanted to be sure...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: That's a good recommendation.

Chairperson Pardo: That it was added that way.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: That's a good recommendation. The only thing is that the changes we made were really technical zoning changes to clarify the language. And if that didn't do the job, then we need to do it better. Now, I did have a chance many years ago to work with the viewsheds with in the project that I was doing in Austin, Texas. And over there, the zoning code had very specific lines, three-dimensional maps that told you that the buildings couldn't go here or there to block the view of the capital. That's my only experience with that topic. So, I'm just saying, you know, if we're going to introduce those kinds of ideas, we need to be careful because the implementation in places that I've seen is a significant effort.

Chairperson Pardo: Many of the properties that are historically designated are inside, not even a corner parcel, and they're inside. And the point is inside the lot, there really isn't a viewshed. It's just straight on from the thing. So (INAUDIBLE)...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: What I'm going to propose is that I say that the viewshed -- as most people would understand it -- is not block in that historic building in the Plaza. What you're talking about is the background, I think, what you're objecting to.

Chairperson Pardo: In that example, it's the background.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: But in the example in the future -- for example, Miracle Mile and what could be put on Miracle Mile, it could forever affect City Hall, which is one of our historic buildings -- designated historic buildings. And you have to be very careful with that. And by the way, the example that I gave you, for example, Denman Fink's office. Denman Fink's office looks just fine where it is, right?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: The only thing is, what happens if all of a sudden someone goes in and says -- to Public Works, they say, "You know, let's put in trees now," and they put the trees in and they block that view of that just by putting in trees. It affects the viewshed. That's why it's talking about compatibility with the historic building and the historic plan, so you've heard both examples.

City Manager Iglesias: Mr. Chair, that would not be covered by this or by anything that's in the right-of-way. I think what we need to do is maybe work -- is look at this from the perspective that I see you all truly want, which is certain buildings, certain things, certain perspectives, certain parameters to make sure that the buildings are not isolated, are not blocked so they could still be appreciated and be viewed, which is very important. Maybe it's something that...

Board Member Bermello: Do you think that we should include that, the designation in the National Registry? (INAUDIBLE) or you want to leave it?

Chairperson Pardo: I am completely against that.

Board Member Bermello: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: How can we now say, "Well, you know what, the Colonnade building is not on the National Register, so let's forget about the Colonnade building," right, Mitch? How careful were you with the Colonnade when you designed that?

Board Member Alvarez: Very careful. (INAUDIBLE).

Chairperson Pardo: And it's not on the National Register.

Board Member Alvarez: We brought in (INAUDIBLE) from Tallahassee.

City Manager Iglesias: It could be National Register or significant by the Historical -- or deemed significant by the Historical Department.

Board Member Bermello: Well, and is there such a list currently?

City Manager Iglesias: I think it would have to be something that could be done with the Historical Department or could be taken care of by the director of (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Behar: I think that...

Board Member Bermello: You mentioned a word that I like, which is -- and I don't think we used that word, was consider the setting. I think -- I like that phrase because it tells the Board of Architects, you know, the total context. And I like -- we did not include that here. I think we (INAUDIBLE) I'd like to...

Board Member Behar: That could be very good. You know, you mentioned something that to me I'm a little bit concerned, district. Because (INAUDIBLE) means it could be much larger, and then with that then becomes more of an issue that how far do you go.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: And I think that's more of the concern of the viewshed as opposed to the setting because even...

Board Member Behar: The setting is good.

Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director Adams: If you have a historic district, you could have development around the edge of the district that still takes the district into consideration. Viewshed, you're potentially looking at seven, eight blocks. The setting is immediately around the historic building. So, setting may actually be...

Board Member Behar: May be more appropriate because it's more defined.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah, the language we use is urban context and terminated vistas, which in my view, were the critical issues with the viewshed discussion. You need to be able

to see the building, the vista and in the context.

Chairperson Pardo: I truly believe that those words are too open and that the viewshed concept is very specific. And the viewshed concept can be applied depending on the case-by-case basis, where sometimes the viewshed would be very simple. And then sometimes, the viewshed includes the original plan, where the altering of the street should be really considered different. Keep in mind that some of our historic elements that we have are fountains in the middle of rights-of-way, are arches over those rights-of-way. These are things that we have to preserve, which includes how future development will affect those (INAUDIBLE). It's very sad to see when you erase that either, you know, just unknowingly and you erase it permanently and you diminish that. That's what I was concerned with. Now, we...

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chairman, may I make a motion that we table this meeting until Thursday, the 30th, that we come prepared to go line item by line item, word by word and either accept or reject -- by accepting I mean incorporate into our document -- and at that time finalize -- which would mean pushing our presentation to the Commission -- to the following meeting after the 28th. It's obvious that -- I mean, I -- in all candor, I have not read the document. Ramon, and I don't want to do a disservice to your work. I want to read it. I want to study. I may want to call you and ask you a question.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I'll encourage that if you want to, you know.

Board Member Bermello: (INAUDIBLE) the meeting. And maybe we could all come prepared with all of our comments. I know that you're probably ahead of us, Mr. Chair, in looking at this.

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Bermello: So, I would like to catch up to you and then we can go item by item and do a service to staff and deliberate and make -- and hopefully we come to a very quick agreement, and we have a document that incorporates as much of staff recommendations as we believe are relevant and good to incorporate. And those that we don't we discuss it with them, and we explain why. And if you still disagree, I think, Mr. Manager, you know, I don't see a problem with staff getting up and saying we agree with everything except we think these, and these still need to be considered.

City Manager Iglesias: Mr. Bermello, if I may say that if the committee votes today to go to the October 12 meeting, it allows us -- I think we've had an excellent discussion today, and (INAUDIBLE) discussion prior to the 12th -- there's an October 12 meeting, the Commission meeting. On October 13 is P&Z. It's going to be presented at P&Z. Then we could go to the second reading in October. We just have tried to crunch everything I think a little too much, and we haven't had time for these kinds of discussions. This is what -- we're not talking about changing the document. We're talking about having some good discussions about certain things here. I thought we've had an excellent discussion today. And truly -- I've been here -- I came here just to make sure that the committee understands that I think you've all done a fantastic job. And the Commission -- the Mayor, the Commission, and myself truly appreciate it. What we want to do is we don't want to change the document. We just want to discuss it and come up with possibly the best document we

could come up with because I see a lot of fantastic architects here, and I think that we have the ability to do so in this committee. But I think that -- and it's not a bad process. You've come up with it. We've come up with certain things. We look at those issues. And the viewshed, for instance, you know, it's an excellent topic. And those are the things that you all came up with. And so, I just think that we need a little more time. We tried to compress it so much and it's too important an issue really, and we want to make sure that we get it right. But I completely agree with you. If the Committee votes to go to the October 12 meeting, I will take it off the agenda on the 28th, which will allow us to go to the 12th, and hopefully, we get it done. But I think a couple weeks more or less or a month more or less (INAUDIBLE).

Chairperson Pardo: I agree.

City Manager Iglesias: And get something that we can truly discuss. And Mr. Chair, there's nothing wrong with -- I mean, you all have done a tremendous job. I much appreciate it. You've done a great job as chairman, and you all have done a fantastic job as members of this committee. What we want to do is get this document -- get this thing right. And there's a number of discussions that we've just had that -- with Planning, with Historical. We have a few issues that we tweaked a few things because it was some legal language because that was basically tweaking things that really were just more legal issues. But really looking at the substance, looking at the meat of this thing and having these good discussions that we're having today. And if you vote for that, I will take it off the agenda on the 28th. I don't think we're ready for the 28th.

Chairperson Pardo: Before we do that, I would like to listen to anyone in the public. We have someone here from the public. We also may have someone on Zoom.

City Clerk Urquia: (INAUDIBLE). Ms. Kawalerski, if you want to speak.

Sue Kawalerski: I would just like to say I think you're doing a fantastic job. I think giving it a couple more weeks to breathe a little bit and to consider it is a good idea.

Chairperson Pardo: Is anyone on Zoom, Mr. Clerk?

City Clerk Urquia: So far on Zoom, no one has raised their hand to speak.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright.

Board Member Alvarez: I'd like to add a couple of comments here. We set out with the mission to figure out how to (INAUDIBLE) the categories of bonuses and how to appropriately allocate bonuses to the quality of architecture, the design or Mediterranean design. That was the mission we were originally targeting. I'm really happy that we've moved away from the straitjacket to work on that. And the conversations that I've been hearing for the last few meetings, the part of Ramon and really all of us have found (INAUDIBLE) more interesting part of the discussion that was not even considered when we started, which is analyzing and studying the possibilities of building site, what happens if we do this, how do we respect the building historic shed, the relationship to the neighborhood. They were much beyond, and I think much more important than the very narrow target of figuring out bonuses for a particular project as a building. This has broadened significantly,

and to me, it's far more valuable and far more significant to the future of projects that are inevitably going to come by. And the size of these projects, (INAUDIBLE) we used to work on a site because that's the site. No more. Any site geographically suitable according to demographics and a number of other analyses becomes a legitimate target for development. This analysis, this planning is far more significant for the consequence of the project and the city and everything that relates to the urban-scape of the city. I'm very happy to have been available and participate in listening to very intelligent propositions from everyone. (INAUDIBLE) I haven't been exposed to (INAUDIBLE) with this situation. But I hear and I know they're surrounded by the pressures coming in as a client legitimately had that. So, I will propose that maybe in defining or maybe in the (INAUDIBLE) doing all things (INAUDIBLE) put in as part of these collateral findings of this effort that we want to devote significant time and effort to analyzing the future projects that will come and is -- we don't have them, we don't see them yet, but you know they're going to be existing. Through our initial effort to try to make the most of the possibility, guide these guys very early in the game, there's a lot of money on the table and a lot of risk. We've got to guide these guys really early in the game what is the scope of Coral Gables mission and how we want to approach it. And if they want to use Mediterranean style, well, then you have to live with these guidelines. Beyond the architectural detail of the building or the fenestration or the arcade or the setback or the height or the window size, we need to make them aware that the most significant part of decision making is that effort. Where's your site? Which streets you're closing? Which alleys are you rerouting? What utilities do you have? What is really the infrastructure? Do you have enough water to meet the Chief Wood equivalent or the Chief --? In my time, Chief Wood was the Director of Safety for the City when I was doing Colonnade. We had extended meetings in infrastructure (INAUDIBLE) evacuation, movement of traffic, movement of people. We've got to bring this type of vision at the beginning before we immerse ourselves at the Board of Architects in looking at this particular elevation and this particular façade or elements of (INAUDIBLE) value, which they are. It's not negating them. Before we enter into that scenery (INAUDIBLE) develop significant resources, time and effort allocating to making decisions on these types of projects.

City Manager Iglesias: Mr. Chair, if I can say one thing.

Board Member Alvarez: The title of the presentation should address -- encompass that. I'm sure Felix and all of you that (INAUDIBLE) should be writing the preamble of what is the real presentation.

City Manager Iglesias: Mr. Chair, if I may say. I'm very impressed with this group we have. I think we've had some not heated but very interesting discussions. And when a group of professionals gets together, that's the case. But I think this group gets along very well. And what we have here is deep discussions, but a lot of respect. There's nothing wrong with that. And I think, from what I see, that we have the ability to take one document to the City Commission. There's no doubt here. If we all work together, we'll take that one document, that kind of unique document that really (INAUDIBLE) to the City Commission and bring it together. And you just need I think a little bit more time to work on this document and get it done. The idea, Mr. Chair, is not to rip apart your document, not at all. (INAUDIBLE). (INAUDIBLE) certain issues and had certain discussions that now that we have the document we can truly have -- I think it's great to work with a solid document and have these kinds of discussions. I don't think there's any doubt in my mind that what I saw here and the fact that it's a very -- everybody's opinionated, but everybody's very respectful and we can come to (INAUDIBLE)

something that could be really meaningful for our city. (INAUDIBLE) give it a little bit more time and work together on it. And I'm willing to do that if you all -- and this is what I had in mind.

Chairperson Pardo: So, you're saying two weeks, Mr. Manager?

City Manager Iglesias: Well, I'd like to -- we can have the Commission meeting -- instead of it going to the next Commission meeting next Tuesday, we can plan on going to the Commission meeting of the 12th. The P&Z is the day after, so this document can be presented to the P&Z on the 13th and go to the second meeting of the -- of October. And I think if this document goes as one document to the City Commission, I'm not sure if the discussions are going to be anywhere near as great as if we go with (INAUDIBLE). The idea of creating the document is that (INAUDIBLE) be able to discuss all of these elements together one by one and then come up with that final document. And it's -- and most of that (INAUDIBLE) tremendous part of this document is (INAUDIBLE). And I think we can work together in going together.

Board Member Behar: You're right. I think that's the goal. That's the intent that we need to achieve. I think the sooner that we get, you know, together again, the better. I think Mr. Bermello proposed...

Board Member Bermello: The 30th.

Board Member Behar: The 30th. You know, I think that that would be to me the latest that we could meet in order to start this process. But I think we need to do that, Mr. Manager, otherwise we're never going to be able to be ready to present something to the Commission.

City Manager Iglesias: (INAUDIBLE) present as one.

Chairperson Pardo: I think there's no reason (INAUDIBLE)...

City Manager Iglesias: They're spirited conversations, but I think everybody is respectful and we all know what we want is the best for our city. So, I think I really thank all of you for spending the time to give us a fantastic document here that we can further discuss. And (INAUDIBLE) with your votes and go to the Commission.

Board Member Behar: If I may, before we conclude, my concern is when I was looking at staff's recommendation where it's more prescriptive of something that needs to be done, and that's what I'm -- you know, I'm reading this document and we have been for the last eight weeks complimenting the building that Mitch did in front of the Plaza, the circle. Today, that building will require -- to get the full bonuses -- a roof (INAUDIBLE), and that's what I think that we cannot have.

Chairperson Pardo: I think staff heard the Committee clearly of the prescriptive component...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I even wrote some from language saying, "This is not intended to be prescriptive." So, clearly, we haven't gone far enough, but Mr. Behar, I agree with you, and I want to thank you very much for your comments. I'm available next week if you want to chat. This is really a polemic for discussion more than a finished document, okay? So, I think we can get to a finished document if we all work with it.

Board Member Bermello: I...

City Manager Iglesias: Mr. Trias, I would like you to look at this document, further refine it, so that we can be ready for the meeting of the 30th.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Board Member Pratt: So, if we could ask sufficient time to review those too.

City Manager Iglesias: So, we want to give you sufficient time, so we need to get that done as soon as possible.

Board Member Pratt: (INAUDIBLE).

City Manager Iglesias: And get you -- not give it to you the day before.

Board Member Bermello: Well, can we...

City Manager Iglesias: You already have this one to start with.

Board Member Bermello: Can we just lock in on this one so that we can --? Because if not -- I'm going to be studying this one. I'm going to be making a comparative. I'm going to pull my notes so if by next Thursday there's now another document presented, I'm not going to have my (INAUDIBLE)...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No, no, no. I think (INAUDIBLE).

City Manager Iglesias: (INAUDIBLE) you're right. I was trying to help, but I think it may be...

Board Member Bermello: Yeah.

City Manager Iglesias: (INAUDIBLE) the other way. (INAUDIBLE).

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Chair...

City Manager Iglesias: If the Committee has no problem, let's lock in on this document and work from this document and then you can further refine it on your own so when you get to these items, you can...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah, yeah.

City Manager Iglesias: (INAUDIBLE).

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I mean, whatever works for you in terms of (INAUDIBLE).

City Manager Iglesias: And I agree with you.

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE).

City Manager Iglesias: I agree with you.

Chairperson Pardo: And just to clarify, Mr. Ceballos, it's okay for us to send emails to Mr. Trias?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: The only issue is board members talking to board members about items that come before them.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: So, you talking to staff -- as long as it's you, one individual...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: That is never going to be a Sunshine law (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Behar: Individually we can.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Individually, that will never be a Sunshine law (INAUDIBLE).

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Right. And the thing that I cannot do is tell you, "Oh, you know what Mr. Bermello said." No, I cannot do that.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Staff and the City Attorney's Office and the Clerk's Office cannot be...

Unidentified Speaker: I thought that's the way that it worked.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: No, cannot be used as avenues to circumvent the Sunshine law. So, if you tell something to Mr. Trias, he cannot relay it to another board member.

Board Member Bermello: And I think that this kind of serves like -- you know, Ramon, I like to call you during the week.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Sure.

Board Member Bermello: You know, like a one on one because I may see something and I may say what the heck were you thinking about, you know, about certifying architects on Mediterranean style architecture.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah, we changed that.

Board Member Bermello: That will be accredited and (INAUDIBLE)...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: We changed that, we changed that.

Board Member Bermello: What is it going to be?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: What I was thinking is...

Board Member Bermello: Teach your course, get a couple of credits, and (INAUDIBLE)...

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Board Member Bermello: And they'll find you. They will all applaud you. Give five credits.

Unidentified Speaker: (INAUDIBLE) did that.

Board Member Bermello: Put it on Zoom.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No, no. I...

Board Member Bermello: And everybody will be happy.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: We did that once. No, I -- what I meant was continuing education, and I did that once with the University of Miami. We did six credits on a Saturday. We had great attendance. Everybody was happy and yeah.

City Manager Iglesias: So, we will keep it -- we will use Mr. Trias' polemic document to (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Bermello: Great.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright. We have to -- we're going to have Glenn out all of October, so we have to get this done next week.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Sure.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, the 30th.

City Clerk Urquia: So, the 30th is also the last day before we publish the agenda so that -- you'll have a chance to meet because we publish the agenda on October 5 for the October 12 meeting, one week prior. So, if you're meeting on Thursday, the 30th is the only Thursday between now.

Board Member Bermello: Can we --? We have to start like just on this item. And I would suggest - I know that you're always allowing time for public comments and that, but did you make a lot of comments? How long do you think it's going to take us to go through your document?

Chairperson Pardo: I could tell you.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Three to four meetings.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Look...

Board Member Behar: I would agree with (INAUDIBLE).

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No, no, look...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: To incorporate all of his comments and your comments into a single...

Chairperson Pardo: No, I don't...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Document...

Chairperson Pardo: Wait, wait just a minute. I don't think we should be doing that. My personal opinion -- Mr. Manager, this is the way I would like our committee to do this. I think for clarity, any components of what staff has come up that we adopt, so the comparison will be from the existing language that's in the Code today compared to this in the redline form, the same as what you sent us on the 10th, the afternoon of the 10th. That way it'll be easier, I think, for anyone, because the 42 pages, I think are unnecessary. If staff -- if we only adopt 10 percent of what staff has proposed -- this committee adopts only 10 percent -- and staff feels strongly against it, they could say whatever they want. But it's going to be very confusing, in my opinion...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah, but...

Chairperson Pardo: To the Commission. I would rather have one document and any of these things gets incorporated into our base document, and then that way, you know, it goes in comparing to the existing.

Board Member Bermello: Right.

Chairperson Pardo: The reason that's important is because that way the Commission can see there is a problem here, and we added this. That's the difference. If you start comparing three things, you'll go crazy.

Board Member Bermello: Well, I guess what I was getting at was not necessarily that. I agree that we're going to have one document, that's our document, that hopefully has a lot of staff's recommendations as part of it, hopefully. My comment was not having read your...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: Your comments, my question was more logistically, do you think that knowing what you've written, that we can start at 4 o'clock and say end at 7 and have gone through 100 percent of your comments? It doesn't mean we're going to adopt them, but that we have gone

through and deliberated.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I think so.

Board Member Bermello: Do you think that's possible?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I think so.

Board Member Behar: In my opinion, you will. You know why? Because when you read some of the comments, I can tell you that we're going to go through and those items that I consider to be prescriptive, you know, I will vote not to incorporate them.

Board Member Bermello: And as Ramon -- you were there. You heard my points on prescription.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And I agree.

Board Member Bermello: And I know prescription helps staff. It's very easy (INAUDIBLE)...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: But I don't like it. I agree.

Board Member Bermello: If you're going to make rice then it has to be two cups of water for every cup of rice. It's very simple to measure the cups of water and the cups of rice.

Board Member Behar: Because the Board of Architects is the one that's going to look at it, not the prescription.

Board Member Bermello: Right, so...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: But please, just my method is simple. We need to talk about our architecture. Right now, the Code doesn't really talk about it.

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Board Member Behar: You have a Board of Architects that's going to do this, the architecture.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Well, I'm just saying that's my...

Board Member Bermello: That's what you were trying to convey...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: That it should be more of architect -- okay. So, I mean...

City Manager Iglesias: Mr. Bermello, I just want to clarify that. I completely agree with you. I think prescriptive architecture is cookie-cutter architecture. We don't want that. That's not our view. That is not our review. And so, what I was thinking is exactly, Mr. Trias, what you were saying. Take

your document, add what you feel is appropriate, and I think -- and I'm sure that we could come up with one document to present to the Commission as a whole from everyone here, and I think that will allow us to go to the 13th...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

City Manager Iglesias: On the Planning and Zoning.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And I will consider it a big failure on my part if I had to say, "Oh, I disagree with what the Committee is suggesting," which I'm not saying. I'm just saying, I think you should add some more things because you have that opportunity.

Board Member Behar: With that in mind, I think we are good. And we'll have a meeting set for the 30th, correct?

City Manager Iglesias: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: Starting at 4.

Board Member Behar: Mr. Chair, I'll make a motion to...

Board Member Bermello: For the meeting on the 30th? We have to make a motion for that?

Chairperson Pardo: Absolutely.

Board Member Behar: So, we'll make a motion to meet at 4 o'clock.

Board Member Bermello: At City Hall on the 30th.

City Clerk Urquia: If the room is available, we'll make it at City Hall.

Board Member Bermello: If not, here.

Unidentified Speaker: (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Bermello: No, it's just that finding parking here is -- it wasn't -- I illegally parked just (INAUDIBLE)...

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

Unidentified Speaker: If you have a ticket, give it to (INAUDIBLE).

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

City Manager Iglesias: (INAUDIBLE) for free. (INAUDIBLE).

(MULTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON)

City Manager Iglesias: We also would like a vote on the Commission meeting to the 12th.

Board Member Behar: I move that.

Board Member Bermello: Can we accept that this item will be brought before the Commission on October 12?

Board Member Behar: I'll make a motion -- I'll second that motion.

City Clerk Urquia: All in favor?

The Board Members (Collectively): Aye.

City Clerk Urquia: Opposed?

Board Member Behar: Motion to adjourn?

Chairperson Pardo: Alright.

Board Member Bermello: I second.

Chairperson Pardo: All those in favor?

The Board Members (Collectively): Aye.

City of Coral Gables Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting
September 2, 2021
City Commission Chambers
405 Biltmore Way, Coral Gables, FL

Blue Ribbon Committee Members

Chairperson Felix Pardo

Board Member Aramis "Mitch" Alvarez

Board Member Robert Behar

Board Member Willy Bermello

Board Member Glenn Pratt

Board Member Javier Salman

City Staff

Assistant City Attorney, Gustavo Ceballos

City Clerk, Billy Urquia

City Architect, Juan Riesco

Planning and Zoning Director, Ramon Trias

Public Speaker(s)

Gordon Sokoloff

Sue Kawalerski

Myra Jolie

Maria Cruz

Bella Smith

Chairperson Pardo: I'm sorry for the tardy -- late -- the late start today because we have three members that are out -- or two members that are out; and one was fortunately able to come back. And can you call the roll, Mr. Clerk?

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Alvarez? Not here. Board Member Behar?

Board Member Behar: Present.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Bermello?

Board Member Bermello: Present.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Pratt is absent. Board Member Salman is absent. Board Member Riesco?

City Architect Riesco: Present.

City Clerk Urquia: Chairperson Pardo?

Chairperson Pardo: Here.

City Clerk Urquia: Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: And is our City Attorney going to be here?

City Clerk Urquia: Our City Attorney is here. He is on Zoom.

Chairperson Pardo: Oh, there we go. How are you?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Good afternoon.

Chairperson Pardo: Good afternoon.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman.

Chairperson Pardo: Welcome. Alright, so at the last board meeting...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Mr. Chairman, if I may. I'm not sure if you can hear me. Can you confirm that you can hear me well?

City Clerk Urquia: Yes, sir. We can hear you.

Chairperson Pardo: But you have an echo.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Great. Just some general information that I feel the need to let everybody know. Because of timing, we need to have -- frankly, a final product, at the latest, by Tuesday. Given that this will be the last meeting before that Tuesday, I just want to make all the board members aware of that. I don't know if we can really get to that point. I'm sure we're going to try. But if not, we will probably need to take some sort of board action or board decision to elect maybe the Chair or an individual on the board to go before the Commission at the next meeting and let them know that, you know, we weren't ready for that particular Commission meeting. But just so that everybody's aware, because of timing, to make the Planning and Zoning meeting and to make all the meetings for the next Commission meeting, we need to have a completed product by Tuesday.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you, sir.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: You're welcome.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, so we're going to try to move quickly through this. And also, Mr. Bermello brought up some very good points. He had sent the information to our City Attorney, and I was able to put all of these things on the agenda. The last one is not shown on the printed agenda, but it will be discussed.

Board Member Bermello: Very good.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. So, going quickly through this, on Article 5...

Board Member Behar: Mr. Chair, I think the last -- before we left was the Table 3, remember? We were going to think about it.

Chairperson Pardo: Correct, and that is right. We're going to jump on the Table 3.

Board Member Behar: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: I was going to just try to keep it in order to just get the cleaning up of these things.

Board Member Behar: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: And if Table 3 is eliminated, then there'll be a little further cleanup simply by striking out anything that has to do with Table 3 in case we go that route.

Board Member Behar: Yeah, okay. Do you want to start with the article -- the recommendation, the suggestion that Mr. Bermello made first? Or do you want to go --? I think -- I personally think we should just conclude Table 3.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright.

Board Member Behar: And then go back.

Chairperson Pardo: The Chair accepts that. Let's continue with that. Let's go to Table 3.

Board Member Behar: My recommendation is we keep building setbacks and step back reductions. I think every case is different, and I think that's a good provision that we should keep. That's number one. Number 2, Number 3, I don't have a problem deleting completely, and Number 4. 2, 3, and 4, we could delete.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright, so just for sake of argument, we are all accepting the deletions of Numbers 2, 3, and 4, which are on Table 3, which are the encroachments into the right-of-way, which is Number 2; the parking requirement exemption, which is Number 3; and the multifamily residential density bonus, Number 4. Those will be stricken out. And then we will discuss now Number 1, the building setback. Mr. Behar, can you elaborate?

Board Member Behar: I think -- and this is something that Mr. Trias brought up last week. And we're -- we have a case that I'm working on, on US 1. And in some cases, we have to reduce the setback and increase in other areas. And I think this provision allows the flexibility to do that. And it's something maybe Mr. Trias could elaborate a little further and give us his feedback on this.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Thank you, Mr. Behar, and Mr. Chairman.

Chairperson Pardo: Yes, sir.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: The Table 3, in my view, the first section is the only one that is significant, and that's the one Mr. Behar was referring to. It provides flexibility and proper

review. In other words, the architect -- the City Architect and the Board of Architects can judge whether or not the flexibility with the setbacks makes sense from an urban design point of view. That's very significant if one is trying to achieve a quality result. If we don't do that, then it's simply whatever the setback is, and we're done. I don't think that that leads to quality urban design.

Board Member Bermello: So, Mr. Trias keeps looking at me, so I don't know if that's a -- but I'll say this. As you know...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I didn't mean to. Sorry about that.

Board Member Bermello: When we started, I was one of those persons that wanted to get rid of all of 3. And I've been pretty much steadfast on that. But I heard, Mr. Trias, what you said at the last meeting, and I also heard what Mr. Behar said. So, I -- I'm all for flexibility, and particularly, the applicant and the board can come to something that is good because there's some overwhelming reason given the conditions. So, Mr. Chair, I'm reversing my earlier position, and I'm agreeing with...

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: The Director of Planning, and also, Mr. Behar.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright.

Board Member Bermello: And I hope that this plays out the way that it's been described here.

Chairperson Pardo: I have some comments, but I'm going to reserve them after -- Juan, do you have any comments about this now?

City Architect Riesco: I'd just like to talk about the strikethroughs and the percentage. The Code now stipulates it's a minimum of 25 percent.

Chairperson Pardo: So, I -- and you're right on target. I think we should strike out A, B, C and D, because they have nothing to do with the setbacks.

City Architect Riesco: Well, I think the trade-off is you allow them not to adhere to the setback, but they have to provide open space in return.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, and I think that's why...

City Architect Riesco: That's the (INAUDIBLE).

Chairperson Pardo: You have to be careful with these formulas of A, B, C and D. For example, this prescriptive 400 square feet of the -- you know, again, we're reverting back to kind of a backwards thing. I think I understand what Mr. Behar is talking about, which is the flexibility on the setbacks being done in such a way that the setbacks could be not necessarily reduced to zero, but that they could be mediated. You know, I think that there should be some verbiage there to give flexibility, but not make it almost sound like an incentive, going back to quote Mr. Bermello when he said that, you know, where is the public benefit? The specific example that Mr. Behar came up with is that it's a unique situation where normally you would go -- on a setback situation, you would simply go to the Board of Adjustment and ask for relief. The problem is that with the Board of Adjustment -- having sat on it two different times -- you can't have a self-imposed hardship. So, therefore, if you're designing, it would be considered a self-imposed hardship. But the flexibility has to be limited in such a way -- I think that the trade-offs that are there are truly redundant based on other places that's already stated in the Code. And I think here that -- in my personal opinion, I think that when you look at a zero setback -- may be reduced to zero setback on all property lines, it sounds like it's all property lines. In other words, you could go to zero on everything. So, again, there's no setback issue. The question is, depending on the particular project

and depending on how it's being mediated somewhere else, that would be my concern. So, I'm sorry to interrupt you. I just wanted to bring that up on this particular issue. Have you seen this come up before?

City Architect Riesco: Well, again, I think Mr. Trias might be able to explain the concept behind the reduction in setback versus the trade-off for open space. I think that's for -- in an urban setting.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: If you allow me. This is not a variance in the sense that there's a hardship there for any different setback. It is actually a proactive way of creating high-quality public space. That's why it has the percentages, and it speaks of certain types of public space. Now, it could be written more artfully. I think, certainly, we could make that more clear that the purpose of this is to do urban design quality public space. I think that probably we could include. But it's not the same concept as a variance.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, I think also on the project that Mr. Behar brought as an example, you all -- that particular property is almost a double frontage property, correct, Mr. Behar?

Board Member Behar: That's correct.

Chairperson Pardo: And because of that...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: There are three -- actually, three frontages.

Board Member Behar: Three streets.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: Right, three streets. So, again, you know, I don't think -- in my personal opinion, I think that it has to be crafted in such a way...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: That it's not point blank. I think that you may run into a project like that every once in a blue moon. You're not going to run into it every day. The message, in my opinion, which I think, you know, Mr. Bermello was talking about the precedent on is that the problem is that once you put this in here, it becomes your guidelines. In other words, that's the normal. This is not the normal. I understand where Mr. Behar is coming from. And the issue is, I think we all agree that you want to be able to have -- you want to have that in your utility box to be able to use when you need to. And the issue is that to promote that I don't think it has to be that there's a formula because each side is so unique that it can...

Board Member Behar: Yeah, but otherwise, if you eliminate it, you're going to be forced to go before the Board of Adjustment for a variance, which you don't have a case for.

Chairperson Pardo: No, no, and I made that argument. I said this is -- having sat on the Board of Adjustment, this is the one thing -- I think that the way that it's written presently is poor.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I agree.

Chairperson Pardo: But I understand that there has to be relief, but it be for the public benefit, quoting Mr. Bermello. And I think the public benefit is extremely important for people to understand to allow flexibility...

Board Member Behar: But for example...

Chairperson Pardo: For the public benefit.

Board Member Behar: If you look at C, types of open space. Types of open space shall be in the form of courtyards, plaza, arcades/loggias, pedestrian pass-throughs, you know, adjacent/contiguous to rights-of-way. So, that itself is telling you, you have to do open spaces, you know, which is going to be in the benefit -- you know, public's benefit.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. And I think that if it were rewritten properly, in my opinion, it could be done in one or two sentences without the A,B,C. And in fact, the one thing that I have a real issue with, with the 400 square feet on the plaza issue, you have very small buildings where 400 square feet is a lot. And you have enormous buildings that 400 square feet is nothing.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, I was going to comment on that. To me, the 400 is the one that throws me off. But I agree if we can clean this up artfully...

Board Member Behar: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: I'll be more than supportive of this. Because the 400 feet -- if you have a 50 by 120-foot lot, that may be too much. But if you're the owner of the Plaza, 400 feet doesn't start to cut it.

Chairperson Pardo: That's nothing.

Board Member Bermello: So, I think that's the issue. I think we're trying to, in exchange for a setback reduction where you're getting so much in the public realm, I'm good for that with all -- you know, mentioning the courtyard, the pass-throughs. All those things make sense. But the 400 square feet I would get away from.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. And the other thing is, Mr. Trias, the problem is that we have already, you know, the pass-through, if the block is X amount of length and -- it's too open. It has to be in such a way that an applicant can say, "I'm requesting this because of this..."

Board Member Behar: But I'm giving this.

Chairperson Pardo: "But I'm giving that." So, I think...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I think...

Chairperson Pardo: That one of the terms which Mr. Bermello brought up is the benefit.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: The public benefit. And I think public benefit should be part of that. The other thing...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And it should be public benefit in terms of design and open space and urban -- maybe we could list that because...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Behar: I think if we rewrote this in a better polished way, I think it will be acceptable to it. But I am also...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Okay.

Board Member Behar: And we said it last time -- I don't like the prescription of the 400 square feet. I -- because if I'm dealing with one acre, 400 square feet is nothing.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I think -- I didn't write that and I don't know who wrote it. But I think that's there just to say that some marginal, little space, that doesn't count, so that's why they put in some minimum.

Chairperson Pardo: A baseline.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah, but however, I agree with all of you.

Board Member Bermello: And I would make it broad because, for example, public art. I mean when they -- think about things of high value in the Gables. When they did the -- when the Foundation did the umbrella, you know, on Giralda, it wasn't adding open space, but it was certainly activating open space that was pretty much dead. It brought it alive, not only for our residents, but people and visitors. You saw more selfies and more photos, you know, highlighting the best of what we have to offer. So, in something like this, there may be someone that comes up with great public art, you know. If you think of Hudson Yards and the stair that everybody goes up, you know, what would you describe that? It's a structure. It's not a playground.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: IT's very controversial.

Board Member Bermello: You know, it is controversial. But let me tell you. I mean, I -- most people I've heard, you know, they want to go there, like you would go, you know, to the Statue Liberty. So, I think those things have value and they may not fit nicely into a plaza or a courtyard, but they certainly activate the public realm. And that's kind of like there's so many spaces that people do a leftover plaza and it's dead. It's like an asterisk. And I think what we want to have is wonderful places for people to enjoy, see.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: The advice that I give to anyone is that zoning has very limited scope. The reality is that there's so much more that can be done. In other words, like the things you're talking about that are not actually prescriptive things that you would find in a zoning

code. I think zoning should do whatever it does. And you're doing a great job, by the way, in terms of making it better in terms of the language. And then we should emphasize that the architect, the City Architect, the Board of Architects, like you've explained many times, Mr. Pardo, they need to do a great job at expanding with zoning. Zoning gives us maybe 10 percent. I mean, the rest of it is something that design and review will bring us.

Chairperson Pardo: And I think also, to be very, very clear, very clear, not only for (INAUDIBLE) again my friend, for the public benefit, but also, compatibility.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes, yes.

Chairperson Pardo: In the specific example that Mr. Behar has -- which is an excellent example - - it is on a road -- a state road that has 60,000 cars going through it in each way every single day. That is not the same as if that were bumped up against a low-density residential area.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: Very different. So I think...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And...

Chairperson Pardo: Compatibility for the public benefit should be put in there so when the Board of Architects and the City Architect looks at it, they have a very good guideline. And so it doesn't get abused where people think that this is a free-for-all.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah. And I think, like I said, I think that enforcement and review, if we could have some language that talks about the fact that that has to happen, that will be very helpful.

Board Member Behar: I propose that we modify the language , you know, to something that is acceptable to our City Attorney and everybody in this board, and -- but we keep a portion of that.

Board Member Bermello: I would like to ask the City Attorney if he's capturing the thoughts here, because I think what we're saying is we're keeping Section 1, building setback reductions, and to keep it very flexible that what we want to get in return is open space, which can take the form of courtyard, loggias, et cetera, et cetera. It's all written out. That we don't want to have the prescription of the 400 square feet or a percentage, and that the guiding principle is that there must be a public benefit and compatibility with the surroundings. Gus, are you capturing the spirit of that, and you can maybe prepare something that you can put up on the screen later so that when we leave here tonight, we can say that we don't have to see this document again? Or you think you should send it to us later tonight and we each send you a note saying, "Yes, this is -- reflects what we decided?" Although I am listening to everything that everyone is saying and I'm trying to take notes of that, I do not want any language on this final product to be my language. I want that language to be the Board's language. So, you tell me you removed B and add C, or whatever changes. I will make those changes. But I don't want them to be left up to myself or to staff to make our interpretation of the Board's intent.

Chairperson Pardo: Gus, let me make a suggestion that maybe will be acceptable to the Committee. Mr. Trias, maybe you can, while you're sitting there concentrating on what we're doing, maybe you could come up with a very simple paragraph that we could then listen to and see if we could kick it around. And then that way we could proceed with the rest of the document.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I can but I don't think I should because of the same reason that the Attorney said. I mean, this really needs to come from you.

Chairperson Pardo: That's fine.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: If at some point you need more help, I'll be happy to provide it.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright. What I would suggest...

Board Member Bermello: So...

Chairperson Pardo: So, what I would suggest now is that...

Board Member Bermello: May I suggest then articulating an idea for Gus to write down? And if you like it, we can vote it or we can adapt it or modify it...

Board Member Behar: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: So we have something. Because I get that none of them want to say they were coauthor or author of the language, and I get it. I understand their position. They're -- that's not their role, so...

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: Do you want to --? By the way, this wasn't my item, so -- but I'm happy to put something up and see if you guys agree.

City Architect Riesco: So, let me just clarify something, going back to what you just said, Mr. Bermello. So, the percentage is also going to be deleted? Or are we going to have a minimum percentage that we're going to work from?

Board Member Behar: I think the percentage you eliminate.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah.

Board Member Behar: There's no -- and then every case is different. So, you know, now it's subject to the review by the Board of Architects, by the City Architect, by the Planning Department to make sure it's compatible and acceptable.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: A practical point of view. Sometimes the discussion in the board is not specific enough. In other words, sometimes they forget to talk about Table 3, even though they meant to. So, we need to have a review process where the Board of Architects talks about each of the elements and approves them or not deliberately. Right now, I think sometimes it's not as clear. So, that's why I would say some language that maybe says...

Board Member Bermello: Well...

Chairperson Pardo: (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Bermello: I think the issue is -- to be very clear -- and I would say the reduction in setbacks -- that's -- if we read the language, setbacks may be reduced to zero-foot setbacks on all property lines subject to the following. And I would suggest the applicant providing public open space of high public benefit, which is compatible with its surroundings, and which may include but is not limited to plazas, courtyards, pedestrian pass-throughs, arcades/loggias, and other similar urban design features.

Board Member Behar: I think that's...

Board Member Bermello: And I think if we do that, you have the flexibility that you're looking for. The BOA realizes that that they must check that box, and they'll look for that open space in whatever form. And if your project has seven acres, you're going to ask for a lot, you know. And

if they got a small property, you're going to be very, very modest because you know it can't be a burden. I mean, I think that's the concept.

Chairperson Pardo: Willy, let me throw this out there if you don't mean.

Board Member Bermello: Pardon?

Chairperson Pardo: Let me throw this out if you don't mind.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, absolutely. This was just a suggestion.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. Reduction in setbacks. Some relief of setbacks as reviewed by the Board of Architects and City Architect may be granted for the public benefit while maintaining compatibility with surrounding through the use of compensating, then open space, et cetera, et cetera.

Board Member Bermello: That's fine with me.

Chairperson Pardo: So, let's list that open space. What were the others that you mentioned, Willy?

Board Member Bermello: Well, in open space, I said including, but not limited to -- and basically, using a lot of the same language that you have here, but maybe opening it up a little bit more because there may be other things. I mean, if someone says, "I included a waterscape," you know, that may not fall -- someone could say, "I don't think a waterscape is open space." You know, you can get into that whole deliberation, you know. And a waterscape could be beautiful. I mean, it could be just majestic. You see it in embassies and other places, so you know...

Chairperson Pardo: So, it sounds okay, as long as we just put it in -- okay, Gus?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I'm here.

Chairperson Pardo: Gus, are you there? Okay.

Unidentified Speaker: There he is.

Chairperson Pardo: So, reduction in setbacks. And you could massage it anyway you think there -- some relief of setbacks may be granted for the public benefit while maintaining compatibility with the surrounding uses by providing compensation -- addition comp -- by providing compensation of additional open space and reviewed by the Board of Architects and City Architect -- or granted by. I don't know which one you would rather use.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chair, I think the only thing I would tweak there is when you say compatibility of uses. I think...

Chairperson Pardo: The compatibility of neighborhoods maybe?

Board Member Bermello: I would say maybe urban context because I think...

Board Member Behar: Urban context.

Board Member Bermello: You want to go beyond just whether it's the same use. You want to go in terms of the scale, the density, the height. That's really what -- I mean, a lot of -- I mean, you tell me if I'm wrong.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: My advice would be to follow Mr. Bermello's idea. Urban design is very important. When you talk about use, it gets into the planning issues and it's a little more complicated and less useful, frankly, from the point of view of the review at the Board of Architects.

Board Member Bermello: Right.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright. Gus, you have enough there?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I think we can make that work.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright. Thank you, sir. Mr. Bermello.

Board Member Behar: I'm good with that.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, Mr. Bermello, good?

Board Member Bermello: Yeah. Should we make a motion to approve that?

Chairperson Pardo: No. I think he's already got everything there.

Board Member Bermello: Okay, so we're good with those?

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah, we're good to go. We're good to go.

Board Member Bermello: So, Mr. Chair, with that, there was a comment I had sent earlier in the week that now...

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: Is extinguished because we do have a Table 3.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: And my comment was that I thought if we deleted Table 3, there would be no reference of Table 3 within the document. But now that we keep the Table 3, my first comment is now...

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, very good.

Board Member Bermello: Null and void.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, very good. Thank you. If you don't mind, if we could go for a minute to the first page, 5-1. I would simply like to reorder under A(1), Purpose, if you don't mind, I would like to make A what is presently C; B what is presently D; C what is presently A; and D what is presently B, simply changing the order. They're all there. The verbiage hasn't changed, but I think it makes more sense when you read it that way. Is that okay with everyone?

Board Member Bermello: For me, the reordering is fine.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Behar: I don't have a problem.

Board Member Bermello: Not an issue.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. Alright, then...

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Mr. Chair, just to confirm. Does that match with the current note on the document, the new order? Being C is A, B is...

Chairperson Pardo: B is C. C is A. And D, as in David, is B, as in boy. One more time?

Unidentified Speaker: Yeah.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Just the first two, please.

Chairperson Pardo: The existing A would be C, as in Charlie. B, as in boy, would be D, as in David. C, as in Charlie, would be A, as in apple. D, as in David, would be B, as in boy.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: All set.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, thank you. The Chair recognizes the residence of Mr. Mitch Alvarez. Welcome. Okay. So, what we did is on 3, we struck everything out except the first section. And we changed the verbiage to include the ability to provide relief of certain setbacks as approved by the Board of Architects and the City Architect when there is a public benefit, and that it is compatible with surrounding areas. Okay, just wanted to bring you up to speed. That's all you missed. Okay. And then we just changed the order of the first paragraph. Just A, B, C and D. We just changed that around. Okay, I'm sharing -- alright, so -- changed this to A, B (INAUDIBLE). Same verbiage. Okay. Alright, so Page 5-2, there were no changes that we discussed at the last meeting. 5-3, there were no changes that we discussed at the last meeting. 5-4, I just wanted to note that under Table 1, under architectural elements and amenities at street level, I -- this is Table 1. Under Table 1, I think that there should be a check next to residential. You see that there's a blank box there. And this is architectural elements and amenities at street level. Okay, do you agree? That way it's giving a message that, you know, landscaping is okay for residential in the front because it's optional. You don't have to have all three. You just have to have one of them. On Page 5...

Board Member Bermello: The only one there that doesn't make -- is little A, because it talks about retail uses...

Chairperson Pardo: Correct, but it says...

Board Member Bermello: Which will be...

Chairperson Pardo: In commercial areas.

Board Member Bermello: Right.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: So, it says in commercial...

Board Member Bermello: I think your concept here is simply to introduce the concept of the landscaping.

Chairperson Pardo: Correct.

Board Member Bermello: Okay, I...

Chairperson Pardo: The concept of the landscaping...

Board Member Bermello: That makes sense.

Chairperson Pardo: And the pedestrian features.

Board Member Bermello: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: So, on 5-5, the only thing I think we have to do is just renumber based on the deleted items. So, Gus, are you with me?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: That's fine. At this point, I don't think that's part of the initial assessment -- the initial ordinance. That'll be done on the final product because I'd like for the Commission to see exactly what numbers are being changed and what items are being removed.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, very good.

Board Member Bermello: Are you on page 5-5 right now?

Chairperson Pardo: That was 5-5.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: So, on 5-6, I think that there are a couple of issues on the second sentence of C. The allowable stories shall -- where it says, "be limited," in my opinion, it should say, "not exceed." And then I would strike "to" on the next line. So, it would read, "The allowable stories shall not exceed the applicable Comprehensive Plan map designation." And then instead of saying "and," I think it should say, "per the height as regulated by the Zoning Code." I think it makes more sense.

Board Member Bermello: I don't know about the others, but I'm fine with those...

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: Modifications, Chair.

Chairperson Pardo: Alright.

Board Member Behar: Semantics.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, on the graph of D, as in David, on the right side that is grayed, where it says, "Additional stories/feet available for all types of architectural design," I think "all types of" -- based on what we discussed last week -- should be changed "for Coral Gables Mediterranean style architectural design." And Mr. Trias.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes, sir.

Chairperson Pardo: On the -- on that particular graph on the height, which is zoned here under D, as in David, on page 5-6 -- Do you have it available or --? I could give you my copy.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I don't have it available.

Chairperson Pardo: I could give you my copy if you'd like.

City Architect Riesco: My copy is all marked up though. You want to...?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: I had two questions for you. The first one was...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Which page was that? I'm sorry.

City Architect Riesco: 5-7.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: 5-7, yes.

Chairperson Pardo: 5-6.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I have it here.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. You notice that under MX1 in the Zoning Code, it has for also lots up to 2,500 square feet. It's missing from this graph. Under MX1, in the Zoning Code it says 2,500 square feet. So, we're missing a line there in this graph.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I...

Chairperson Pardo: If you see the (INAUDIBLE)...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No, I understand what you're saying. But I do think that that's a deliberate choice. So, if you want to make a different policy choice, that's a recommendation you're making.

Chairperson Pardo: No, I'm a little confused. I'm just -- if it was deliberate, I'd like to know why it was deliberately left out.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah, it was deliberately left out so that the smaller parcels wouldn't qualify for the additional...

Chairperson Pardo: For the 45 feet in the Med bonus.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Right, right, exactly. That's why it's there.

Chairperson Pardo: And I'm sorry, but in my opinion, it should say MX1, 2,500 square feet, not applicable.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Okay, no, that's fine.

Chairperson Pardo: In my opinion, because if not, there's like, "Was this a mistake or not?"

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No, it's -- this was deliberate and...

Chairperson Pardo: That's fine.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And I go back to the little (INAUDIBLE) that in the past, it was 20,000, so the 10,000 was a new...

Chairperson Pardo: A benchmark.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah, a new benchmark.

Chairperson Pardo: That's fine because the thing is, when you go to the MX2 down below, you have the 2,500 feet there.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah, and...

Chairperson Pardo: And then for the MX3 also.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And if you look closely, you can see that it's different number of stories; five stories at 2,500, seven stories at 10,000. So, there was an attempt to have a more nuanced transition.

Chairperson Pardo: In my humble opinion, I would think it would be better to say not applicable, the same as you've done in other parts of the Code.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: That's a very good point. Very good point.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. Now, since you're here, I have a bone to pick.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: Because the Zoning Code says clearly 45 feet.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: And in another part of the Code in the other table, it incorrectly says 50 feet. And Mr. Behar last week thought that he needed better eyeglasses, and then apparently, I found this discrepancy. And I think that that should be addressed.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I thought I explained it last time, but maybe I didn't. The 50 feet is in the comp plan, and it's not 45 feet. You're right. I don't know why, but we are aware of the fact that it's different.

Chairperson Pardo: I'm glad you mentioned the comp plan because I have a copy of it here. And populated in the comp plan -- we have the comp plan, and we have the Zoning Code.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: And there are discrepancies the way that the text component of -- in the element is written. There are some discrepancies here. But...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: Unless I'm misunderstanding -- I went and I did the math on every single one. Every single one, I did the math. Simple math. And when I did the math, the MF2, 10,000 square foot is perfect; 83.5, if you get at that one level. When you go to MF4 -- I did the math -- 163.5 feet, perfect math. Every time that it was -- per the Zoning Code, the 70, the 150, it was correct. But every time there was a 45 foot. It was incorrect. But every time there was a 45 foot, it was incorrect.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: My opinion is that it says clearly in the land use element in the Comprehensive Land Use Plan that you go by the Zoning Code and then you add the feet. There's a delta of five feet there, where it's a 45 foot. So, if you want to change the Zoning Code, go ahead and change it to 50 feet. But right now...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I think...

Chairperson Pardo: The way that this works is with 45 feet plus the (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Behar: But that's a change to the Zoning Code, which...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Board Member Behar: Would have to be addressed...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: What I would recommend is that if you feel very strongly about it, make a recommendation to change the Zoning Code to 50 so everything is consistent.

Board Member Behar: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: But right now, it says clearly, not only on the map, but it also says it in the text that it's per the Zoning Code. The Zoning Code says 45 feet. It doesn't say 50 feet.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Okay.

Board Member Behar: But what's harder to change?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No, no, no. The...

Chairperson Pardo: No, I'm just saying because this chart -- what we're doing today, Robert, is the Zoning Code. This is the Zoning Code. This is not the comp plan.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Right, the -- but let me say -- let me correct the record or clarify the record. What the comp plan says is up to 50 feet maximum. So, it says 50 -- that's what it says.

Board Member Bermello: No, the comp plan gives you maximums. It doesn't prescribe -- the comp plan.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: That's what the future land use says. Now, I understand you feel very strongly about this. And my suggestion is, yes, there is an issue, and it could be corrected. And the correction will be to change it to 50. I don't think it makes a big difference. It doesn't give you an extra story, but it gives you enough flexibility in terms of the quality of the stories.

Chairperson Pardo: You know, I have a real difference of opinion with you on this.

Board Member Behar: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, and the reason is because words mean things. And when I look at the future land use element...

Board Member Behar: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: Which is the text interpretation of the map -- actually, the map rules, but then you have this document also. Everything that I highlighted on these 11 pages, everything I highlighted is problematic because there are certain things that have issues here. I'm just trying to get through this section, so we get this thing right.

Board Member Behar: Then, Mr. Chairman, I think what you do is we make a recommendation to fix one of them. You know, there is a contradiction and there's no question.

Chairperson Pardo: Exactly.

Chairperson Pardo: So, I agree, Mr. Behar, there's no doubt. I don't want to stress...

Board Member Behar: But we're beating a dead horse here that I don't think we're going to be able to do anything...

Chairperson Pardo: No.

Board Member Behar: On this right now.

Chairperson Pardo: That's correct, but I feel very uncomfortable recommending something that's wrong to the City Commission. I think that either they're all right, or they're all wrong. The problem is that some of them are right, and then some of them are wrong. So, what I'm saying is that I think that when you add this, you should specifically add it according to the Zoning Code. And if you change the Zoning Code, then it ultimately changes this chart for the bonuses

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. What I would say is that one of the most controversial things that were done in the recent update of the Zoning Code was to actually specify the number of stories clearly for all of the different...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Because before, it wasn't like that. Before it was -- it said you get an additional one story or three stories, but it didn't say specifically...

Chairperson Pardo: No.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: 14 (INAUDIBLE).

Chairperson Pardo: No, no. And it says clearly...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: In the future land use element, it says clearly in parenthesis, no limitation on floors. In other words, the height is there and then no limitation on floors. Let's say we have two architects and they're designing two buildings, and they choose to make -- you know, maybe it's a big department store and they have, you know, basically a 30-foot high first floor, and then a second floor, which is the same. But they end up with ten floors, compared to 15 floors.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Sure.

Chairperson Pardo: So, the height is there. I mean, for me, the comp plan does three things. It provides a ceiling for height, use, and intensity. So...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: It also -- in this case, in our case, it also talks about number of floors, and that's where the problem is.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, and the thing is that it says here over and over again in the comp plan, per the Zoning Code, per the Zoning Code, per the Zoning Code. So, the height is based on the Zoning Code. Like I said before, I did the math. I did the math. And everything except the ones that are 45 foot -- per the Zoning Code -- all of them, the numbers match. I'm simply saying, that, unfortunately saying here plus one story, 13.5 equal five story/63.5 feet. The math is wrong by five feet.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Then it should be corrected by 5 feet. I agree with you, and I agree also with Mr. Behar. I think that you should make a recommendation to the Commission to fix it.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah, and the whole point is that, for me, I don't want to put forward a mistake. In my perspective, this is a simple mistake. But the thing is that that should be corrected at this level because we're providing -- this is the one that has to do with the bonuses that give the height, so that's really the point that I was trying to make because this is wrong. So, I don't want to belabor this anymore. And you know, we've got to get this right in my opinion. Thank you. On the next page, 5-7, on the Level 2 bonus on 5-7, if you look up (INAUDIBLE) Level 2 bonus, it says, "All applications desiring bonuses shall meet the minimum requirements of Table 2." I think we should just clean it up a little bit where it should say...

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chair, where is that you're reading?

Chairperson Pardo: Oh, I'm sorry. Page 5-7.

Board Member Bermello: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: The top, the very top.

Board Member Bermello: At the very top?

Chairperson Pardo: You see it's missing a dot -- E period, Level 2 bonuses. If you go to the previous page, that's D. E was not printed on there for some reason. The top should say -- I wrote it by hand -- E. Level 2 bonus. Then number 1. It says, "All applications desiring bonuses shall meet the minimum requirements of Table 2." I think it should say clearly, "All applications desiring Level 2 bonuses shall meet the minimum requirements of Table 1 and Table 2 in order to earn a bonus under these provisions." You see it just says bonuses. It's not referring to Level 2 bonuses. It should be clear. That's one of the things is the tables are there, but the level of bonuses aren't clear there.

Board Member Behar: But you're not getting to the Table 2 yet. This is pertaining to...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Behar: The top only.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah, (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Behar: So, you should not mix...

Chairperson Pardo: No, no, no. It said -- if you look at the previous one -- take a look, Robert, at the previous page C. It calls out Level 1 bonus. Be consistent. The other one should be Level 2 bonus. It's not in order with the table, Robert. It's completely out of order, but that's okay because the tables are the tables, and the bonuses are the bonuses. There's no mention anywhere with Level 2 bonus.

Board Member Behar: So, it says to call it Level 2 bonus.

Chairperson Pardo: Absolutely. Because once you're at...

Board Member Bermello: You're saying that...

Chairperson Pardo: You can't get to 2 unless you...

(MUTIPLE PARTIES SPEAKING IN UNISON.)

Board Member Bermello: Paragraph D to be like paragraph C. Paragraph C introduced Table 1. And you're saying Paragraph D should introduce Table 2.

Chairperson Pardo: Well...

Board Member Bermello: And in addition, say that when you're going for the Table 2 bonuses, just because you also comply with the Table 1 bonuses. It's not that you...

Chairperson Pardo: Correct.

Board Member Bermello: Skipped over one.

Chairperson Pardo: Because Level 2 bonus is...

Board Member Bermello: Right.

Chairperson Pardo: You have complied with Level 1 in order...

Board Member Bermello: I think that clarification makes sense.

Chairperson Pardo: Correct.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: What about the top of 5-9 that has Paragraph E, Level 2 bonuses?

City Architect Riesco: At the bottom of Table 2.

Chairperson Pardo: 5-9, you said?

Unidentified Speaker: It's actually (INAUDIBLE).

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: 5-9 -- on my page it's 5-9, but it's E, Level 2 bonuses.

Board Member Behar: Yeah, that's in 5-8, in the bottom of 5-8.

City Architect Riesco: Bottom of 5-8, yeah, right after Table 2, the completion of Table 2, which is letter E.

Board Member Behar: At the end of the table.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah, yeah, yeah. Oh, that's where it is. Alright.

Board Member Behar: So, what happened is D should maybe move -- or this language should move before the table or, you know, D, move it after the table. Because this is...

Chairperson Pardo: Very confusing.

Board Member Behar: This is not E. It should be D, D-1, D-2.

Board Member Bermello: You know, the way that Table 1 is done, it's confusing. But if we're going to be similar to it, then we have to -- we can't do what you're suggesting, Mr. Chair, because it would throw it out of whack.

Chairperson Pardo: Actually -- and you're right, Robert -- the table should happen after 1 and 2. That first table should happen after 1 and 2.

Unidentified Speaker: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: The way that it's presented -- Do you see that, Mr. Trias?

Board Member Behar: Yeah, but I think it's clear that D was supposed to -- and what followed D should go before the table.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I think anything you do to make it more clear is better. And redundancy is fine. I mean, just do it as many times as you feel comfortable with.

Board Member Bermello: Again, I don't think it's a problem if Item E, Mr. Chair, you simply call that table -- you're introducing Table 2.

Chairperson Pardo: I'm sorry, Mr. Trias. Say that again.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No, I think it says Level 2 bonuses. If you want to say it again on Table 2, that's fine. I mean, I don't see any...

Chairperson Pardo: When you have the Level 1 bonuses, the graph below it is correct.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: But unfortunately, the way that the pagination works -- right?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: That maybe this should be above where you have -- see, and the funny thing is that under 1, it refers to -- and this is what's confusing, Robert. Up above, you see where it says, "All applications desiring bonuses shall meet the minimum requirements of Table 2." So, it's kind of like in a quagmire. You know, it's in a no-man's land there. Where does that belong? Up above or down below?

Board Member Behar: I think that's just...

Board Member Bermello: I think what it's missing is under these Table 2 provisions, which is kind of like a (INAUDIBLE) here -- but I don't see a problem in trying to understand that Item 1 and 2 on 5-7 is really dealing with Table 2 and not dealing with Table 1. I think that's really all that we're talking about.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay, so I would...

Board Member Bermello: That could be the...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I mean if it's an issue of graphic design...

Board Member Bermello: I think it's an issue of graphic design. (INAUDIBLE) new section.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: We could work on it. It certainly...

Chairperson Pardo: Can you fix it?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes. I mean, we're not going to change any of the content. I would request that you focus on the content...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And then make a recommendation for the graphic design, and we can work on it.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. So, the last thing I want to bring up, because I want to get to a very important subject now. And that is that under Table 2 where it says, "Architectural and Public Realm Standards," I think we had agreed that instead of "realm," we would be using the word "amenities," public amenity standards.

Board Member Bermello: Where are you, Mr. Chair?

Chairperson Pardo: The gray part where it says Table 2 on 5-7.

Board Member Bermello: Oh, yes.

Chairperson Pardo: To of the chart.

Unidentified Speaker: Right, architectural and public...

Unidentified Speaker: Very top of the chart.

Board Member Bermello: The header, the header.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: Architectural and Public Realm Standards.

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: Right, okay.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay. So, I'd like to skip -- if you don't mind and...

Board Member Bermello: You're changing that to "amenities?" Is that the concept?

Chairperson Pardo: I'm sorry?

Board Member Bermello: To change...

City Architect Riesco: Realm to amenities.

Chairperson Pardo: Realm...

Board Member Bermello: Correct.

Chairperson Pardo: Correct because they're called out as amenities everywhere else.

Board Member Bermello: So, public amenity standards?

Chairperson Pardo: Public amenity standards, yes.

Board Member Bermello: That's fine.

Chairperson Pardo: And then one other thing. I'd like to go back -- I'm going to skip here because we're going to lose Mr. Behar in just a few minutes. I'd like to skip to 5-9 for a minute and discuss something that was brought up by Mr. Bermello. He had sent an email to the City Attorney and - with a concept, which is intriguing to say the least, that had been discussed before. And -- there you go. So, in this concept -- I'm going to have Mr. Bermello actually read it into the record, if you don't mind, and I only have one question. And we could discuss that after you -- yes, sir.

Board Member Bermello: So, if I may read it into record. The idea is to include this paragraph after Section H, which follows Table 2, and it would read the following: Optional standards. Applications that comply with both Table 1 and Table 2 bonuses, but which reduce the residential unit density by 50 percent, while providing for double the required front setback requirements and use not more than 90 percent of the maximum permitted -- I forgot here "building height," sorry - - include building height -- shall...

Chairperson Pardo: I'm sorry. Include what?

Board Member Bermello: Building height.

Chairperson Pardo: Building height.

Board Member Bermello: In other words, that stay 10 percent under the allowed building height. Shall earn an additional .5 FAR to promote family-style opportunities in the MF2, MF3, and MF4 districts.

Chairperson Pardo: And this prohibits it being used for MX.

Board Member Bermello: Yes.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Keep in mind, MX, most of the time, doesn't have a limit in density, so that wouldn't be an issue.

Chairperson Pardo: So...

Board Member Bermello: The concept here, Mr. Chair, is to -- in the residential districts...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Bermello: To provide -- let me backtrack. The Code that we're dealing with historically has pushed the development industry into providing as many small units as you possibly can to maximize density. It's a given fact of life. The trends historically in communities as they mature is that people start to oppose that growth because of the ensuing traffic as areas densify. So, this concept is to provide, not a requirement -- so it's an option -- but it provides the option that says, if you're willing to do half the number of units and you're not going to maximize the building height and you provide more front open space than what is required in terms of setbacks, you're allowed to increase your FAR while you're complying with everything else. What that does is it allows for larger units for families, as opposed to what you see throughout America, which is an anti-family move, okay, of the micro-units and the studios, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. I think this community is different. I've lived here for more than 40 years. I got seven grandchildren and I don't plan to go anywhere else. But I'd like to propose this ordinance, or this change within the Mediterranean style as long as you comply with Level 1 and Level 2, you fully comply, but you take advantage of the fact that you do half the density, you don't go the full height, you provide more open space on your front yards, and you get an extra .5 FAR. What that does is it promotes homes. It promotes three- and four-bedrooms style. If you go into the Gables to look for a four-bedroom unit anywhere, you're not going to find it. Mr. Trias knows this.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Sure.

Board Member Bermello: And the reason that you don't find it is because our Code penalizes any developer that tries to even go there. So, this provides -- again, this is not a straitjacket. This is not telling every developer you have to do this. But I think we would be surprised by the fact that having this, the developer will say, "You know what, for the time being, I'm going to have people that are going to come and applaud me in a presentation," because I'm not going to be the tallest. I'm not going to have the highest number of trips that are generated, which is usually what happens here. People end up having to hire a traffic planner to appease the neighbors that you're not going to create, you know, additional trips. This will create negative trips, negative trips. So, as I -- if...

Board Member Behar: I think you're -- I think I'm a hundred percent in favor of this because it does promote larger units. Less units, but larger units. I think it does promote kind of more family-style units. And I think the allowable -- the 50 percent is good. I think the height is good. I just -- the only thing that I don't see when it says double the required setback. That may be -- no, I would say additional setback. But I'm not sure that the double -- depending on your lot width, that may not...

Board Member Bermello: Maybe double is asking too much, but an increased setback, and without getting into percentages. Let's say that your setback is 15 feet, or you know, 20 feet. Increase it, not just meet minimums.

Chairperson Pardo: Well, let me ask you this, are there going to be any situations where you have double, 2, times zero? Mr. Trias.

Board Member Bermello: What is double, 2, times zero?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I don't understand the question.

Chairperson Pardo: In other words, the front setback is zero, so two times zero -- double zero is zero.

Board Member Bermello: Oh. No, I don't think -- Do we have zero in any residential area?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No, if Table 3 were to be applied, for example. I mean, I guess that's the issue that you're raising, right?

Board Member Bermello: See, I was the proponent for no Table 3, but I...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Right.

Board Member Bermello: So, I never envisioned...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No, but I think...

Board Member Bermello: I mean, that's cute. Two times zero is zero. But that's not what I had in mind.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: The way you have phrased it is additional setback from what's required.

Board Member Bermello: Correct.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: So, I don't think that that issue would apply.

Board Member Bermello: But I mean, Mr. Behar may be correct. I mean, doubling in certain areas where you have a small lot may be...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: But it's only for MF2. It's only for the multifamily zoning.

Board Member Bermello: Yes, only for the multifamily residential.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: They all have setbacks in the front.

Board Member Behar: If you provide -- if you require an increase, that means you're giving more than the minimum, but it's not limiting you to (INAUDIBLE). What I do like about this is that you're going to provide larger units, but less units.

Board Member Bermello: Correct, correct.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Let's keep all of the discussions in the public. It's very important.

Chairperson Pardo: So, getting back to this point, I think that any time you give a bonus, you should have at least the minimum. When it comes to setbacks, in your mind...

Board Member Bermello: My mind the public benefit here, if somebody said, "Well, Willy, what's the public benefit of this?" I'll give you three. Number one, less density. Number two, less height. And number three, more increased open space on the front yard.

Chairperson Pardo: I'm sorry. I'm sold.

Board Member Bermello: So, I mean, that -- I mean, to me this is an easy one to explain to my next-door neighbor. You know, and they'll immediately say, "Wow, why didn't we do that before?"

Chairperson Pardo: No, I think this is great idea. The only thing -- what I meant to say is your -- what is the minimum as far as a concept? It has to be usable because its residential. It has to be useable. And we should apply a number because we're providing a bonus to do this, which has a public benefit. There's no doubt about that.

Board Member Bermello: Well, what I was suggesting -- but I'm willing to back off of -- well, I was suggesting doubling. So, if it's 10 feet, provide 20 feet; it's 15 feet, provide 30 feet. But I realize that that could then become -- it may become difficult to do. So, I'm willing to back off. I think the concept is give more greenery.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah, yeah.

Board Member Bermello: I mean, give more greenery.

Board Member Behar: (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Bermello: And...

Board Member Behar: You're going to have less units, less density. That -- in any neighborhood, that's (INAUDIBLE)...

Board Member Bermello: But Robert, less density and less traffic.

Chairperson Pardo: Give me a number of feet.

Board Member Bermello: Less traffic. I mean...

Chairperson Pardo: No, no. Listen, we're...

Board Member Bermello: I mean, and I realize that some people will say that this is an...

Chairperson Pardo: I just want to have a minimum amount of that -- if you're going to promise -- you said double. Let's back off on double because we don't know -- it could be 30 feet, and then it becomes impossible to design.

Board Member Bermello: Yeah. I went double because, I mean, most people know what double is and it's not a percentage. But I'm willing to -- I mean, my -- the concept, again, Chair, was less height, less units, more greenery.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: It's a simple kind of like ABC that you could explain to a child.

Board Member Behar: I don't think we need to...

Board Member Bermello: And -- but...

Chairperson Pardo: I disagree. I think...

Board Member Behar: Set a number.

Chairperson Pardo: I think we have to set a number, and I'll tell you why. Let's think about this for a minute. The sidewalks are five feet normally. They could be six foot. They could be eight foot. They could be ten foot. The minimum sidewalk is five feet. For you to plant a tree in this green space, you have to have at least 10 or 15 feet. I'm just thinking of a minimum canopy.

Board Member Behar: Mr. Chair, we already have a setback requirement. If you were doing a building that you were not taking advantage of the bigger unit, (INAUDIBLE).

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Mr. Behar, please speak into the mic.

Board Member Behar: You could do the same building, but you know, this is -- the only thing this is doing is keeping that building with a little bit more. It's not telling you 10 percent, 50 percent. But what it's telling you is that you could do less units, just have a little bit more square footage.

Board Member Bermello: Maybe a compromise -- and I'm thinking -- and Mr. Trias will tell me if this would work or not. Let's say that your front setback is 15 feet and that your side setbacks are 5 feet. Under this thought process, the increase would be the adding of the side and the front to create an expanded front setback. So, your new setback will be 20 feet instead of 15 feet. So, it's not a doubling, but it's taking the measurement, the metric of the side setback and adding it to the front.

Chairperson Pardo: I would say that we...

Board Member Bermello: Why do I say that? Because typically the side setback is a function of the parcel plan and how big the property is. And I think that may be a much better metric than relying on percentages or like I pulled, you know, the double out of my -- you know, out of the air. So, I would say -- Would that be acceptable to you, Mr. Behar?

Board Member Behar: Say it again, Mr. Bermello. I'm sorry.

Board Member Bermello: So, instead of a doubling or instead of adding 50 percent, that the increase would be the sum of the front and the side setback. Usually, the side setbacks are the...

Board Member Behar: That's fine.

Board Member Bermello: Minimum.

Board Member Behar: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: So, it would be the sum of those two. But it still would be...

Board Member Behar: An increase.

Board Member Bermello: An increase over the existing setbacks.

Board Member Behar: I mean, maybe Mr. Trias is the one that best could give us, you know...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I think I would encourage some flexibility for the Board of Architects to find the right solution. Because I mean, at the end of that, we're looking for quality.

Board Member Bermello: Correct.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: We're not looking for arbitrary numbers. I mean, from my perspective, yeah, give me an arbitrary number. It's a checklist, great. That doesn't necessarily give you quality.

Board Member Bermello: I agree. I would, again, prefer for the Board of Architects to always review. I mean, maybe adding the two is not enough in this case. Maybe the adding of the two is sufficient in this case. So, I'm all for entrusting the Board of Architects and the City Architect both with this.

Chairperson Pardo: Let's bring this home. Hold on for just a minute. Mr. Trias...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: From a technical...

Chairperson Pardo: What is the front setback of an MF2, MF3, and MF4?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: For example, in the North Ponce, that would be 10 feet, MF2. And I think that's the one that is the tightest one. I don't recall -- I'd prefer to look at the Code for the other ones, but I can tell you that 10 feet is the MF2. Ten feet, for example. Okay, doubling of that to 15 feet -- whatever, 50 percent more or so...

Chairperson Pardo: I just don't want to add to...

Board Member Bermello: I mean, in 10 feet, you cannot even have the canopy of a tree.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah. And...

Board Member Bermello: Just to put it in perspective.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: The idea was...

Board Member Bermello: You put an oak tree, you're pruning continuously because, you know, it doesn't -- it gets so...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: However...

Board Member Bermello: So, this is trying to get a little bit more greenery, Mr. Chair. And again, I realize I'm against prescription, so it's like talking against myself when I'm going against the doubling. But I can understand Mr. Behar's point that it may become a problem in certain areas. That's why I think I would, number one, introduce flexibility. Number two, as a guide -- maybe not a prescription -- that it be -- as a minimum -- the summation of the side and front setback if you're taking advantage of this section. You don't have to.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. But the other thing that you have to be careful with is sometimes the side setbacks are zero, right?

Board Member Bermello: Yes.

Unidentified Speaker: Right.

Chairperson Pardo: So, you know, are we --? Is this a placebo, you know? Let's not go down that path.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: The technical aspect of this is that the comp plan doesn't regulate the FAR for the multifamily. It does regulate FAR for the mixed use and so on.

Board Member Bermello: Mixed use, correct.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: So, you can do it. You can actually do it because, in the comp plan, it just talks about density and multifamily; MF2, MF3, MF4. So, that incentive I think is very valuable. We've discussed that in the prior rewrite and so on.

Chairperson Pardo: But wait a minute. I think we're kind of dancing around over here. Let's get back to the front setback.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Sir, I'm trying to explain the issue.

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Trias, my biggest problem is that some of the streets in this city are very wide, but there are a lot of streets that are very narrow. So, now we're going in and we're providing less density, you know, a little bit bigger building, trying to keep people not going somewhere else because they don't have the square footage, like Mr. Bermello, so that's a good thing. But the thing

is also that maybe it should be done according to the right-of-way that you have to be able to expand it to be able to get those trees in there to make it more...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: That's (INAUDIBLE)...

Chairperson Pardo: Attractive...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: For people that are leaving their single-family homes with a 25-foot setback. I mean, for me, it's absurd that we can't come up with a number that would be minimal. If it's 15 feet, let's think about that. We'd put a tree. We plant it. It's going to eventually have a 20-, 22-inch caliper when it's really fully mature, so it'll be a foot and a half off the sidewalk. And if you have something where you don't have to take that tree and do what has happened to our trees under the FPL easements, and so it has a shape, it has the canopy, and it brings the quality of life, which is what Mr. Bermello's bringing.

Board Member Bermello: That might be a compromise in regards to coming back to it. Because in the MF districts, like Mr. Trias said, the front setback typically is from the 10-foot range. And when I said double it, that would make it 20. What you're suggesting is 15, which in a way...

Chairperson Pardo: I would think so because the canopy of the street...

Board Member Bermello: And that I'm saying might be...

Chairperson Pardo: Is going to go...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: The point I wanted to make is that if you make it 20, then the parking may not work in MF2, which is the point that Mr. Behar was...

Board Member Behar: And we're having that issue right now.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah.

Board Member Behar: We're having those issues.

Chairperson Pardo: But again...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Those are the issues.

Chairperson Pardo: Maybe...

Board Member Bermello: No, I realize. That's why I'm all for the flexibility because I realize in certain situations where you're trying to fit your parking, the parking is a difficult challenge.

Chairperson Pardo: And you know, let's get back to the City plan. Some of these streets were never designed to have big buildings on them.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: The rights-of-way were never designed for that. Let's accept that, Mr. Trias. Let's also accept that our street trees through the single-family neighborhood, City trees sit on the middle of the swale. The swale is 10 foot wide to the edge of pavement -- from the sidewalk to the edge of pavement. If someone with a single-family home has to accommodate a City street tree there, I don't think that it's right for us to put a big building on a small street and then force them to say, "Well, the only way I could put the tree on is if I put it in the middle of the right-of-way on the pavement and take parking out." That doesn't make any sense to me. I cannot say enough great things about Mr. Bermello's idea of reduction of density, of providing a quality

product for people. But I think that maybe all the lots in this City aren't made for that type of product. Okay, and maybe...

Unidentified Speaker: Yeah, you're correct.

Chairperson Pardo: What it means is that maybe people should be looking for not just bigger lots in the area, but wider or something like that. So, I really do believe that I have, for example -- and I've said it over and over. Mr. Bermello did a great job on the parking garage across from Books & Books. And it flies over the sidewalk, and it provides protection for people leaving on a day like today, the way it was pouring today. But that's the middle of the CBD. And what we're talking about is not even mixed use. We're talking about multistory residential areas.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: Where we're trying to increase the quality of Mr. Bermello's idea of reduction in density and providing more square footage in those units. So, look, it's time to pony up. We need to have a minimum distance. And you know what, if you provide the parking and you do it a certain way and all that, that's great, but sometimes that lot isn't going to be deep enough to be able to do it.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Mr. Chairman, I think the only issue is finding the right setback, right? I mean, that's the only thing we...

Board Member Behar: That's it.

Chairperson Pardo: I would say it has to be at least 15 feet, in my opinion.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: That would be a good recommendation.

Board Member Bermello: I'm accepting 15 feet. I don't have a problem with 15 feet.

Chairperson Pardo: I mean, and I would...

Board Member Bermello: I'm acceptable to that as a motion.

Chairperson Pardo: Willy, and I think with a minimum...

Board Member Behar: The minimum required is 10 feet.

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Board Member Behar: 15 feet. You got 50 percent increase.

Board Member Bermello: Yes.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah. It's not double, but it's almost there.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No. And in addition to continue the Chairman's idea, sometimes you have 50-foot right-of-way, sometimes you have 60. Sometimes, you know -- and that is the review process that takes place with the Board of Architects. That plus the 15 feet sounds like a lot to work with.

Board Member Behar: Mr. Bermello, if you're good -- since you're the proposer of this suggestion...

Board Member Bermello: So, could I read it again now with this modification?

Chairperson Pardo: Yes, sir. And one more thing, Mr. Bermello, if you don't mind. That was the cleaning up issue I was talking about. I would -- instead of making this I, what I would suggest strongly is that -- because you even said it during your conversation. You said, "Other Development Options." This should go on Table 3, which is called "Other Development Options," where we struck out all the other things that were superfluous.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I would recommend that, sir, yes.

Chairperson Pardo: You would not recommend it?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes, yes, I would.

Board Member Bermello: I'm fine with that.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Behar: See, that's the reason we kept Table 3.

Board Member Bermello: So, the wording would read something like this, and I guess -- Gus, are you there?

Chairperson Pardo: Gus fell asleep.

Board Member Bermello: There he is, there he is.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I am here. If you'd like I can share my screen.

Board Member Bermello: You're like the holy spirit; I know you're there. I can't see you, but you're there. Optional Standards. Applications that comply with both Table 1 and Table 2

bonuses, but which reduce the residential unit density allowed by 50 percent while providing for a 15-foot minimum front setback requirement and use not more than 90 percent of the maximum permitted building height shall earn an additional .5 FAR to promote family-style opportunities in the MF2, MF3, and MF4 districts.

Board Member Behar: May I suggest something? Can you say up to an additional -- not limited to -- it says an additional 50 percent -- right? -- on the FAR, .5 for the FAR? Up to. Shall earn an additional .5. How about if I...?

Chairperson Pardo: Up to. In other words, it's optional. You don't have to go there. I see what Mr. Behar...

Board Member Bermello: Oh, yeah, that's fine.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: Up to an additional .5.

Chairperson Pardo: Gus, did you get that?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I did, but if you do that then that would make it the interpretation of the Board of Architects or the City Architect to not grant .5, but to grant .1 or .2 or .3.

Board Member Behar: No, no, no. Then...

Chairperson Pardo: No, no.

Board Member Behar: I take it back.

Board Member Bermello: Then forget it.

Board Member Behar: I take it back.

Board Member Bermello: Leave it the way...

Board Member Behar: Forget it.

Board Member Bermello: It was.

Board Member Behar: Forget it. Thank you for the clarification.

Board Member Bermello: Because this -- the person that does this is doing a lot already, cutting the project by half in density, not using 10 percent of the allowed building height, and increasing the setback. I don't know of any project that has done that here.

Board Member Behar: Well, the reason you haven't seen many is because the Code is not...

Board Member Bermello: It doesn't exist.

Board Member Behar: Intended to...

Board Member Bermello: And the Code is generating small units and we see it all over.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. Minimum of (INAUDIBLE).

Board Member Bermello: So, are we okay with the revised language?

Chairperson Pardo: Perfect.

Board Member Bermello: Gus, you have that?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I have something to that effect, yes. I can show that to you later.

Board Member Bermello: Okay, thank you, Gus.

Chairperson Pardo: And also, minimum size lot would not be an issue here because...

Board Member Bermello: No.

Chairperson Pardo: No, right. I mean, you can't do it on a smaller lot anyway.

Board Member Bermello: Correct, correct.

Chairperson Pardo: Right. Alright, so -- yeah, very good.

Board Member Behar: And then there's an additional item that you would like to introduce as well, right?

Board Member Bermello: There are two more things. One was that the way that 5-202 is currently written dramatically did not make any sense. So, I was suggesting that we strike out the last phrase of A and then continue with the wording below that says include design elements of the Coral Gables Mediterranean architectural styles.

Chairperson Pardo: Willy, I know I couldn't contact you directly. But I wanted just to bring up a point so...

Board Member Bermello: That was just grammar, not...

Chairperson Pardo: No, no, no.

Board Member Bermello: I'm not changing the substance.

Chairperson Pardo: I'm not...

Board Member Behar: Where are we at?

Chairperson Pardo: I'm not defending my stuff with the bad grammar. But what I did was, I took that verbiage -- Are you there? That's here.

Board Member Behar: What page are we on?

Chairperson Pardo: That's on 5-12. So, on the grammar, so you know, I took this...

Board Member Bermello: I'm not being critical. I just thought that it would read better...

Chairperson Pardo: No, no, no, no. But I wanted...

Board Member Bermello: If you collapsed the two.

Chairperson Pardo: To tell you why it was done like that. That is verbatim out of the original 1986 resolution.

Board Member Bermello: How it read?

Chairperson Pardo: Exactly.

Board Member Bermello: I mean...

Chairperson Pardo: So...

Board Member Bermello: You want to keep it for historical context? That's fine, that's fine. I mean, I used to have a grammar teacher in Coral Gables Elementary School, and she was pretty...

Chairperson Pardo: I came up with an option anyway. I also said...

Board Member Bermello: She would not let me do run-on sentences and things like that. I realize those things are not in style today.

Chairperson Pardo: I said -- what I did was, I just changed it a little bit. I said, "Design" -- "include design elements of the Coral Gables Mediterranean Architectural Style, which are characterized and include design elements of the Coral Gables Mediterranean" -- instead of saying that say, "include design elements of the Coral Gables Mediterranean Architectural Style, which are characterized within the following existing buildings." I think that's what you were looking for.

Board Member Bermello: Right.

Chairperson Pardo: But I wanted to explain...

Board Member Bermello: Yeah, that's it.

Chairperson Pardo: I took it straight out of there.

Board Member Bermello: That's okay. And the last item for discussion -- and I'm glad that Mitch is here. And although it doesn't have anything directly with Mitch, but it has to do with a project

that we're all very proud of and we always compliment, and it's really an acclaim that he so much deserves, with the Regions Bank building. But I could see where someone -- and this is not a criticism of our Board of Architecture -- could have imposed that for that building to meet the spirit of the Mediterranean style ordinance, that it includes a number of features that I think would have totally destroyed the things that we like about the building. So -- and I'm kind of tiptoeing here because I'm trying to be courteous and to not hurt anybody's feelings because that's not the intent. But I could have foreseen a situation where maybe someone could request barrel tile roof portions somewhere in the elevator machine room or maybe certain depths to the windows or a certain series of frames or seal details that probably at that moment, Mitch would probably have, you know, done somersaults, and you know -- so, the issue is, if you have a situation like that project or it could be others that are maybe more transitional, where the architect -- there are certain things that they don't feel are appropriate in their design that you allow them to do that in exchange for losing some FAR points. You know, again, I'm not referring to anything -- mine personally that I can think of, but I -- you know, I could see where someone says, you know, this is what I wanted. I think this matches and is complementary, and I'm willing to give up some things because this is going to be an office building. I don't want to have big, large windows and an expensive -- and I don't want to see barrel tile anywhere in the project, not even in the elevator machine room. Nowhere. And in exchange for that, I'm willing to give up some of the bonus; not all of it, some of it. And what made me think of that, Mr. Chairman, was Mitch's building, which doesn't have any of those features. But I think that even though they're not all here, every member of this board, Mr. Trias, I don't think a day goes by that we don't point to it because it happens to be across from another project that we kind of like are not applauding -- right? -- and we're using that project as an example of what's right about how you interpret the Mediterranean style in a modern motif, where it still creates a good marriage in the urban landscape. But I could see how someone could have -- at that point in time many years ago -- denied Mitch's building had they applied rigorously a lot of the criteria. So, that's for -- that was a discussion item, and I think that because this is the Mediterranean style ordinance -- and I'm all about, you know, what are you doing for me lately with your project. And if you want something from us, there better be some public benefits. I've been consistent on that. But similarly, if you don't give all the public benefits because you decide

-- you think this is the right thing to do, but you give up some of those benefits that you get in return in the way of bonuses. So, I just wanted to present that because it also gives flexibility to the board a lot. And I would like to see more buildings like Mitch's around town. And I think the way that happens, you can't prescribe it. You need a good architect. There's no substitute for that. And you need to have enlightened leadership that sits on this board. And I know that that goes up and down.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Mr. Bermello, if I could ask you. Don't you think that the Table 1 and Table 2 process that was set up in the Code was meant to do that? Meaning Table 1 doesn't have as much as a Coral Gables Mediterranean architectural requirement; Table 2 does. And Table 2 gives you more FAR than Table 1. I think that's the reason why that was...

Board Member Behar: But I think...

Board Member Bermello: I will tell you in this sense -- I can -- you know, you can talk about, you know, things when they're in the past -- right? -- so now we can talk about the Commission and JFK because years have gone by, right? And I can talk about 1500 Venera because time has gone by and it's a beautiful building, et cetera. As we were going through that process, there are a number of things that I basically succumbed to and did because, first, I'm not a kind of a conflictive type of personality. And I, you know, don't profess to have the right answer all the time, and I will take a backseat to people that I think know much more than I do. But at that moment -- and I had a client that wanted to get his approvals, so there was a lot of pressure. And there were some things that, you know, were not really to my aesthetic liking on proportions or things of that nature. And that's what I'm talking about. There may be sometimes if I would have maybe had an option, there might have been some things that I would have said, you know, this is just a difference of opinion, and I'd rather give up and try to convince my client before giving up some square footage photos or number of units in exchange for something that I felt would be more appealing. But again, I think that the most impressive example is Mitch's building where, you know, it's one that we applaud, but I don't think we would be hard-pressed to take those seven examples in the

Mediterranean style ordinance and say it met any of these. What it did meet was the spirit of the City, and that's what I -- what we all like, you know. And so, that's what that's intended to do it. It's intended maybe to set the dialogue and...

Board Member Behar: Mr. Bermello, I think -- I mean, I personally, I like this because I've been a proponent of something similar to this for a long time. And what's key here is that you don't achieve the total maximum FAR that you would. You lose some, but yet the key will be that you are providing a lot of the public amenities that we're looking for. And I think you -- in your -- you described the four inch on the windows, mullions, and you put the roof, the gables. You know, that you necessarily, as you're referring to Mitch's building, it's not there, but yet, if you give that up, you don't achieve the .5, is what you're...

Board Member Bermello: Correct.

Board Member Behar: And I personally tend to agree with you there.

Board Member Bermello: Right. And by the way, some of the ones that I didn't mention, which are very difficult to describe, have to do with proportions, which is kind of in the eye of the beholder. I mean, it's easy to say, "Well, your windows don't meet the four-inch depth," or you know, "You don't have steps corbels," or you're missing barrel tile. But when someone says, "Your windows are the wrong proportion." Well, what is the right proportion? And those proportions may vary depending on the use in the building and the scale of the building, et cetera, and what's behind it. You know, I made the mention of, you know, when we did the Museum parking garage, and if I were to do it over again, I would do all the vertical cores where people are waiting for an elevator or going down the stair much different, not enclosed. I mean, who wants to go on those stairs that don't have a single window into it? And so, it's that kind of situation where the use and the context sometimes merits looking at things a little different.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: My advice is that let's accept the limits of zoning. Zoning cannot predict good architecture. It cannot make it mandatory. It's impossible. And I think that any language that we can include in the Code that you could recommend that talks about the review process, the process at the Board of Architects and so on, that they should focus on those issues. That is probably the most effective.

Board Member Behar: Yeah, but I think this -- if we elaborate more on this point -- and I'm thinking -- you know, and I don't mind (INAUDIBLE) the Plaza, but I -- you know, there are some projects that are in the US corridor that, you know, just because they did the trim around the windows and they -- you know, and they got the maximum possible, you know, bonuses doesn't mean they're...

Board Member Bermello: I mean, (INAUDIBLE) more clear. I mean, you see the projects.

Chairperson Pardo: I would...

Board Member Bermello: Paseo and Gables Station. I mean, if someone has to tell me how in the heck can you say those are Mediterranean style?

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: If those are, you know, then I could say Ronnie Mateo's, you know, Luminaire is Mediterranean style. So, I -- you know, so there's a -- and I think that's -- I mean, again, and I don't want to be critical because I realize those projects went through this board, the Board of Architects.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: They did, they did.

Board Member Bermello: Went through the City and...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: Was reviewed a thousand times. And I don't want to be critical of who was there at the time.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And the City Architect made changes through the process according to his authority also. And as you know, those things happened.

Chairperson Pardo: I would like to express my opinion. I think that this is a very slippery slope, and let's think of it backwards. On the one hand, we just discussed something about reducing density for the better good. Now, let's think about this penalty. I don't think anyone in their right mind even today -- when I say today, I mean in 2021-- would deny Mitch's building that he did so many years ago. It would be -- he would get off his bonus because the intent -- everybody could see through that. There's no doubt. The quality -- and I'm not saying it because my friend is sitting next to me. I'm saying because great architecture is a great architecture. But now let's think about the penalty. And I read this very carefully, Willy, and you know that I listen very carefully when you write or say something. Let's think about that huge building on US 1. What square footage is .1 FAR to that building? It's a behemoth. .1 to these extraordinarily large buildings is nothing. I think that the merit of the architecture, the merit of someone like Mitch making his presentation to the board, whether it's any of the examples that we've gone over and over and over in Mitch's illustrious career, it stands for itself. And I think that we get into a very slippery slope by now providing not just the power of approval to the Board of Architects, but now it becomes the square footage, you know. Now it becomes more of a moving target. It's very difficult -- unless you think that you could do this prescriptively, a paint by numbers thing, and this is how this whole thing started. There are many projects out there that have been built recently that truly to go anywhere else in the United States and never be considered Mediterranean if they were placed somewhere else. And if it wasn't for the bonuses, they wouldn't even be considered Mediterranean. The Commission was clear in what they said. I think that the quality of the architect, the quality of the

product, the expectations of the architect, the expectations of the developer should drive this. And I think that if you open the door this way, we're going in reverse, and we spent all this time for nothing. That's just my opinion. I respect your opinion and I understand that. At the very beginning, when we were looking at this, it wasn't the style of the architecture that I was concerned with. It was about the public amenities. And at one point, I was thinking of trying to have 10 public amenities where we gave, you know, a fraction of an FAR point for each one. But I like what you said, which was, look, do them all. Everything that's feasible, you do them all. I like this. It's all or nothing. And in my opinion, that's what I like. There's no doubt in my mind that Mitch Alvarez today could stand here before this Board of Architects and get it approved as a Mediterranean bonus architecture. That's just my opinion, and that's the way I think.

Board Member Bermello: By the way, I agree with you, Mr. Chair. My comments have nothing to do with those more planning and urban design issues of encroachment, setbacks, building height, et cetera. My comment has to do with, if Mitch was doing that building today and he would have gone through the Board of Architects that I went through in Venera, his project would have been denied. That's what I'm getting at. So -- which again, is not an indictment. I mean, it's just a fact as to how there was an application in different times of the same ordinance. There probably was a more enlightened group at that moment watching what was about to be presented by Mitch. They saw the quality there, et cetera, and they went with it, and they did the right thing. I happen to agree very much with Mr. Behar. I have a hard time understanding how the two projects that he mentioned got all the approval and which have nothing to do with a lot of the comments that I'm referring to. I mean because they certainly did not put the barrel tile. I don't see it anywhere, or a lot of the corbels, or some of the details. It's absent actually from there, which is a different issue. My bigger issue with them is the whole massing, the massiveness, you know, et cetera.

Board Member Behar: The proportions, everything on that.

Board Member Bermello: I'm talking about someone that is not in any way doing any of that. It's just they -- you know, I think a guy -- he's a friend of mine, Ronnie Mateo. I mean, Ronnie Mateo's

a -- I think he's a great architect, very good designer. You're not going to get Ronnie Mateo ever to subscribe to a number of the things that the Mediterranean -- and I'm -- and somebody that would give a great design, I think there needs to be a trade-off. That's all I'm suggesting.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah...

Board Member Bermello: It may be some things that architecturally -- I'm not talking about setbacks, height, building, none of that. But you got someone like that -- I remember when we did a project in the Gables here it was with Michael Graves and -- at the University of Miami before he died. And Michael Graves came in in his wheelchair. He asked me, "Willy, are we going to make it through with the fact that we don't have --?" And he was very nervous about, you know, coming here because of, you know, how the -- level of the applications. So, all I'm saying is, that there could be a situation -- and I'm not providing an incentive, nor am I saying that a .1 in FAR will make a big difference in Gables Station, Paseo, or the Plaza. I don't think it would. But all I'm saying is, as you try to strive for great design, and you have someone that believes strongly that some of these details the way that are applicable may not be totally applicable, to give them that freedom. There's still a Board of Architects that's going to review it. But you don't have to check the box in terms of each one of those features. And what I'm talking about, Mr. Chair, has nothing to do I think with what the neighbors and residents are talking about. I'm just talking about now purely on a design basis. And so, that's just to provide some flexibility to someone that doesn't want to do a strict Mediterranean style architecture. Mitch never did strict Mediterranean style in the Regions Bank. We all agree with it, right? Imagine somebody that today wanted to do it, still wanted to do a great project. He or she would have a very tough time. And that's all that I'm introducing.

Chairperson Pardo: And what I was going to say to you, Willy, is that I think you have a very good argument, but I think it's an argument for another point in time, and something that should be brought up to the Commission to see, you know, how they feel.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I will give you just a warning in the sense that FAR, as you know, is not the total square footage. There's a lot of stuff that is taken out. And if you met with me or -- I mean, you know how that goes.

Board Member Bermello: Oh, I know, I know.

Board Member Behar: But I -- look, I agree with Mr. Bermello. I think that gives the flexibility. And you're right. It may not be that in those projects, Felix, the square footage is that much, but I bet you that, you know, you take away those details that they were put there just to increase it, you know, and some people may opt to -- you know, say, look, I'll give up whatever it is, you know, of the total square footage not to have to do it. I think you're going to have, you know -- now, very good buildings, I think that, you know, is not compromising the public amenity spaces, which is what we're trying to do with this. You're not increasing the height. You're not increasing the density. On the contrary, you are decreasing the FAR. I mean, that is the way I look at it as well. And I tend to agree with Mr. Bermello that today, perhaps Mitch's building would not have gotten the total .5 benefit. And you know, and we would have maybe, you know, today lost out on a beautiful building.

Chairperson Pardo: Actually, the percentage would have been .2. But the key is to be able to qualify.

Board Member Behar: Put your mic down.

Board Member Alvarez: (INAUDIBLE) facing a serious challenge here because the Commission request was -- as if such is possible, I doubt it is -- but that you can create by formulating fantastic effort -- through fantastic effort all the details of this table you can achieve like if this was a chef recipe. You can achieve a great result for whatever dish is cooking. It doesn't happen that way. What Willy said and what you say and what you said is exactly on the dot. It's very difficult, I think, in the climate we all are facing in every environmental consideration, the mentality -- I

would say the mentality prevailing and the people that created significant pressure on the Commission to come about with this -- with resolving the problem by requesting this committee to create a formula, or a I'd say, criteria that could be measurable in very quantitative manner and very impartial manners, and in very, I would say, very rigid manners resulting is impossible to pretend that the best minds available would -- can formulate a recipe to create good architecture, good urban architecture in a challenging environment as we see to satisfy the intent, which is the vision of replicating the motifs -- the people expect some of these motifs that we think are traditionally associated with the architecture of the period, it's a formula you can apply. And the four-inch recess that is mentioned and the barrel tile -- these are things that have been used, but in no manner, they can be articulated as formula, as elements for the recipe. It does not exist. And the more they are presented or described, we may incur in encouraging that is -- the Code is written incorporating them as such, and we may be working against what we today, us, representing a broader spectrum of architects in the City. We all are hoping for improving the quality of projects. And the bonuses are an incentive for the developers to really work in that direction and giving tools to the architect/designer to do that. But we got to be very careful what we write down, so they don't become an element to tie our hands or be misused. This is the risk. I think you guys have articulated all this extremely clearly, very well. My thinking is still the concern that I don't think we'll be able to turn the table in our favor with the flexibility that you're alluding to by articulating this little formula. I don't know how to present it to the City or to the City Commission that is the body that empowered us, requested this help from us. I don't know how to express that in a manner that will allow that flexibility to happen. I just -- and I you know, this formulas of points of 5 percent and points of 1 percent in FAR is very elusive. This statistical data is very difficult to be interpreted and much less very difficult to be explained to a broader public that is expecting a product -- they think we can deliver a formula, as I said. (INAUDIBLE) things that are in this nature of activity, which is creating beauty and satisfying most important needs of habitation, it does not happen by shaking these complete components in a perfectly measurable manner and adding another factor that says per square footage of building acreage or building site. This -- you know what I'm saying. It challenges how do we word it in a manner that gives the flexibility in the Code without making them believe that we're alluding the fundamental petition,

which is writing in some manner a description of what constitutes Mediterranean architecture. Really, they had presented a question: Can you formulate a description of what makes Mediterranean architecture? So, you can print it as an example. The best thing you can do, as a matter of fact, is compile a series of buildings that we all have accessibility or have -- even if it's not from this area, but that we can feel that are elements and guidance that this building satisfies the basic components of urban design, satisfies most of the building codes we have. At the same time, they're unique. They are the result of circumstances: site, availability of information on parking area that's available, things that you can use to, you know, to give flexibility. The hardest thing in the world would be to present this in a manner that the people that receive this message would understand what we're trying to communicate and will let it ride as a piece of guidance in the Code. Rigidity is not going to be helpful. Formulas or percentage of points of square footage is almost impossible. Codes -- that's one of the reasons this should be used very strongly, precisely because the City has characterized itself by an avant-garde position of creating a body of volunteer architects practicing in the City with a level of experience and credibility that they can be an asset to the rest of the community. This board works only with the interests of the City and the citizens. You are not here for money. Nobody pays out a penny, and sometimes, we hold recognition, which is always -- adds fuel to the enthusiasm of the design force of the architects in the City. But we have to express that. We have to tell the citizens and tell the Commissioners, "Guys, you have" -- "We can help you, but you have to insist that the Board of Architects is the best interpreters of all these applications." It's not a rigid formula. And provide the necessary flexibility in the architectural process as the review process the City's established with assistance from the -- Mr. Trias in the Planning and the Zoning people, the attorneys that can guide us if we need to create a special ordinance to satisfy a situation. You know, when we did Douglas Entrance, we had to sit with three attorneys and the Planning gentleman at the time -- I forget his name; it was 40 years ago -- to create a PAD -- the first time that a PAD was used. And the regulation at the time said, "One site, one building." It's impossible with 7.3 or 7.8 acres. It would have been a million and a half square footage. It's not absorbable, manageable, buildable, or financial, or marketable at the time. So, they understood that and created flexibilities through a PAD. These types of things, as they develop, they develop, other projects will come about. You'll be facing challenges like this

one that we don't feel happy with, it'll be coming along. There'll be consolidation of land. There'll be all the difficulties coming along. But the formula is not going to be resolved with looking at sites of 15 or 20 or 25 or 35 or 50,000 square feet. You are going to see this coming, you all will, and they're going to be big challenges. Remedy is only reconfirming that the most available and effective tool is make sure you keep a balanced Board of Architects. Make sure you keep this board enthusiastic enough to continue their effort to do this work. And try to educate the citizens with as much graphic or possible records of previous constructions here or from -- even if they're not from Miami. There are words to guide and emulate both, the public, the developers, and the architects. And this is -- I think this is the best thought I can give you.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you, Mitch. Thank you very much. That was an incredible reflection. Thank you. I would like to just say one thing. At the Commission meeting that I was asked to attend, I received from our Assistant City Attorney, Gus Ceballos, an email. And he said that the Commission -- following the guidance from the Commission -- the Commission wanted to further define the term "compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods." I'd like to read this into the record, and I'll explain. Response to the City Commission for the City Commission guidance. Compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods shall include, but not limited to: Number one, preserve residential properties to assure that future development will be in conformity with the foregoing distinctive character with respect to type, intensity, design, and appearance. Number two, maintain the character of residential and non-residential districts and their unique suitability for particular uses. Number three, transitions between zoning district changes shall be accomplished through massing step-downs, such as step-backs, increased setbacks, and location of uses adjacent to said areas. So, they asked for a much more defined definition of compatibility, and I want to tell you that the first two are verbatim out of the land use element completely, in our land use element, under the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, which clearly states what compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods is. The third one about the transition is that when you have uses next to each other, they use of setbacks or step-downs of massing is critical for that compatibility as a physical design tool for the Board of Architects to use, which is already in our design standards. And unless you disagree, I would like to be able to send this as a response to the City

Commission request for the compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods, which is a lot more clear.

Board Member Bermello: Could you repeat the definition?

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah. The first two come straight out of the City of Coral Gables land use element. Number one, preserve residential properties to assure that future development will be in conformity with the foregoing distinctive character with respect to type, intensity, design, and appearance. Number two, maintain the character of residential and non-residential districts and their unique suitability for particular uses. Number three, transitions between the zoning districts -- before the zoning district changes shall be accomplished through massing step-downs, such as step-backs, increased setbacks, and location of uses adjacent to said area.

Board Member Bermello: I mean, I think that's as a statement is good. But if I -- I'm sitting on the board, whether it's the Planning Board, or the Board of Adjustment, or the Board of Architects, it seems to me there are a number of items, specific items that really define compatibility. One -- and probably the most important one -- is use. I mean, we all travel, and you go through other countries. And you could find a single-family home next to a gas station. That probably creates the most incompatible of areas. So, use is critical. Density. You put a single-family home next to a multifamily building, it's not going to be a happy situation. Height. You got a single-family home that's three stories high on a street that they're all one-story ranch homes. You know, the three-story house is going to stick out like a sore thumb. Style. You go into the Chinese Village -- whether you like it or not -- and you do anything else other than the Chinese Village and you're going to stick out and you're not going to be conforming. And the last, which is really a transition area, has to do with the edges -- you call them setbacks or transitions. How many places you've gone, maybe in Latin America, and you say, "Boy, this is so different than the US." You got a nine-foot wall right on the edge of the sidewalk. You don't see -- there's a big, you know, wooden *porton* or whatever, and you say how different this is in terms of neighborhoods, you know, where I come from, where you see a lawn, you see a garden. So, I think how those -- and in different

areas, you see them immediately. You can see how from different neighborhoods that varies. So, I think all of that starts to define your level of compatibility. And if you're in a trans -- and where you really worry the most are in transition zones, you know, where you're -- you try not to do it across the street. Usually, it's an alleyway that differentiates. But in some cases -- the City of Coral Gables is a long, narrow municipality that has different cities, you know, South Miami, the City of Miami, Unincorporated Dade County, across the street from someone. And so, edges are important, but I would say all of those, with -- I think your mission statement was important. But I would add these specifics. But I would also like to try to finish the earlier item. I know we kind of migrated to this. And if I may just quickly...

Chairperson Pardo: Sure.

Board Member Bermello: Because you mentioned that slippery slope, which is a good observation. And think of it in this fashion, in reverse. Paseo and Gables Station got their entire bonus, some way, somehow, they got it. Imagine that you could have been there and said, "You know what? I don't really think you comply with the definition of Mediterranean, because you haven't done this, this, this, and this, and I'm going to give you .4 because you did all these other great things. But you're not going to get the .1 because you didn't do this." There, you're not doing it voluntarily. There, you're doing it as a board. These guys got it all. These guys got it all. They got it all.

Board Member Behar: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: So, at least this in reverse, Mr. Chair, if it does anything, it may give the Board of Architects the feeling, you know what? They're not going to get it all because they're not doing it all. Now, if Mitch was to come back with Regions Bank, I would like to give it to him all because he was meeting a different spirit. But at least, you know, for every one of Mitch, there's a thousand that we're not too happy about, and those are the ones that we're going to try to hopefully do something about. So, think of it in reverse, that right now, there are three projects that have

forced the creation of this committee. All three of them got it all, all three of them. So, if anything, you know, I mean, it may not be perfect, but at least it's saying you're not going to get it all. And it introduces a subject of more public discourse because probably that developer is going to have the best land use attorney, and they're going to say, "Well, there's precedent in Coral Gables because they did it here, here, here, and here," and then this place will be a room full of people. And someone will remember the words that we gave, and they'll say, "You know, those guys were talking about -- this was the intent when they came back with that .1," which I get it, it's not a huge amount, but it's -- but in the past, they got it all, Mr. Chair. They got it all. And you know, I know you go by, and you look at the building, and I go by, and I look at it, you know, and it's not Mediterranean. I mean, they didn't do any of the things that I had to do in 1500 Venera.

Chairperson Pardo: The sad part...

Board Member Bermello: You know, so...

Chairperson Pardo: The sad part is it was approved -- it was reviewed by staff, staff worked with them.

Board Member Bermello: Again, I'm not here to be critical. I mean, I have the highest...

Board Member Behar: There are circumstances that (INAUDIBLE) in the...

Board Member Bermello: Listen...

Board Member Behar: And the City Architect...

Chairperson Pardo: Right.

Board Member Behar: And you know, there are circumstances there that we cannot...

Board Member Bermello: I have the highest of respect for...

Board Member Behar: Yeah.

Board Member Bermello: You know, Mr. Trias, and he knows that. We have a fan club going so -- and the City Architect too, so don't take my comments -- you know, because I realize some of the things are beyond -- they're beyond you.

Board Member Behar: No, no.

Board Member Bermello: You know, they're...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: What I would appreciate, if we could understand better the things that we don't like about those projects so we can prevent that from the future. And not right now. Think about it and give us a better -- things that -- a list of 10 things, for example, that are objectionable from an architectural design point of view about any of the projects that we don't like. I think that will be very helpful.

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Trias, if you recall a couple of months ago at the Sunshine meeting, if you recall, I said that there should be a case study of certain areas. And if you recall, I was very, very specific. What you're describing now is a case study to see what went wrong, how it went wrong, and how to change it.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yeah.

Chairperson Pardo: I think we've come a very long way in addressing a lot of these issues with seven architects. And I think clearly this tweaking of this code, this narrative has been a real improvement. Now, the next step is analyzing the rest of the process, which at the end of the day,

you know, we have to make sure that when these projects are being reviewed by staff, by the Board of Architects, and the City Architect, that they are very careful in understanding these concepts and the concepts and the tools that they have. And I think also -- and being quite frank -- I think that one of the best things is to make sure that the Board of Architects is always involved from the very beginning in these projects.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And let me give you an example, and I don't want to be critical of anyone. Paseo was approved by the Board of Architects, following the process (INAUDIBLE). Then they came back, and they changed the proportions of every opening, they changed the design of cornice, major, major aesthetic changes. And I don't recall being at that meeting myself. I know that they came back to the Board of Architects meeting and so on, and it was approved. I mean, they followed the process. So, what I would ask you to do is realize that there's something in the process that -- some kind of messaging or something that is not taking place.

Chairperson Pardo: I'm sorry.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No, I apologize. I mean, but what I wanted to say is that that's what happened in that specific case. And we could look at 10 other cases. A very successful project, I think it was the one that Mr. Bermello did in terms of the architect. I think -- I mean, that's my -- I think the process worked well in that case. My -- I've been doing zoning since I was 17, so I hope I know a little bit about these things. I can tell you that there's no perfect zoning code and no zoning code is going to prescribe quality. That is never going to happen. The process of review and the standards of the architect that designed the building and the Board of Architects is what I would focus on, giving them some guidance, because that to me is where the distinction between quality and mediocrity takes place. And unfortunately, sometimes we haven't been up to the task. I mean, obviously, according to the opinion of many people. I think, frankly, you can tweak zoning all you want. Oh, I want whatever, wherever. That's still not going to give you a good project.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you, Mr. Trias.

Board Member Behar: Mr. Chair, before...

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Board Member Behar: You do -- I have to leave, but before you do, I want to just make two comments. I agree with Mr. Bermello a hundred percent. I am in support to adopting something to this effect. So, before I leave, my vote will be to do something like this. But more importantly, I want to thank the whole committee as this is going to be my last -- our last day together -- thank the whole committee for the effort that we have put in. I think we have done something extremely great, and I'm very proud to have served in this committee with all of you. So, thank you very much. And you know, hopefully, we'll be able to see the effects of this in the near future.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you.

Board Member Behar: Okay, thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you, Mr. Behar.

Board Member Bermello: Thank you, Mr. Behar.

Board Member Alvarez: Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: I'm going to open this up -- if you don't mind -- to the public right now. the City Clerk has made that comment. Is there anyone in the public here that would like to say something?

Gordon Sokoloff: Hi. I'm Gordon Sokoloff, 225 Alesio Avenue. I've been to five out of the six of these meetings personally, and I appreciate it so much, all of you to put in this time. I served on the Transportation Board for eight years. I'm now the Vice Chair of the Parking Advisory Board. So, our boards relate with each other because ideally, and supposedly, we are all residents who love the City and care deeply about it. I was reading on the Coral Gables Zoning Code the Board of Architects' authority. It says, "The purpose. Board of Architects is created to ensure that the City's architecture is consistent with the City's regulations and preserve the traditional aesthetic character of the community." Emphasis on the traditional aesthetic character of the community. And I understand the challenge in doing that. It's hard to do that when you have developers who go -- who come from elsewhere and they say, "Well, other cities are doing this and other cities are doing that," and they want to impart that influence here. We also have a City Manager and people in the City themselves who want to make the city of the future. You know, Coral Gables, we want to have the technology, but you need to draw a line because we are a city that is rooted in, you know, so much history and Mediterranean design. I was -- I actually came to the first meeting hoping that eliminating the Mediterranean bonus altogether was an option. I think there are, as you said, Mr. Alvarez, about there's so many ways to play "Let's Make a Deal" when the developers come up there with the FAR and the Med bonus. It just doesn't seem straight and narrow, you know. There seems to be -- I always use the comparison of the Keys. If you go down to the Keys, nothing is above four stories. And I would love to see a level playing field between commercial developers and residential homeowners. When I came up before the Board of Adjustment to make my swimming pool bigger, I had to show a hardship, and I used this line then. I said the only hardship that developers seem to show is they're not going to make enough money. But you know, homeowners have to show some legitimate hardship that's not brought on by themselves. I had -- as Chairman of the Transportation Board, one of the members had brought to our attention the Terranova project that was coming up on the corner of Miracle Mile and Ponce de Leon. That project was passed by the Board of Architects and on the Planning and Zoning Board. And I spoke in front of the Planning and Zoning Board against it and the City Commission. That project did not have a parking garage, not one single parking space. They were endorsing remote parking. It did not have a driveway, not a single driveway for a seven-story hotel. And they were -- the

developer wanted to use the back alleyway, the public right-of-way, to drop off and to pick up their guests. This passed the BOA; it passed the Planning and Zoning Board. How egregious of an insult. And by the way, I don't know of any traffic impact study by any traffic impact study company that's ever said, "You know, this development is too big. I think you ought to scale it back." They always seem to side with the developers, even Mr. Morris' initially proposed 16-story building, 170 apartments, somewhere around there, that was cited as it's not going to increase the density. You know, we were born at night, not last night. I just don't see how these guys can get away with it sometimes. I think that this board is excellent. I think that we need to work on the architectural plans even further, deeper. I don't think your work should end here. I think there's a lot of work to do. It's a very complicated code. And very often -- we're doing it today -- you know, everyone points fingers. The Commissioner is doing it. "That wasn't approved while I was a Commissioner," or "That wasn't improved when I was here." We're doing it now about the Plaza. I heard at the last Commission meeting, the City Manager said, "Well, let's not talk about the density. It is a beautiful project." And he's right, it's a beautiful project, but it's here and we have to live with it. And if you live down the street from it -- which I do -- you have to look at it every day. So, yes, we want to try to curtail these mistakes that happen. And by the way, Mr. Alvarez, unfortunately, there are people that sit up here that do have ulterior motives. It's unfortunate, but it's true. The last thing I'll say is, I live on -- off of Ponce de Leon, between Camilo and Bird Road, next to Christy's. And there is a developer -- I won't say who it is -- but he was trying to get the zoning changed from duplex single family to townhome. And he championed, you know, this. And all the homeowners got together, and we fought him on this. This gentleman, had he gotten that passed, it would have taken that townhome -- would have taken the setback all the way out to the sidewalk -- right? -- which townhomes do, and that would have been the precedent all the way down Ponce, from Camilo to Bird Road. This gentleman, when he was arguing this, was sitting right there. He was not a member of -- he was the Chairman of the Historic Preservation Board. Talk about a conflict of interest. We all are citizens, we all live here, we all love Coral Gables, but some people here, I understand, want to make money. But some people on these boards sometimes have ulterior motives. Some people do have -- you know, want to impart their influence

for their own gain. It's unfortunate. It does happen, and we need to be wary of it. Thank you for all your work. I really appreciate it.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you, Doctor.

Sue Kawalerski: Good evening, everybody. My name is Sue Kawalerski. I live at 6830 Gratian Street. I represent the Coral Gables Neighbors Association. It's a pretty large organization here in Coral Gables. And I want to thank all of you. I sat with you for five out of the six sessions, and I heard some great things coming out of your mouths. I think what you guys have done is a first step. I don't think it's the last step by any means. I think it's a first step. In my humble opinion, I think you've taken out some language out of the current code, and I think -- and thank you today, Mr. Bermello, for recommending something that wasn't even in the code to begin with. I think that's an excellent way to encourage more families to stay in Coral Gables. Give them more space on the inside, more bedrooms, and give them something in return for a developer doing that. So, thank you for introducing something new. But I really believe it's just the first step that you have achieved. I think -- if I was to go before Commission at the next meeting, I would very strongly encourage them to keep this panel going if you can afford the time to do it and move on beyond the Mediterranean bonus, or even tweak what you've already done. I think the Code really has to be looked at by experts like you. I don't think it was correctly done in the past, and I think this board has the opportunity to change things for the better, I really do. You know, I like sausage. I don't know how it's made, but I know when I see it. It's kind of like Justice Potter Stewart on the US Supreme Court once said, "I know it when I see it." And he wasn't talking about architecture, if you remember that. But I know it when I see it. I'm just a resident. And when I look at the Fink Studio, I know that's Mediterranean. I know that's something special, and I want more of that. I don't know about canopies and windows. And I learn new words here -- fenestration -- and all kinds of things like that. I don't know how that's done. That's -- you, as the professionals, know how to make it happen. You know how to make the sausage. I, as a resident, would just like to see it look Mediterranean if it's supposed to be Mediterranean, and you guys figure out how to get there. But regarding the prescriptives -- and I understand where you're coming from, Mr. Bermello

-- but you know, if I'm a doctor and I'm treating a patient, I have to prescribe the sick patient some drugs. And right now, at this point in time, we've got a sick system in the City. I think it's a sick process that has to be looked at. And we had a sick Mediterranean code that you guys are trying to fix. So, prescriptives, I think, are better. You know why? Because if I tell my sick patient, "Well, you could take some apple cider vinegar, or you could take Vitamin A, B and C, or you could do this," it's not necessarily going to get to the point of healing that patient. So, prescriptives, I think, are good because left to an individual, we are all subjective. We are not objective, and we can never be objective. I was in the news business. I never had one objective reporter working for me, not one. You know why? Human beings can't really be objective. We can try, but we'll never get there because we have biases. We have likes and dislikes, and that will always infiltrate into the end product. So, the more detail you can get, the better, with some wiggle room. But when you're talking about various levels of -- in this case, various levels a developer has to go through, think about all the individual interpretations are being laid on that project. You have City staff. How many people are looking at that on City staff with individual interpretations? Then it goes to the DRC, then it goes to the Board of Architects. Look how many individual interpretations of what you're presenting them, look how many there could be and what that could look like. It may not look like a sausage at the end. So, thank you for your work, and I hope you keep it up. Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you very much. Mr. Clerk.

City Clerk Urquia: We do have several speakers on Zoom, sir. The first speaker is Ms. Myra Jolie.

Myra Jolie: Good evening to all of you. Alright, my name is Myra Jolie. I live in the neighborhood, 700 Geronimo Drive. The residents of Coral Gables who seen me speaking at these meetings all the time, they know that I don't mince my words. And I said it -- I give them directly because I have nothing to lose, nothing to gain. If you -- if the board or the City officials, they want to bend for every whim of the developers, I don't care. If they want -- if they don't want to

listen to the residents, I don't care. But when I care is when I see the justice, when I see things going the right way, when I see officials who will tell the residents that they're going to do something and then, through the back door, like one of the residents said, they are doing their own little deals with the developers. At what point the developers became so important that we have to have -- Mr. Trias, half of the time, I don't know what he's talking about because half of the time I know he's talking about something that will benefit somebody else but us. And at some point, I don't even know who works for who. The mission statement of the City of Coral Gables is this one, it says, "Hometown feel, honor our history, enhance our quality of life." And every time you call the City, City Hall, and you are put on hold -- which is many times -- you listen to that mission statement. And you start listening to it and thinking that that's what you want. But then this is what happens. This is a very good, concise, precise and up-to-the-point group of people. The blue ribbon is an honor. It's like the cordon bleu that is given to a group of us that are such excellence, and we have honor and integrity. That's what we have to have in our City officials, coming from the Mayor, Vice Mayor, and all the Commissioners. We don't want a Commission that right now has four men -- or three, I don't know -- and one girl, and we have a girl that fights like a girl, while all the others are fighting like men. But we don't care how they fight. We want them to fight for our rights to live in the City of Coral Gables, and we want to have what we bargained for. That's what we paid for. But little by little, we see how the developers, if they don't go through this group of people that are now in the blue-ribbon committee, they will go through -- over this group and go -- eventually, they will go to the City Commissioners, and that's when the residents were saying that the infiltrator is among us. We don't have to go far. We have to find out which one of the people on the Commission -- Mayor, Vice Mayor, and the Commissioners -- which one of them is the mole if it's not all of them. When we have people in our board that have -- and you can tell, you can see it. They have an intrinsic interest, monetary interest, professional interest in letting the developers come and take and take and take. We have to stand up and call them, each one of them in front of everybody. There is no way we can become just this polite group of people when we see our lives being destroyed by the same people that we are selecting to serve us. None of the things that were said today, I have no idea what anybody was saying. It is good that we have the experts. But I am afraid eventually our experts are going to be forced by the Commissioners, by

the Mayor or Vice Mayor, they're going to be forced to go against the grain, against the residents, because we only represent one vote. And if we don't -- it's only 16 of us here in this Zoom, 16 of us, when we have how many residents? How many we have? And the homeowners' associations, but we get tired. We are not Mr. Incredible here. We have to be fighting the bad guys everywhere. And the developers are the bad guys because they're bringing their money to make cubicles out of the residents, out of Coral Gables, so they have more people and more money. And for us, more money, more problems.

Chairperson Pardo: Ms. Jolie.

Ms. Jolie: So, I don't want to give you the thanks because we need more than just that. We don't want to have a board who's listening to us, and then next -- go to the next chapter.

Chairperson Pardo: Ms. Jolie.

Ms. Jolie: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: I would like to be able to hear the other people that are patiently waiting. I don't want to cut anyone off, but I...

Ms. Jolie: Oh, you can cut me off. You can cut me off. I have to go and make dinner. Peace out, people.

City Clerk Urquia: Thank you, ma'am.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you very much.

City Clerk Urquia: Mr. Chair, the next person is Ms. Myra -- Maria Cruz.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you.

Maria Cruz: Good afternoon. This has been a wonderful exercise. Let me tell you. Last week, during the Board of Architects, I heard something that really opened my eyes because something that we've been saying for a long time, and finally it came out publicly. A chairperson, while Mr. Trias was giving directions of what the Board of Architects was supposed to do, said something that really, really hit hard. She said -- she stopped, and she said "Oh, you're telling me we can do what we were told we couldn't do before?" There's something there. People have been given directions to do, to accept, to go along with what we do not want, what this city doesn't need. And I think that's what the problem is. I heard something tonight, okay. Well, you know, the developers are going to say, through their attorneys, that there's precedent. Yes, there's precedent, bad precedent. Because guess what? People approved buildings that were not up to the Code. And because they did, we should not approve any more like that. Since I was a little girl, there was a common saying, "Two wrongs don't make a right." It was wrong. What has been built in this city is wrong. The bonus that they -- that developers have been getting were wrong. So, we have to put a stop to that before it gets worse. Maybe the time has come for the residents, for the taxpayers to get a referendum going. Maybe we need to put our foot down and say, "You know what? If the electeds and if the staff cannot do the right thing, we're going to do it." We're going to say, "This is the only thing that will be approved because that's what we want." We're the ones that pay the taxes. We're the ones that bought here a long time ago. We're not coming here just to build, take the money, and run. We're here, and we plan to stay here for many years more. And the time has come -- and we need you all to stand firm. There's no reason whatsoever to bend anymore. The people have spoken. We have made it very clear. If it's not Mediterranean, if it doesn't look like the buildings that we have in the -- whatever, the manual, if it doesn't fit that criteria, guess what? No bonus, period, the end. Not a little bit, not a quarter, not an inch. Because you know what? Once you open the door -- "You know, you only gave me a quarter. Well, you know, I really need half." And we're going to be back exactly where we are now, gambling, haggling, cutting deals. And let me tell you. And you're going to see it in one of those blogs soon. There are developers today, major, major developers that their projects were not approved that

have been seen in City Hall talking to the top people. There are people at this moment recently -- if not today, because I didn't get any reports today -- but there are people that are going to the top administrators to see what deal they can cut. There's no deals. We say, "No deals." We want people to strictly follow the code, like we do in our homes. And if it doesn't work like that, then first of all, there are several Commissioners that can be recalled. There're also elections in two years, and we can do what we need to do to keep the City the way we want. And you fit very well. Please, please, we ask you not to bend, not to compromise. What you have come up with -- with very few exceptions -- have been wonderful ideas. Don't let people force you to change and say that you agree. You need to stand up and you need to say, "This is what we think should happen, and if you don't think so, you are the electeds" -- but guess what? -- "We're not going to say that we agree." We need that, and we expect it from all of you. Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you.

City Clerk Urquia: Mr. Chair, the last speaker registered for this evening is Ms. Bella Smith.

Bella Smith: Hello?

Chairperson Pardo: Hello.

Ms. Smith: Can you hear me?

City Clerk Urquia: Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Smith: Do you hear me?

City Clerk Urquia: Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Smith: Oh, okay. I don't think anybody that's on the Commission is a combat veteran. I've been described that way because I grew up in Shanghai, China in two wars: the undeclared war and World War II. The reason I'm bringing this up because none of the developers, nobody that has been speaking has thought of this one aspect. With Coral Gables being the home of so many foreign councils, with whom I've worked since I was a member of the Army Association, an honorary colonel there, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, when you grow up in war, you never lose that experience and it's always there. It never leaves you. Okay, I was four in the first one; bombed out of the house, shot at on the ship that we were trying to escape, and continuous through World War II. You haven't thought of one very important, major aspect. Foreign councils, major businesses in Coral Gables, terrorism. Don't think it can't happen here. It happened in New York. And you have illegal immigration. How do you think they're going to get in here? It doesn't take a genius to figure this out. And we only have two rescue trucks. You can't cover everybody. As it is, you can't cover them now. What are you going to do in the situation of terrorism? Keep it in mind. It can happen here, okay. I also want to bring up another point. When you do construction, you have concrete dust. Now, how many people do you think have lung issues? I have it, and it's the kind of thing that gets worse and worse and worse. I noticed -- I was a professional opera singer. Here it this, right there in The Herald, on the front page, a very good one. But this is -- I can't do it now, of course, at my age, but I shouldn't have this breathing problem. I wondered what was wrong with me. I went to Dr. Penaranda. I had to take a CAT scan. That concrete dust is killing you. And think of the Palace for which the residents pay a considerable price, and the land belongs to the City of Coral Gables. They're paying you to live here, okay, you, the developers and everybody else involved. Think about that because senior citizens have lung issues. In addition to that, you have children. Look at the schools around our neighborhood. They get asthma, a lot of allergies, et cetera, concrete dust. So, I'm trying to make you aware that you're facing two very challenging issues here. All these experts don't mean a thing when you have terrorism. And New York, very sophisticated city. They have everything; the arts, which Coral Gables also has. But you keep in mind terrorism because you cannot handle this. The City cannot...

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you.

Ms. Smith: Handle it. Thank you.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you very much, Ms. Smith.

Ms. Smith: Okay.

Chairperson Pardo: Mr. Clerk.

City Clerk Urquia: That's it, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you very much. I wanted to thank the board members for their service. I know that Gus is going to put everything together and send it to us for one last review. As far as the last subject that we discussed, I'd like to keep that basically as a footnote to bring before the Commission at that time, if you don't mind. And I would like to also thank all of staff, Mr. Adams, Mr. Trias, our City Attorney Gus Ceballos, and you, Mr. Clerk. Thank you so much. And also, although he's part of our committee, City Architect, our chairman that had surgery just -- or Chairman of the Board of Architects -- or rather, sorry, our representative of the Board of Architects, Mr. Pratt, that had surgery today. And I wanted to thank everyone. Yes, Mr. Trias.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: The next steps, just briefly.

Chairperson Pardo: Yes.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: September 14th, Commission meeting, first reading. So, hopefully, we'll have that final version prepared by Mr. Ceballos.

City Clerk Urquia: Mr. Trias, really quick. It's going to be at 5 p.m. They -- the Commission...

Chairperson Pardo: 5 p.m.?

City Clerk Urquia: Set a time certain for 5 p.m.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you very much.

Board Member Bermello: Is that a time certain?

City Clerk Urquia: Yes, sir.

Chairperson Pardo: Yeah.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Then there's a special Planning and Zoning meeting on Friday, the 17th. We were able to get four members. That's a quorum. And then the second reading will...

Board Member Bermello: Can you send us a -- like a calendar with all --?

Chairperson Pardo: The City Clerk will.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

City Clerk Urquia: Yes, we will. Yes, sir.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I'm just announcing it for the public record, so everybody knows what the expectations are. And then, I suppose, the second reading will be September 28. So, that is the current plan, unless you have different recommendations.

Chairperson Pardo: Thank you very much. Appreciate it. And also, I just want to wish both Mr. Pratt and also Mr. Salman well, because they both had surgery. And I hope to see them soon at the -- both the Commission meeting. We're going to coordinate that to make sure that all the board members -- if they can attend -- are here for that particular meeting. I'd really appreciate it. And I just thank you very much. Is there a motion to adjourn?

Board Member Bermello: Motion to adjourn and see you on the 14th.

Chairperson Pardo: Okay.

City Architect Riesco: Second.

Chairperson Pardo: Second? All those in favor?

The Board Members (Collectively): Aye.

City Clerk Urquia: Thank you very much.

City of Coral Gables Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting
September 30, 2021
Commission Chambers
Community Meeting Room
405 Biltmore Way, Coral Gables, FL

Blue Ribbon Committee Members

Chairperson Felix Pardo
Board Member Aramis "Mitch" Alvarez
Board Member Robert Behar
Board Member Willy Bermello
Board Member Glenn Pratt
Board Member Javier Salman

City Staff

Deputy City Attorney, Cristina Suarez
Assistant City Attorney, Gus Ceballos
City Clerk, Billy Urquia
City Architect, Juan Riesco
Planning and Zoning Director, Ramon Trias
Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Director, Warren Adams
Development Services Director, Suramy Cabrera

Public Speaker(s)

Sue Kawalerski

[Start: 4:00 p.m.]

Chairperson Pardo: Welcome to the Blue-Ribbon Committee meeting of September 30th. Call the roll please.

City Clerk Urquia: Board member Alvarez.

Board Member Alvarez: Mitch Alvarez is here.

City Clerk Urquia: Board member Behar.

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

Board Member Behar: Here.

City Clerk Urquia: Board member Bermello.

Board Member Bermello: Here.

City Clerk Urquia: Board member Pratt.

Board Member Pratt: Here.

City Clerk Urquia: Board member Salman.

Board Member Salman: Here.

City Clerk Urquia: Board member Riesco.

Board Member Riesco: Here.

City Clerk Urquia: Chairman Pardo.

Chairman Pardo: Here.

City Clerk Urquia: Thank you. Mr. Chair you have a quorum.

Chairman Pardo: Thank you. We have the City Manager standing in front of us here. Would you like to address the committee?

City Manager Iglesias: Thank you very much Mr. Chair. Just wanted to let you all know our discussions on the Commission meeting this Tuesday and I think the consensus of the Commission is not to put a timeframe on what you're doing, to make sure that we get this right, because it's got to be right, and so, if it extends beyond the next Commission meeting, they do not have an issue with it. So, I just wanted to make sure that you all were aware of that, and so, I think all the Commissioners and the Mayor were looking for the best document possible, as far as Med Bonus is concerned. So, I don't want you to feel that there is any constraint as far as time. The only issue is to get it correct and get it as best we can.

Chairman Pardo: Thank you.

City Manager Iglesias: And in addition to that, I think Ramon has a small PowerPoint presentation dealing with a few issues. I have been in contact with our City Attorney and our outside council to make sure that we don't have any legal issue in what we're doing, especially from a Bert Harris perspective and issues like that. We want to make sure that we don't take three steps forward and five back from that perspective. So, he will be discussing a few of these issues and I think that those issues we can work out. Thank you, thank you very much.

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

Chairman Pardo: Thank you Mr. Manager. Mr. Clerk we've already had the roll call, what we are going to do is approve the minutes, is there a motion?

City Clerk Urquia: Mr. Chair there are no minutes before you to be approved.

Chairman Pardo: So, the last minutes that we received, the last minutes that we received that were approved at the last meeting, last Wednesday's meeting were already approved, but we had a meeting but then we have not been issued those minutes yet.

City Clerk Urquia: That is correct.

Chairman Pardo: Okay. Mr. Trias.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Thank you, members. I want to thank you for all the time that you've taken to talk about this very important issue. And as the City Manager explained, I think time should not be the main factor here. If you look at the timeline since 1986, this has been an ongoing discussion and I fully expect that it will continue to go on for quite a long time. All of those are the different ordinances that have amended the original Mediterranean Ordinance from 1986, which is here and is shown here. And I've had a chance to have two meetings with Mr. Pardo in recent days, and I think I understand much better what some of the comments were about, and I think that what Mr. Pardo reminded me was that in 2007, Charlie Siemens, I wasn't here at the time, I wasn't even living in Miami at that time, but Charlie Siemens was the consultant of the city and he changed a lot of terms, not necessarily the content of the ordinance, but the words that he was using, such as incentive instead of special allowance, etc. So, I think that Mr. Pardo very correctly was trying to get back to that original meaning and that original statement. Is that more or less?

Chairman Pardo: Yes.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I think that should be supported and that's fine. I don't have an issue with that, if you want to make that recommendation, I think we could do that. I tried to summarize some of the issues, just for the benefit of the Commission when we make a presentation. You all know all of this. But as you know, the types of bonuses and incentives have changed also through time, so that is not an unusual idea; and I think that at the end of the day, we all know the parameters that we work with in terms of the height and the number of the FAR. Again, I want to go fairly fast with this, because I want to hear your thoughts. We do have some comments attached to your recommendation. In general, I think most of the recommendations that you made are very reasonable. And at the last meeting we provided a memo with three categories of comments. The last one was an aspirational recommendation from staff that may be a little bit too much at this point. I think that may be too distracting to deal with those issues, so I would prefer to focus the time on your recommendations and the recommendations that you are going to make for the Commission, unless you want to talk about something else, that's really up to you. So basically, as I said, most of the text I think is acceptable, is fine, and the only thing that I think is up for discussion is this last slide, which has some of the comments, some of the changes that you're proposing that upon discussion with the City Manager, we, staff may not be ready to support,

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

although you certainly could recommend them. And one of them is the introduction of the View Shed. We are still uncomfortable with that concept. The open space reduction, given the fact that we try to enhance open space in the last update, I don't think that's something that is purely a Med Bonus issue, it's more of a zoning issue. The idea of having awnings be comparable to arcades, that to me, that's a very difficult concept to grasp. An arcade is a substantial investment in a building, and it really, really changes. An awning is something that could be less permanent. Yes sir, you could interrupt anytime. Yes sir.

Board Member Bermello: [Inaudible]

Chairman Pardo: I think your mic is off Willy.

Board Member Bermello: You hear me now. We've gone through a process, and I think you have opinions that I think you phrased in the document that we all got. I mean, I hate to cut you off, but I've got to leave today at 7 p.m., and I've got an event that starts at 7:30 p.m. personally. Last meeting the Chair was very familiar with what you had submitted, I had not read it, and I recommended, and the Manager agreed that we should not rush this to give us an opportunity to review and then comment. And I have read your document, every page, line by line, word by word, and I'm ready to discuss it. I would prefer not to take you on, line by line, and word by word, because it may appear antagonistic and that I'm being critical of someone that I respect. I rather personally focus on the areas that I would accept incorporating into the document that doesn't change the intent of the things that we have discussed here. Because for example, the concept of the arcade which in some cases works very well, in some cases the arcade doesn't work very well. The arcade doesn't work well in retail areas. Now, you may not agree with that. I happen to believe that they don't work, and so, we'll have a difference of opinion there. I happen to believe that awnings in a retail street work better than an arcade. Arcades are great residential streets, even mixed-use where its more services and retail. So, we can get into that argument, but I think once we speak, I think the board needs to be transparent, and I read everything that you have, and frankly, this committee by its modifications is actually giving more power to the Board of Architects. It means that the Board of Architects probably has more importance, and its fiduciary responsibility has grown, maybe even the way that the Board of Architects is appointed maybe should be looked at. Your comments want to give your position more authority. Everybody on the dais said numerous times, we don't want prescriptive architecture. Let me tell you something, a pig with makeup is still a pig, and there are a number of projects that are the reason that we were created that have nothing to do with architectural ornamentation. Has nothing to do with the depth of the windows. Has nothing to do with the type of arches or the type of columns. It has to do with other things that we've been discussing. Only because this is more of a courtesy to me, because last time I wasn't ready to address it, but now I personally, Mr. Chair, I have reviewed all the comments from, I guess from staff, I don't know if they are your comments or other people's comments, and there are some areas that I feel very comfortable incorporating, but there is a lot that I'm not, and I'm not about to recommend to our Commission that we make the Planning Director the most important position beyond the City Manager. I'm not about to recommend that the issues here are one of ornamentation, creating good design, that's prescriptive ornamentation, and I'm certainly not here, I mean, I don't mind stylistic changes or correcting something that was a misstep from our board, but a lot of these are just very personalized comments. You didn't need

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

us to create what you gave us. I don't want to be used, personally, as a conduit to get somebody's agenda presented to the Commission. If you want to present something, Ramon presents it, but not on my ticket. Now, I highlighted page by page in yellow everything that I would gladly accept and I'm here to discuss it amongst the board, but what I don't want to do is to kick the can down the road further, even though I know the Manager has told us that we have all the time in the world to do something beyond what we were charged to. My recollection that we're here not to discuss the type of column that we have, the degree of the archway, the depth of the window, or whether the barrel tile was dark chocolate or red. That's not what I think neighbors and citizens have been alarmed about. So, it's not a decorative item, it's not an ornamental item, it's not even an item of proportions. Ramon and his comments are architectural treaties, but we are not here for that. I don't think that was our, and I don't want to be disrespectful to Ramon, because I respect him, but in this case, I think we have a mission to accomplish, and this is taking us, this is a tangential thing, purely tangential.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: But sir, I just said that I would like to focus on your comments, and you have added, you have a few ideas that could be incorporated. Very good, we can do that. I am not ready; I don't think the city is ready to have a bigger discussion on that. That can get completely out of hand. I think that your comments, the comments from Mr. Pardo were very good. He explained to me his logic and I fully agree, and the last image is just a preview of what staff is going to say. So, I'm just saying, I'm informing you of some of the issues that I have discussed with the City Manager, and if you have any thoughts, if you want to incorporate anything that we propose, very good. If you don't, that's fine.

Board Member Bermello: I do. As a matter of fact, I highlighted page by page all the areas that I think your comments are valuable and add, and don't detract from our mission or the intent of the board, and then everything else that I did not mark I left in orange, are things that I think are going contrary to the intent of what we've been talking about.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Very good.

Board Member Bermello: And I think that's the part that as I look at it, I think – Listen, the city has spent a lot of money of our taxpayer dollars. Mr. Manager, how much did we spend on Elizabeth Plater-Zybert study, do you recall? – at least a quarter million dollars, \$200,000.

City Manager Iglesias: A little bit less than that.

Board Member Bermello: A little bit less than that, and we spent what, two years.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes –

Board Member Bermello: You're getting a great value here with this group, because it's not costing you anything, and we're going through at least one chapter of the code free of charge, with public input, and I think as I look at it, what we've done here, is pretty darn good, and still the code is easy to read, easy to read and manipulate. If you make this so difficult that any common citizen would have to hire a bunch of attorneys and architects, just to read the code, I don't think we've

done...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I agree with you...because I agree with you.

Board Member Bermello: I for one – is that your list the last one, is that the list?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: That's the list of the items that staff is not going to support that came from you.

Board Member Bermello: Okay.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: However, if you want to suggest some other things, please do. I agree with you. I don't have any disagreement.

Board Member Bermello: I think staff should get up if you don't support any of the areas that we did, speak your mind...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: That's precisely what I'm doing today, sir.

Board Member Bermello: And that is it. You already have your mind made up. That was not based on any discourse with us. You already have a PowerPoint presentation. We don't have a PowerPoint presentation. You already have a PowerPoint presentation of your decisions that you are going to present to the Commission.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: To make it easier for you, that's all.

Board Member Behar: Just keep in mind something that his suggestions do not have to go with our recommendation to the Commission. It may be something that they tried to for us to understand, but it doesn't mean that we are going to incorporate it.

Board Member Bermello: No, no, no. What it means that he's going to stand up that day, I mean that's the way I take it, and that's fine. It's perfect. They are going to say, does staff have any comments and he's going to get up and he's going to say yes. I have six comments of six areas that we disagree with the findings and recommendations of the Blue-Ribbon Panel Committee. That's what he's going to do.

Board Member Behar: Yes, but don't forget, Mr. Iglesias last meeting said that the goal intended was to get it all into one document, but if we don't feel as a committee to incorporate some of those...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: That's fine.

Board Member Behar: Its simple.

Board Member Bermello: I know, but I don't want you to think that he's not going to present the

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

items that he has. He will and that's fine. I don't have an issue with that at all. I just think that he just arrived at a series of recommendations and conclusions that were prepared in a conference room between staff talking, not here deliberating. Okay. Every comment, every suggestion whether I made a suggestion, whether...made a suggestion, whomever made a suggestion, it made its way here, was ventilated in this room, not in a back room. No one came in, I guess the Chair would write, would send things to the attorney with red lines and we use it as a basis, but everything we discuss here, Ramon. So, if I said something that was foolish, you know, you had six other people that could say, Willy, what are you thinking about. I was challenged if I would say anything here. What you are going to present...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: But Mr. Bermello, I'm in agreement with you.

Board Member Bermello: Let me just finish. What you are going to present, maybe you had all your staff, I don't know how you came, but it certainly that list that you just came up with that I can read, because my eyes don't help me at 70 years old, we have not discussed it, and I have no issue, I have no issue. I just want to be true to the process, Mr. Manager.

City Manager Iglesias: I think that I did ask Mr. Trias to go ahead and consolidate what our views are, and I think this is a much more...

Chairman Pardo: It's almost like a bullet point.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

City Manager Iglesias: I asked Mr. Trias just to consolidate what our views are, because the idea was for you all to come up with your document, you've done a fabulous job in that. However, we have certain input, and we may be able to support some things, but there may be things that we don't. And the idea now is to discuss those. Now we are looking at, from that document, we are looking at those bullet points. There are reasons. I have a few issues with some of the things and we can discuss that, and I don't think that looking at those bullet points is using that entire document and I think I talked to you last time that we were going to try to do that. In other words, reduce that document into something more manageable that we could discuss and ideally present one document to the City Commission. If we can, we can. If we can't, we can't. You have your opinion, we have ours and I respect yours and I'm sure that you respect ours, but I would prefer to go to be able to discuss from all the documents those items there and then come to the, hopefully some agreement and if we can great, if not, then we state our cases. I don't think there is an issue there, right.

Chairman Pardo: I would like to summarize. Is there anything else you would like to say Mr. Bermello?

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Trias and staff, they put in also a lot of effort, as I read through this, and I think there are items that as I went through it and I compared it with ours, I said you know what, this could make sense. I highlighted them in yellow. I highlighted in orange the ones that definitely would not, and doesn't mean that I have the answers here, but the ones in yellow, which

are not a lot on every page, but a couple of sections. I don't have a problem amending right away and then let's look at the ones that they have big issues with. I saw there, I guess as a View Shed that you have an issue with.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: Maybe you have an issue is only because of not the concept of the View Shed, how you going to regulate the View Shed? So, I want to hear you out.

City Manager Iglesias: And we want to make sure that we have, that this has been looked at by legal and that we don't have other issues when you do use View Shed, if that creates a Bert Harris issue, that creates other issues that may complicate that. So maybe we can look at that in a different perspective.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Mr. Bermello...

Board Member Bermello: I think what you're getting by that is that you don't want the View Shed to in any way down zone an area simply because you're applying something that creates a higher restriction than what the code establishes.

City Manager Iglesias: That would be a Bert Harris issue.

Board Member Bermello: That would be a Bert Harris issue and I think the way that the View Shed is in an urban context utilized is a site planning guide, not establishing or modifying any of the underlying zoning guidelines. That's the way that I interpret it in the academic world, that the View Shed is simply a guide, but it's not an amendment of your setbacks or your step-backs or of your building height.

City Manager Iglesias: That may not be an exact legal interpretation and I understand you're looking at it from an academic point.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Depends on how you regulate it, and that's a question for you to make a recommendation. I fully agree with all your comments. I don't have an issue. If you have two items that you'd like to incorporate – fantastic: one – great. Just let me know, we can discuss them.

Chairman Pardo: I would like to maybe summarize, if the committee can give me just a moment. I say the first thing is putting it in the order that it's here, presented to us in the section of the code is that a line was added that says, changes to the approved design before, during, and after construction shall be reviewed by the Planning Director for compliance with the original approval. Now, we had a discussion last time...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And if I could explain, because I think the way you explained it is not really the way it was intended. So, we failed at that. The reason for that is to make sure that whatever is approved by the Commission is just purely administrative, is what's being

proposed, because some of the projects that have been raised by some people did not do that. That's the only reason why we have that there.

Chairman Pardo: Okay.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: That's it. The most powerful person here is the Manager, obviously. There is no question about that.

Chairman Pardo: Okay. So, one of the things that was discussed last week was that I made a suggestion and I explained based on the way the Med Bonuses are granted. The Med Bonuses are granted by the Board of Architects and the City Architect is the agent and representative of the Board of Architects. He's there to serve the Board of Architects, but the bonuses are actually granted by the Board of Architects, correct Mr. Pratt?

Board Member Pratt: Correct.

Chairman Pardo: Okay. So based on that because of the closeness and when the committee was being formed, I suggested to the Commission and they did so, I said we need a representative from the Board of Architects, and we need the City Architect, and this is why. So based on that, I think it's a good idea because of the issues that we've had with some of the projects that have not been executed the way that they were approved by the Board of Architects that there should be an inspection process that brings in the City Architect who is most qualified representing the Board of Architects that granted the bonuses to begin with, to make sure that what was approved not conceptually, but what was approved from a permitting standpoint that that is either exactly the way it was approved or very close based on his professional qualifications and his representation of the Board of Architects.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Mr. Pardo, if I could make a comment. That's the way we did it and it didn't work very well, so it would be better to have more than one person in that review.

Chairman Pardo: In that review then, in my opinion, it would be someone that is selected from the Board of Architects by the Board of Architects in case the City Architect could not do that. The reason I'm saying that is because again, it goes back to the bonuses are granted by the Board of Architects, not granted by anyone else in the city. Once those bonuses are granted based on those approval recommendations design, then it goes from there. It's more of understanding because if there is a change, because they made a change during the construction, at that point whether it is the City Architect or one of the representatives of the Board of Architects would be qualified to be able to say, you must go back and get, and have it reapproved by the Board of Architects.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Let me give you an example.

Chairman Pardo: Yes.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: The Paseo – for reasons that I still don't understand, all of the sidewalks which were part of the approval, because the sidewalk includes the public spaces were

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

changed through the permitting process, and there wasn't a formal review of verifying that the changes actually match the original approval. It's purely an administrative process. This is not about anything else, and if we don't make that clear that whatever is originally approved will be reviewed by professionals who are qualified to understand zoning, planning and the way that the public spaces are designed, then we have what we have. That was the only issue.

Chairman Pardo: And I think that Mr. Bermello is uncomfortable giving that to the Planning Director because the Planning Director did not issue the bonuses which are issued by the Board of Architects. For me, if the bonuses are granted by the Planning Director, then yes, it should go to Planning. If the bonuses are granted by the Manager's office, it should go to the Manager, but in this particular case they are granted by the Board of Architects.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And the theory here is that there is somebody who did not grant the bonuses that is checking.

Chairman Pardo: And the other thing, Mr. Trias is that the reason I recommended the City Architect is because the City Architect is an employee, a fulltime employee of the City of Coral Gables, and the Board of Architects are volunteers. So I didn't want to put anyone in a position that would not be able to respond and be able to speak with, the City Architect can speak with the Planning Director and speak with the City Manager and speak with the Board of Architects in case there is an issue to be able to bring resolution to the conflict between what was approved for those bonuses and so forth, and the reason that you have the different type of inspectors and the different disciplines is specifically because that's their specialty. But right now, in the inspection process you do not have that, so therefore, something happened which Paseo is the one example that keeps coming up over and over and over, and...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: The Paseo changed the...design, it changed the details of the arches, many things that were architectural, plus the public spaces which are maybe less architectural, but certainly the Board of Architects reviews it, that was changed without any serious review. So, I'm just saying, whatever you want to recommend, please strengthen the review process.

Chairman Pardo: And Mr. Trias, I'm sure you would say that those changes were made as a revision at the Building Department level.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Chairman Pardo: But they never came back to the Board of Architects.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Many of them were like that, yes sir.

Chairman Pardo: And you know what, and it shouldn't be limited only to the bonuses. The bonuses are more complicated because there is more at stake, but if a single-family home has a change where it's significant enough where they are changing the type of roofing, the type of windows, the details, those kinds of things, it should automatically go to the Board of Architects also, the same

as going to structural or mechanical or electrical or anyone else as far as a revision. And that's the way it was done when I sat on the Board of Architects.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chairman, isn't the City Architect the Secretary to the Board of Architects?

Chairman Pardo: Correct.

Board Member Bermello: So, it seems to me that in pure ministerial services, which can be the review of a proposed change. One of the things that we always try to also make sure the City of Coral Gables is a friendly place to work in, and we all know that every construction project has changes. So, the idea is how to facilitate them, how to make it as easy, convenient, and simple to navigate, and as rapidly to process. I don't have any problem personally, if the City Architect who serves as a Secretary to the Board of Architects, who knows who was there when the approvals were granted, when the project was being reviewed, and maybe together with Ramon, but probably if it has to do with the features that made part the decision-making in the granting of a bonus that maybe the City Architect not be outside of the purview of making the call as to whether it should be approved or not approved. So, Ramon, my point when I saw that was, wait, the architectural group that should be involved because obviously, you are pointing to an issue that's been a problem.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: Changes are being made and neither you are aware of it...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Absolutely.

Board Member Bermello: And neither the Board of Architects are aware of it.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: That's the only reason what we are saying is.

Board Member Bermello: And I agree that something needs to be done. I just don't believe that the Board of Architects or its representative should be out of that process, because they were the ones their intimately in the review and the dialogue and somebody would have had the intent, who better than someone that was there, right.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: The way that most codes are written, they speak of the City Manager or whoever he designates to leave it open. That's also another option.

Chairman Pardo: And I would disagree with that, with all due respect to the City Manager, because to be quite honest, he could actually have an Assistant City Manager, he could have someone else. The problem that I have is, everything in this particular section, everything in the section says that the bonuses are granted by the Board of Architects.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

Chairman Pardo: It doesn't say by the Planning Director, by the Manager's office or anybody. I understand that the Manager at the end of the day is responsible for everything that's good or bad, and the point is that I'm just trying to keep it simple going back to his representative because he's a city employee and he's a representative to the Board of Architects and because its granted only by the Board of Architects. It's not granted by any other department, except the Board of Architects.

Board Member Bermello: How does that read right now, Ramon? You obviously reacted to something that the board – can we go to that. Mr. Manager, I think you would agree with me, if we are going to get through this tonight, I know we started with that item, but you have six items, what I would recommend is we go to the section on the revised code, as we have amended it, or recommended to the Commission, go to that section...

Board Member Behar: Listen to his comments and...

Board Member Bermello: I think they should be done within the context all of his comments are to amend something that we have done or that we failed to do.

Board Member Behar: Or incorporate additional comments.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Meant to incorporate.

Board Member Behar: In all fairness, the objective, look, today the Manager said that we don't have the pressure to go to Commission next week or whenever that was supposed to be.

City Manager Iglesias: October 12th.

Board Member Behar: Let's go through the comments. I don't agree with a lot of them, but I want to hear him out.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I want to hear what things we agree on, because if Mr. Bermello says that he agrees with a few topics, that's good.

Chairman Pardo: The reason I wanted to get this off the deck before going to the bullet points, which I'm desperately trying to get to, is because Mr. Bermello made certain points and that was one of the points that he made. So, I took that one out of order, because it's extremely important.

Board Member Bermello: I took that one out of order as one of the items, but I also mentioned all the...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Like I tell everybody, if they say something it's because we have an issue. I don't recommend things just for the sake of recommending.

Chairman Pardo: And the reason that I brought it up also was because that was the sequence. What

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

I was hoping to do is just get, how does the committee feel about that? Should it be the City Architect, I'm just trying to get an understanding of how this committee feels. Should it be the City Architect to make sure that compliance with the approved...

Board Member Salman: If I may through the board, through the Chair. I think it's a very simple issue. We have a City Architect. He is in charge of the Board, any changes, and I'm tired of going to the city board, to the Board of Architects or asking for administrative approval for some minor change to the City Architect. That process exists. However, what doesn't exist is the final determination of compliance. Your suggestion, as I see it, is determination of final compliance, correct, that's what we're talking about.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes. Yes. Yes.

Board Member Salman: So, it should be assigned to the City's Architect of his assign, because he's the one that's responsible and what we want to do is make sure that we keep clear the lines of responsibility and the authority under which those lines of responsibility are guided. So, your point is well taken, that's how I see it. I think that's the quickest and easiest way to deal with it, is part of a final review, just like you have final building, final electrical, final – you have one final with regards to architectural compliance with regards to a Board of Architects approval. Simple as that.

City Architect Riesco: And let me speak to the record. That process is currently in place. If there is a change that is generated in the field that we are advised of via the contractor, via the inspector, via the Planning Director, those items come to me. I review the extent of the change and if I feel it's an appropriate decision that I can make, I make it. If I don't feel comfortable with the decision, then I send it to the Board. So that's already in place. That's happening today, it happened last week, it happened last month.

Board Member Bermello: So, what's wrong with that?

Board Member Behar: The issue is when they bring it to him. When they bring it to you, but the problem is that there may be changes in the field that never come to the Board and that's what happened in the Paseo.

[Inaudible – Everyone speaking over each other]

Board Member Bermello: That's a different issue. That's an inspection issue.

Board Member Behar: But that is the problem.

Board Member Bermello: You red tag the project and they won't do it a second time. I mean that's an inspection issue, because it doesn't matter...

Board Member Behar: Mr. Trias, isn't that the biggest problem?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes sir.

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

Board Member Behar: That the changes in the field do not come to the Board of Architects, to the City Architect and then nobody sat there and looked at that.

Board Member Bermello: But Robert, that's not going to be changed if Ramon puts himself in the place of the City Architect, that's not going to change.

Board Member Behar: And that's the problem.

Board Member Bermello: We'll be talking about next year in terms of how they passed all of these in front of your nose, and you never found out about it.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Exactly.

Board Member Bermello: There is not going to be any difference.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: But I'm responsible and I...

Board Member Bermello: Just like Riesco is responsible.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: What happens is – let me give you two examples. Again Paseo, one of our favorite projects. Paseo changed the design of the corner very significantly, as a shop drawing, so do you think a shop drawing should come back to the Board of Architects? – maybe it should have. Secondly, Paseo changed all, actually all of the openings in the front from French doors to sliders, which included by the way, changing the proportions of every opening, and that also happened as one of the amendments to – that should have gone to the Board, I think.

Board Member Bermello: Ramon, are you trying to imply with your comment that you would know something that Mr. Riesco would not?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No, no.

Board Member Bermello: You would find out, but they can pull the wool over his eyes, but they can't over you? – is that what you are saying?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No, no, no. What I'm saying is that Mr. Riesco is really good at what he does and if we have two or three other people helping him it's going to be even better, that's all I'm saying.

Board Member Bermello: That's not what the change that you are recommending said.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: [Inaudible]

Board Member Bermello: Maybe you did it to...[Inaudible]

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Sir, I apologize for wasting your time, I really do, in the sense that I never meant to have a discussion about the semantics of the change. I'm just giving you what the goal was. Let's write it properly.

Chairman Pardo: Let's move on, but before we do that, just a show of hands, does everyone feel that the City Architect should be the person responsible with whomever helps him or whatever representing the Board of Architects.

Board Member Bermello: I would say the City Architect or designee of the City Manager and the reason for that, I would say that its only because he knows what the intent is that he be the representative. But imagine that there's an issue where the City Architect is not available, he's gone, something happened, Covid, many things can happen. I think we need to have the administration, the ability, the Manager can pick up the phone and say, I designate today Ramon Trias to take care of this problem, or designate Glenn Pratt, that he has the ability to keep the business running, but I do agree that conceptually totally with you, this is the Board of Architects and any change to that should revert back to him, but there could be a situation, he could be on vacation and the designee is there and I think the City Manager, the buck stops with him, and we cannot tie his hands to not be able to operate. That's my thing.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I think that's a very good suggestion.

City Manager Iglesias: I would like to say that I would never make that architectural call. It would be referred to...

Board Member Bermello: No, I know you are not going to make it, your designee.

City Manager Iglesias: I understand that. But I just wanted to clarify that I'm very sensitive to the Board of Architects, I believe in the Board of Architects, and I would simply refer that back to Ramon and the Board of Architects to, if Mr. Riesco was not available, because I think that is the appropriate board to actually look at, because that's the approval board, and it's something that it just makes sense. You brought up a very good point concerning inspections. Inspections is something that we are looking at right now and a couple of good red tags will take care of a lot of problems, and it's going to happen.

Board Member Bermello: It sends a message.

City Manager Iglesias: It's going to happen. One of the things that Coral Gables was always very strong on is making sure that the approved plans are what the building looks like, a very basic issue.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And after hearing from the City Manager, I had to personally inspect Paseo. I inspected it personally.

City Manager Iglesias: It had numerous issues that cannot happen and will not happen again, because I think we've taken precautions for that, but if we don't approve, if we don't build what

the Board of Architects approves what good is it.

Chairman Pardo: And Mr. Manager since you have the Director here for Building and Zoning, one of the things that I think it would be very important to do is that, especially when its project that has been awarded Mediterranean Bonus that somehow there should be a way that someone looks, even if it's a shop drawing that has to do with the exterior, windows, the roofing that it should be somehow brought to the attention of the City Architect to make sure that it is in compliance with the original.

City Manager Iglesias: That's very, very difficult Mr. Chair. I think what we are going to do is put verbiage in all our permits that indicate that nothing aesthetic much change in those shop drawings and it must be in compliance with those plans or immediately its disapproved, and apply it to the actual job site, because it's very difficult. You get 100 shop drawings and it's very difficult to...

Board Member Bermello: You'll be inundated. It will come to a stop.

City Manager Iglesias: And I understand exactly that point, that's a very good point, but we can handle that legally and make sure that when something like that happens, all you have to do is make sure they tear it down a couple of times in one project and it takes care of the problem. I have no problem doing that. And it's something we can work out with our legal department to make sure that in our new InterGov system we are moving now and by the second quarter of next year we'll have our Development Services Building done. Everything will be electronic, we will have a new enterprise system, InterGov, to replace our prehistoric system that we have now, and yes, its prehistoric, I'm sorry, but we are going in a completely different direction towards the Smart City concept and no paper by the end of next year. What we can do is make sure that that's documented that no, there is nothing that you can bring in. Building like Paseo is going to have 100 shop drawings, 150 shop drawings, right, that nothing that affects the architectural design that it has to be in context with what was approved, and if it's not, its red tagged and you have a couple of projects where you tear that down and believe me, it won't happen again.

Chairman Pardo: Ms. Cabrera do you have anything to add?

Development Services Director Cabrera: Actually yes. In the new software, we can, and we will be putting conditions so that an alert comes up, and let's say that when Ramon reviews it, he's concerned about the windows or the roof tile, so that he would put himself as a reviewer so that when that shop drawing comes in, it could get routed to Ramon or to Juan, because we don't want him on every single shop drawing. Only on the ones that they feel they need to see in order to verify that the integrity of the Med Bonus has been executed at the job site. I think the one with Paseo was a little complicated, because...

City Manager Iglesias: I think there were...[Inaudible]

Development Services Director Cabrera: Yes, they made changes.

City Manager Iglesias: But I think the Director brings up a very good point, fenestration. It has to

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

be per the plan, so that's a major shop drawing.

City Architect Riesco: Can I jump in here a second. We already in process, we do review fenestration. As the City Architect I go through window shop drawings or one of my assistants. I go through roof tile selections, color, height, so we do that already. There is a cross-referencing that occurs.

Board Member Behar: But what happens when the project has a private provider, do you get to see those shop drawings?

Development Services Director Cabrera: Yes, we do.

City Architect Riesco: It's a permit, it's a separate permit; it's a separate permit for windows and it's a separate permit for roofs, so yes.

Development Services Director Cabrera: A private provider could only review Florida Building Code; they are not allowed to review for zoning or aesthetics or public works or any of the other disciplines.

City Manager Iglesias: Fire also.

Board Member Behar: And the roof tile goes to you guys, not through a private provider.

Development Services Director Cabrera: It will go to the private provider for the building and structural review, but it would still have to come through us where we would review zoning and the City Architect.

City Manager Iglesias: What we could do is, in our new system, although our City Architect is doing that...

Board Member Behar: Identify what...

City Manager Iglesias: We could identify those that have to come directly to the city.

Board Member Behar: Today, I'm sorry, it doesn't work like that.

City Manager Iglesias: Our current program does not do that, but we can do that, and the Director is doing that. So, let's say, we talk about fenestration, automatically to the City Architect; roofing – roofing tile automatically to the City Architect, because what happened in Paseo is not acceptable and we are – right now it's not going to happen because those things go to the City Architect. Our new program will automatically direct them to the City Architect as they should be. Really it shouldn't be a manual process. It should be an automatic process and our new program allows us to do that.

Chairman Pardo: And I want also to be crystal clear, I want the record and the public here and on

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

Zoom to know that our City Architect was not responsible for Paseo.

Development Services Director Cabrera: No, he was not.

City Manager Iglesias: No, he was not.

Chairman Pardo: So, Juan you get a free pass.

City Manager Iglesias: He was not responsible. Thank you Chair.

Chairman Pardo: And any work doing this. Thank you so much for your clarification.

City Manager Iglesias: But understand that we are moving forward on these very important issues, as you mentioned.

Board Member Behar: He's not responsible because a lot of things were changed without coming back to the city, and that's a problem with that project. There was a lot of deviation that never came back to the city.

City Manager Iglesias: There were a lot of issues on that project and that will not happen again. Under our new system, what we are implementing now is going to catch those kinds of issues, because it won't be a manual system now. It will be an automatic system and we will be catching all those issues so that it doesn't slip through the cracks. We cannot allow those things to happen, and they won't.

Chairman Pardo: Thank you very much. Mr. Clerk, I would like you to set in the record that by a show of hands all those in favor of having the City Architect be the person, the correct person responsible for this, please show hands.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chair, isn't that the way it's written, can we concentrate on the written word? – because at the end of the day we are going to give a document.

Chairman Pardo: Well, the reason is, this was an additional line that have been added by Mr. Trias, it was not in our document.

Board Member Behar: Accepting that.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Its fine. Its fine.

Board Member Bermello: If we're not accepting that, if what we want to do is to put the language that it needs to be the City Architect and it's not shown there.

Chairman Pardo: No.

Board Member Bermello: Then let's make a modification. If it currently shows the City Architect,

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

then I think there is no more discussion on that item, right.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I agree. What I would ask you to do, if you have anything that you want to incorporate from the suggestions like what Mr. Bermello said, maybe we could focus on those things. Let's focus on those things.

Board Member Bermello: Let's do this. I think probably, let me do the reverse, because...are items that I would accept that maybe are not important to you. You have items that are very important to you, and you made a list – Ramon, let me finish, I'm trying to help. You made a list of items that are very important to you, and you had a PowerPoint slide, I don't know, it had six items, I could not read them from here. Is there a hard copy so we could read them?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I think have one copy.

Board Member Bermello: What I would like to do Mr. Chair is to take one by one and go in the section of the code that is obscurely written by us, and then address his comments and his recommendations one by one, and let's vote on each one by one and if we could finish here and have consensus on all his items, I think we're done.

Chairman Pardo: I think that's a great idea and the only thing if you can indulge me.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: So, this is what I'm going to say. Before this meeting, five minutes before I had a discussion with the City Manager on this list. So, this is the list that's coming from staff. It's not my personal views or anything like that. This list, if we could have it up again.

Board Member Bermello: So, let's go – and you have here the View Shed. You want to go to the section of the View Shed?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: That list has all of the items that are your recommendations.

Board Member Bermello: Seven items.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Should be discussed.

Board Member Bermello: Can we take them one-by-one?

City Manager Iglesias: The first item is the View Shed and our concern is that may yield some Bert Harris issues, and so, our Historical Director may have maybe some verbiage that may be different and may not create a Bert Harris issue.

Board Member Behar: I think you are right.

Chairman Pardo: Welcome Mr. Adams.

Historical Resources Director Adams: Good evening. You may remember at the last meeting I had suggested setting maybe something that should be considered...

City Manager Iglesias: A historical setting.

Historical Resources Director Adams: Just setting in general, current setting. I've done some thinking about it. As we know different historic sites have different factors which contribute to the significance, could be the setting, could be the architecture, could be the streetscape, you know and we were discussing maybe having a list for properties that this should be prescribed to; and obviously, over the course of time a lot of these things that made properties significant have changed anyway. So, my suggestion which possibly takes care of almost everything in this entire section here would be compatibility with the context of historically designated landmarks and districts shall be considered in site planning, massing and step-backs by the Board of Architects. Context, this is what just one definition I find could be defined as circumstances or...conditions that are relevant to something that exists.

Board Member Bermello: You have that written – I wasn't taking notes. Do you have that, you can pass that around?

Historical Resources Director Adams: I have this written and I can prepare it, but to my mind...

Board Member Bermello: We can discuss it and approve it.

Historical Resources Director Adams: Yes. Instead of trying to decide which historic sites of districts that are actually important, or they all are important, but they all have different traits.

Board Member Bermello: Your key thing here is, you don't want the word View Shed. As our Historic Preservation Officer, you're recommending to this board that instead of View Shed that we consider historical setting?

Historical Resources Director Adams: No. What I'm suggesting is, if we use the word context.

Board Member Bermello: Context.

Historical Resources Director Adams: Certain sites may actually have a very important View Shed, but not all of them do. So only in those circumstances where we have a historic site where the View Shed is...

Board Member Bermello: Eliminate the word View Shed and use context.

Historical Resources Director Adams: Use the word context and then if you wanted a description of somethings that could be included in context that could be setting, architecture, streetscape, you know, and in certain circumstances...

Board Member Bermello: You're the authority here. I'm sitting here, but I would want to hear

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

what our Chair because this is your item.

Board Member Behar: The Manager brings a good point. Will that affect anything that could potentially affect other properties and qualify for...and that's a very valid point that I think we need to make sure we don't.

City Manager Iglesias: In addition, Mr. Behar, you could have litigation on historical itself, so it could open up a number of issues that you probably do not want from that perspective. So, we are looking at outside properties that would have, that could be downzoned for this, and when you do things like that, you have to be careful that you have state preemption, you have a number of issues that could come into play if we go overboard. So, it's just to make sure that we don't deal with these Bert Harris issues, to make sure that we deal with – I know what you're trying to accomplish, however, we just want to do it in a context that is more legally.

Chairman Pardo: Let me put it this way, Mr. Manager, since it was my item and I'm not backing off in any way shape or form. Historic context I'm okay with. I'll give you an example, the day that I showed photographs to the Commission, because I said that one photograph was worth a thousand words. The last photograph I showed was the 2901 Building what was in the back. Now, if this were taking and although I'm not an attorney, but I've done enough public hearings in my life, I would tell you one thing that the Board of Architects has the perfect right to discuss massing, discuss step-backs, discuss all these things that could affect square footage. What they can't do is get into the underlying zoning. I think we all agree to that. But in that particular case it was very interesting, because the historic plan of where those streets were was changed and that's not a taking when they are asking for something. When they are asking to go above and beyond the code, that's not a taking. You can't legally have a taking when you are asking for something. My second point is, that in that particular case, when you look at the background which I found objectionable was that it was designed in such a way that it was completely busy, completely whatever, and it took away from the significance of that extremely historic small three-story building. It could have been designed differently, but now by having something for the Board of Architects to be able to utilize, to be able to refine the design without a taking, I think it's possible.

City Manager Iglesias: Mr. Chair, if I may say something, because what you mention is correct. However, that was not a taking, because there was no underlying zoning because it was going to happen. So that's not the case. I think there you're completely right, but there is no underlying zoning. You are asking for the zoning. However, there is an underlying zoning that exists prior. Now, what you are saying is a whole different context because you have basically, Mr. Bermello's project here and you have this new project here, so you're asking, you don't have underlying zoning, because you're asking for it. So, in that particular case is completely different. What I'm saying is when you have underlying zoning that exist there or may have existed for the past 90 years, then you have a problem.

Chairman Pardo: Mr. Manager, I think you and I are speaking the same language. The difference is, remember, the only place that specifically is asking for bonuses that were trying to protest these historic structures is the architectural Mediterranean Bonuses. Every project that asks for bonuses is subject to this and everyone is, and pardon me, maybe the City Attorney has a different opinion,

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

but because they are asking for bonuses, they are not in a rock-solid someone took away my right completely. That's why for me, it's important that we protect these historic structures. And another example, City Hall, and the reason that we use, or I use the word View Shed and it was defined, and it's been used in other cities before was because of some of these vistas to these specific buildings and specific monuments. In this particular case, I want to be clear that because of this View Shed, which is historical context and some of them the View Sheds are very limited if they exist. For example, the Denman Fink Building has no View Shed. It has zero View Shed, but if all of a sudden Public Works, our own city goes in and says, we want to plant ten oaks in front of that building, we would destroy the historical context of that building, hence altering the very limited View Shed. So that is the point I'm trying to make.

City Manager Iglesias: I think you make an interesting case, because I think George Merrick took care of the View Shed in City Hall. Our widest right-of-way, 120 feet was Miracle Mile. So as soon as you come in, you cross Douglas Road you have our widest roadway, its 120 feet, our widest right-of-way and you have Miracle Mile at the very end. So, I think there was an intent to create a View Shed there, but I think that we need to look at that in the perspective of every historical site in the city and I understand what you're trying to accomplish, and I don't disagree. I just want to make sure that the context that we put through is something that is more in line with maintaining, and I know what you're saying that this is an extra, but you can't deny the extra period, you see what I'm saying. You can't just say, oh, we won't consider you and so you get into a legal issue.

Board Member Behar: You're looking at and I understand what you're thinking, but you are concentrating more specific. This is to be more of a broad, which affects something else that could be taking some of the property rights.

Chairman Pardo: The intent was never...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Mr. Pardo, the City Attorney.

Deputy City Attorney Suarez: I'm going to ask the Assistant City Attorney, Gus Ceballos, he's on Zoom, I'm going to ask him to address some of the comments that have been made.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Mr. Chair, can everybody hear me?

All: Yes.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Good afternoon. My apologies for my lack of attendance. I was supposed to be on a trip and sadly this morning my daughter test positive for Covid, so we are trying to take care of that. In regard to the discussion about the legality or non-legality, I don't think we can make that definitive statement simply because something is a bonus that it cannot be a taking. So, I would avoid that type of discussion, I would leave all the legal questions to myself and the Deputy City Attorney, we can't make those types of conclusions. Any changes could be somehow challenged, whether we are successful or whether it would be likely to be successful that's a different story, but there is no definitive way to say that simply because something is a

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

bonus that it can never be a taking, that's simply not true.

Chairman Pardo: Thank you Mr. Ceballos.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: In the case of City Hall, a part of the View Shed is the buildings are built behind it. How would you feel with that, the fact that some buildings that are tall?

Chairman Pardo: My concern is not so much the buildings that are built behind it, but the buildings that may be built in front of it that affect the colonnade, that affect the rotunda, that affect the...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I understand, but that also would apply to the Plaza situation where there was nothing built in front, the streets were kept.

City Manager Iglesias: If I may say that we have an architect who dealt with that very effectively, Mr. Alvarez, who actually kept the building in the back below City Hall so as not to affect City Hall, because that is really where we have half a mile of View Shed.

Chairman Pardo: And I'm intimately aware because tried to save that building unsuccessfully, but I tried to save it, but...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Mr. Alvarez did a great job also with the Colonnade, for example.

Chairman Pardo: That's exactly what I was going to bring up and the perfect example of the Colonnade and the way that Mitch masterfully dealt with that is that it has, the Colonnade has the articulation, the respect for the Colonnade Building that all of us can see from Miracle Mile. So that's the point I'm making.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: But in the review process, if you indulge me, in the review process somebody could say, well that affects the View Shed because its right behind it and so on.

Chairman Pardo: No, no. And again, that is the perfect example.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Chairman Pardo: And the perfect example is because of the way that the rotunda is replicated in an arc plan-wise, beautifully done, the proportions are perfect, the articulation of the rustication is in proportion to the building. So therefore, it actually is the perfect setting for it. Unfortunately, the other example that I showed the Commission, it was completely devoid of that. It was an insult to that building. So, pardon me, but what Mitch did was excellent and what was done there was a desecration.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: But what I would propose to you and the members, I'm not arguing, I'm just proposing ideas.

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

Chairman Pardo: No, no, no. And I understand the Manager's concern, I understand your concern on the Bert Harris and I understand what the lawyers are saying. What I'm trying to say is, I would encourage the type of solution that was provided and the reverence that was provided to the Colonnade and how it was done masterfully behind it, compared to how the other building at 2901 Ponce was treated.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: The distinction is the talent and ability of Mr. Alvarez. It is not the zoning code, and that's the only point that I want to make. Let's not think, let's not forget that if Mr. Alvarez had designed that other project, it may be much better and, in my view, that's really the difference in this case.

Chairman Pardo: By the way, the Colonnade was done prior to this ordinance.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Exactly, and it was...

Chairman Pardo: Original ordinance – and the thing is, it was done with great care.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And I don't think the Planning Director had to review it. All I'm saying that's not the problem.

Chairman Pardo: The only thing is, I have no problem changing from View Shed to historical context, because its more encompassing and I get that, and we could have Mr. Adams come up with a much better definition.

Historical Resource Director Adams: I wouldn't necessarily use historical context. I would use context, call it context, existing context, because then you are dealing with what actually exists around the historic buildings at the moment.

Chairman Pardo: Exactly. And I understand that there are a lot of people that are nervous from developers to land use attorneys. I get that. But the point is that what we are doing is, just giving the opportunity to make sure that the citizens which are the ones that are the owners of all these historic monuments in this city that live here get something in return and that we protect it, and I know that the administration wants to do that, so you guys figure it out, so Mr. Trias and Mr. Adams, you guys figure it out and run it by the legal-eagles and we go from there.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Thank you sir. We could go down the list if you want.

Chairman Pardo: Absolutely.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chair, can we agree on the specific language, so when we leave here, we get meeting minutes that correctly reflect the red line, as opposed to whatever, and I know Gus does a great job, but can we go ahead and read it and vote on it?

Chairman Pardo: Sure.

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

Board Member Bermello: We've got seven items, let's put it on the record.

Chairman Pardo: Do you want to back up and add that sentence?

Board Member Bermello: It applies to all the items (C) on that article, which that item originally read, compatibility with the View Shed of historically designated building shall be considered in the site planning, massing, and setbacks by the Board of Architects. A View Shed is defined as the blah, blah, blah.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: So, the word was context, is there a View Shed, is that what I heard?

Board Member Bermello:...with the context, is that what it's going to say?

Chairman Pardo: Historic context.

Board Member Bermello: Take out the word historic.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: The recommendation from staff was not to say historic.

Board Member Bermello: The word would be compatibility with the context of historically designated buildings shall be considered in the site planning, massing and setbacks by the Board of Architects. End of discussion. We can then take up the last sentence.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: You got it?

Chairman Pardo: Got it. Alright, is there a motion?

Speaker: So moved.

Board Member Bermello: Seconded.

Chairman Pardo: Call the roll.

City Clerk Urquia: Board Member Alvarez.

Chairman Pardo: Can you repeat the motion?

Board Member Bermello: This is the way it will read Mitch. And basically, we're substituting the word context for View Shed in little paragraph (c) and the last line which read, a View Shed is defined as the blah, blah, blah, that is struck, because View Shed is being taken out. So, it will now read as, compatibility with the context of historically designated buildings shall be considered in the site planning, massing and step-backs by the Board of Architects. That's the motion, which

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

was made and seconded.

Chairman Pardo: We took historic out. So, the Clerk is asking for your vote, yes or no.

Board Member Behar: Yes
Board Member Bermello: Yes
Board Member Pratt: Yes
Board Member Salman: Yes
Board Member Riesco: Yes
Chairman Pardo: Yes

Board Member Bermello: You want to go to the next one?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Whatever you prefer.

Chairman Pardo: Since we're right here, do you want to make a motion on adding the sentence (d) under the supplemental (I)(2)(3) on the same page 5-4, where Mr. Trias had added the changes to the approved design before, during and after construction shall be reviewed by the City Architect for compliance with the original approved plans.

Speaker: So moved.

Board Member Bermello: Which is the item, I'm sorry.

Chairman Pardo: It would be adding that sentence on page 5-4, our final draft, after letter (E) it would be a separate paragraph or sentence (F).

Board Member Bermello: (F) – you're putting an (F)?

Chairman Pardo: Yes, because it's A, B, C, D, E, F.

Board Member Bermello: What would (F) say?

Chairman Pardo: (F) would say, changes to the approved design before, during and after construction shall be reviewed by the City Architect for compliance with the original approval. There is a motion.

Board Member Bermello: I second it.

Chairman Pardo: Made and seconded. Call the roll please.

Board Member Behar: Yes
Board Member Bermello: Yes
Board Member Pratt: Yes
Board Member Salman: Yes

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

Board Member Riesco: Yes
Board Member Alvarez: Yes
Chairman Pardo: Yes

Chairman Pardo: Mr. Trias the next item on your bullet point.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: It's up to you, whatever you would like to do.

Board Member Bermello: Let's go one by one.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Can we go back to the image, the open space reduction that have been recommended for MF4.

Chairman Pardo: Table 1.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: On Table 1.

Board Member Bermello: That was item 8.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: That was one of the items that – it's up to you.

Board Member Bermello: If we go back, we included MF District, which was left out of Table 1 in the first paragraph.

Chairman Pardo: Under (B).

Board Member Bermello: It was left out of item 3, so the MF District was kind of omitted.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: And when we came to this discussion, the part of the discussion was that the landscape open space requirements for the MF4 should be similar to the MX Districts, that's what was led to this.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes, and what happens is that that's dealt with in a different section of the code, the zoning code the open space and so on.

Chairman Pardo: It's a reduction.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes. This is one of those things that I know that the Commission has tried to enhance open space, it has been one of the big topics and so on. I just wanted to raise that concern. We don't want to, or I would not advise reducing the open space or making.

Chairman Pardo: You're saying right now that by adding MF4, which is silent here, it's already

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

somewhere else.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes. I believe that's the effect, yes.

Board Member Bermello: Now this will make the MF4, and the MX live by the same guidelines.

Chairman Pardo: How far off are they on their percentages?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: About 10 percent maximum.

Board Member Bermello: And the MF4 is actually more intense.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes. Yes.

Board Member Bermello: You have a lower density.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: What I would suggest is that that's a zoning, a purely zoning issue, not a Med Bonus issue. Let's look at it more carefully, because we identify some consequences to that. We could just skip it and just...

Board Member Bermello: What would be the consequences?

Chairman Pardo: Let us skip that.

Board Member Salman: You mean set up a conflict in the code by doing it. You have a differential in one table, and you are calling it differently in another table.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: We don't have much time.

Chairman Pardo: Well, let me say, I think we should restudy it. I personally would like to go back to the zoning code and take a look, but since you brought up the point about open space and I think we should have this conversation right now.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Sure.

Chairman Pardo: I was at a meeting last night and one of the residents brought up a project, beautiful project. I asked the question that they were providing, they were required to have 20 percent open space. No, I'm sorry, open landscaped space, it didn't say open space, open landscaped space.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: In the context of the Gables Village Project, I think.

Chairman Pardo: So, the presenter, the architect, said that staff was working now on redefining open landscaped space, in other words where it would be whatever. Now, I know we've had discussions here on the board about open space and hard-scape and landscape and that kind of

thing. My question to you is the following: in that particular case it's an MF3 project, and this MF3 project has a required 20 percent.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: The 20 percent is the requirement of the PAD; it requires 20 percent or more.

Chairman Pardo: Correct, because it's a PAD.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Chairman Pardo: And one of the things about it is that it's basically low-rise, its townhouse, because its MF3, etc., and it's not very high. Now one of the things is that other jurisdictions will allow you in these types of developments to have a certain amount of open space, but then they tell you that at least a certain percentage of that required open space must be green, in other words landscaping, green landscaping. I just hope that staff because this is not part of this, of our purview, but I would like to say that I would hope that staff is reviewing the ability to have a specific percentage of that open space dedicated to landscaping, because to be quite honest, I'm not impressed with having trees on roofs of buildings, because for people that are on the sidewalk walking their dog will never see that tree, and unless they live there or unless they buy a drink upon the roof they are never going to see those trees. That's my personal opinion. I'm glad that you brought up this particular point, because I think that it really needs to be addressed and it may not be applicable to everything. Maybe you're in the middle of the CBD and it becomes very difficult to provide that type of green space there and you could only do it through the trees, etc., and you are very limited, and you must put it on the roof. But in this particular case, which is in the middle in the heart of a single-family and duplex residential area. I think it's important that staff be very clear on defining.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: It's at the ground level. It's not allowed to be – yes, that's in the code already, and we dealt with that issue over three years ago.

Chairman Pardo: The whole point is that in that particular section, for that particular zoning it doesn't just say open space, it says open landscape space. If you take landscape out of it, then we should really reconsider the whole concept.

Board Member Bermello: If you take landscape out of it, it creates a whole different setting. The issue here is that the MX District, which is in the areas that all the projects that we have dealt with is ten percent, ten percent. The MF4 District, even the MF3 its much higher, and it makes absolutely no sense. So, the idea here is to provide some equity and balance between the two. Twenty-five percent makes every sense in any residential area that a single-family and duplex. But once you go high-rise and your requirements for parking and all the rest that comes along with it, meeting that becomes – that's when people start playing games. They look about putting a tree on the rooftop and that kind of thing, because if you're sitting on the side not irregulating but trying to design it, you'd be hard-pressed. Once you put your driveways and work out your parking, you don't get there, you just don't get to the 25 percent in an urban dense area. However, you can do a dense mixed-use, just have retail and guess what, all of a sudden, your requirements go less than

half down.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: The main issue is that it is not a Med Bonus issue.

Board Member Bermello: But it is a Med Bonus from the standpoint that you address it with your MX. So right now, the way that the current code is, you are addressing it. We are not inventing it. We are amending something that is here right now and what I read it was only, it was throwing a bone to the MX, which is obviously the majority of the projects that you get are on the CBD District. So, those projects, Mr. Chair, have ten percent. When you have an intense residential development, ground level, it becomes almost impossible to get, Mr. Behar would know, the 25 percent, impossible. So, what this is doing is really correcting something that's wrong. In other words, Elizabeth Plater-Zybert was hired to fix the code, it hasn't been. There are a lot of things that yet have to be fixed and I don't know what's going to happen on the 12th, maybe someone with more smarts can come up with the idea, hey, why don't we let this committee continue free of charge, its great consulting service, the city is not paying for it, and let's continue fixing some of the other areas. So, this is just addressing an issue that I know exist.

Chairman Pardo: So, Mr. Bermello, are you saying to leave it in there?

Board Member Bermello: I would say leave it in there, unless there's a problem. Now, if Ramon can say, this is going to present a problem, then I want to hear it.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Sir, if you want to leave it in, leave it in. We can fix the issue later on.

Board Member Bermello: I would back off and say let's fix it some other way.

Chairman Pardo: But I understand what Mr. Bermello is saying, theoretically it sounds yes, its lower, but what you're saying is it's impossible to do it otherwise.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And I also want to thank him for offering his service to review the zoning code, that would be great.

Board Member Bermello: This is what we're doing here. We were each appointed by a member of the Commission. I think the neighbors that have been here have seen a tremendous transparency, ideas have been ventilated. We obviously don't all think as a block, which is great, you know you get to hear from one end to the other and I think it's been a great process. I never thought it would be, to be very honest with you, but I'm impressed, and I think it's – we are going through this in detail and if we continue and we take one of these chapters one at a time, we can make great strides. That's just my feeling.

Chairman Pardo: Mr. Trias can you go to the next bullet point.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes, absolutely. We can have the bullets again.

Board Member Behar: By the way, I agree with Mr. Bermello, we should leave it in.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Require all tables two standards. I think that's fine. I just wanted to make sure that that's what you wanted to do with this. Everything is required now to be to.

Chairman Pardo: Absolutely no, but we should put verbiage in here.

Board Member Bermello: It was a concept the day that we discussed it.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: And the concept was, we have to be aspirational as a city and particularly the Mediterranean Bonus, and to start with a feeling that you don't have to comply, it didn't make sense. Let's aspire for every project. You know, it's like you are trying to do LEED, you want to go platinum, right, and you want to try to do as much as you can, sometimes you may have backup. We have a Board of Architects that I think...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: For transparency's sake, I have it on the list, but I think it's a good idea.

Chairman Pardo: But if you read the sentence about Table 2, we added a word, actually Mr. Bermello...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Show substantial.

Chairman Pardo: Exactly.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: That worries me a little bit in the sense that I don't understand what that means.

Board Member Bermello: It's a word that attorneys love to use, and I'm not an attorney, but they like to use that word a lot.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: But you know what, Mr. Bermello, I may get to review one your great projects one day and when you tell me it substantially complies, I'd say, I don't know.

Chairman Pardo: Let me bring up the issue. For example, underground parking is number 12. Now it is possible that you have a building that doesn't have underground parking, but because it doesn't have underground parking, though you may be striving for it, you may say you know, I can't put underground parking here, or it's not feasible, you're still substantially compliant if you got the other 11 in. That would be an example of substantially compliant.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I don't have an issue with it if we competent staff like Arceli Architect and so on, because that call can be made in terms of quality certainly, but that may not

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

be always the case. So that's the only issue that I have. Let's start to think about that more carefully. If we could have the list again.

Chairman Pardo: So, it will say substantially compliant with all qualifications, that's why we carefully crafted it this way.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I just wanted to raise the issue.

Board Member Bermello: I can tell that every architect in every project deal with definition of substantial completion. At the end of the project, which we know doesn't mean...there is always a gap of things, but they are minimal, they weren't intrinsic to the use. In this particular case what you're trying to say is, substantial in compliance with the intent of the code and all its guidelines. I think the Board of Architects will...

Board Member Salman: And that's who's charged with defining substantial is the Board of Architects, simple as that. You want to add the term substantial in accordance with the Board of Architects, that's it, you're done, that's the idea.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Very good. Very good. So, the issue with the awnings, again you don't have to do an arcade, that is not a requirement, that is just one of the things you could do. Now when you make the whole, everything a requirement, I just think that you're correct, an awning is certainly much better in a shopping, for example, on Miracle Mile. Miracle Mile doesn't have too many arcades, as we know.

Board Member Bermello: And if you put arcades in Miracle Mile it will kill Miracle Mile.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Very bad idea. It's just that, I just think that we probably could find a more elegant way to – I think they are comparing awnings and arcades...maybe a little bit unclear to some people, in the sense that not you, but certainly an architect who doesn't understand the Mediterranean code may come up with something inappropriate. That was my my...think about it, it's not a dealbreaker. Setback reductions in Table 3. I think the final recommendation on that was...

Board Member Bermello: Are you fine with the awnings? By the way, I don't have interest in an awning company, okay. My point is that I do care about exciting retail spaces, and it hurts me when I go to Miracle Mile and I see stores that are black, that are dark; and I told you, we did the Museum Parking Garage and it's great to be covered, but any retail under that arcade suffers. The bicycle shop is surviving because you don't go there, you make it a destination.

City Manager Iglesias: As a matter of fact, Mr. Bermello, our retail consultant really emphasizes that, that when you have enclosures or an arcade with columns or differences in elevation you are creating two spaces and you are hurting retail quite a bit. So, we don't want to do that. The only context that we had on awnings is that if they are used in conjunction with structure so that we don't lower the quality of...[inaudible]

Board Member Bermello: Maybe there's a way that we can...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Elizabeth Plater-Zybert, who I know you don't like what she said, but one of the things, I am kidding, one of the things she did put in the update was, no arcades on Miracle Mile specifically. So that is there for exactly that reason.

City Manager Iglesias: One thing is an overhang, and one thing is an arcade where you have vertical barriers and elevation barriers and we are trying to eliminate that, because as you said, you kill retail.

Chairman Pardo: Mitch actually brought up the arcades that he has toward the east side of his building, the Colonnade Building, why? – because its facing north on the south side of the street. So therefore, he said with the windows so dark, etc., no store has ever been able to survive there, he said, so they are offices.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Its mostly office.

Chairman Pardo: And that why because that thing is just a killer for retail business.

City Manager Iglesias: But remember Chair, you can do a cantilever, you don't have to do columns, you don't have to do arches.

Chairman Pardo: Correct, and that's why...

City Manager Iglesias: You can put cantilever that protect you from the sun and the weather, make the sidewalk level and now you've got a 15-foot sidewalk with a very nice retail area versus an enclosed area that kills retail.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Let's just think about it in the sense that, a structural awning something that is part of the building, very good.

Chairman Pardo: We have examples of that. Wasn't it Wallace...?

Board Member Bermello: Maybe it's the chair of the – the concept is to make sure that the...and arcades don't become such an inducement in that towards a bonus that they end up in the wrong place.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And that's the problem.

Board Member Bermello: If we say accept their use in, and I don't know, because there is no defined maybe term for pedestrian retail areas, but the concept is that we are not inducing a developer simply for FAR bonus to put an arcade in a street that today is alive, and after they are done its dead. That was the thought process and that that developer, if they do great – you walk in beautiful streets in Paris where they have awnings and it's a wonderful place and you have Channel and this and that, and they are not cheap awnings, they are beautifully done, everything is exquisite.

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

So, the idea is, don't penalize the developer in that setting that does it correctly, that doesn't hurt the retail, but had they done the loggia which would have been bad, then they get an extra score for it.

City Manager Iglesias: Mr. Bermello, I think that I hope that we can take that arcade concept and look at it carefully, because its killing retail, as you said. We need to open that up, we need to level it, we need to create a streetscape that is appealing, not something like this. So, I would hope that if we are going to incentivize by arcades and what we are doing is negatively affecting retail, which I don't think is what you want to do. So, I think you need to look at that a little better and say, how can we remove that without really – certainly there are many ways of having weather and some protection. It doesn't have to be an enclosed arcade with a different elevation.

Board Member Bermello: I think any area that requires ground floor retail, and you have that in the code that in lieu of loggia or arcades in those streets – the idea of the awning is to provide some sense of protection.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias:...structural awning is very good. In South Florida it would provide shade. If you go to Portland or Seattle they are actually out of glass because it's kind of dark over there, so that they provide protection from the water, and lets light in. I think that's the subtlety that the Board of Architects, as you have so explained, can help the architect do. Most of the time an arcade is not going to be a good solution. I think most of the time.

City Manager Iglesias: It's proven to be negative, actually. So, I hope that we can come up with some solution other than that. Maybe combination of structural overhangs and awnings can be quite nice and still keep the high-end construction that we have.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: It's not a big point, just make sure that its architectural measure, the structural, make sure it enhances the permanence of the building, as opposed to something that is flimsy.

Chairman Pardo: By the way, the word awning doesn't say a material.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And that's part of the concern.

Chairman Pardo: At the same time...

Board Member Bermello: Would a different word be better for you, street canopy? Would a street canopy be a better term? Awning to me, everybody thinks of canvass awnings, cheap, you know.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Exactly.

Board Member Bermello: It gives a feeling.

Chairman Pardo: At the Plaza Building, the other things that are positive, they have these beautiful metal awnings, and they are awnings. They are not something other than awnings.

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And you should thank the Board of Architects for the review they did there, because...

City Manager Iglesias: Chair, if you look at some verbiage there, because you can provide a structural cantilever too, you can, and create that protection from the weather and sun and maintain that. One of the things we want is that streetscape, so maybe canopy, some verbiage there that will give credits, but not hurt retail and hurt our streetscape, like what we are doing now. The intent was never to do that, but that's a consequence.

Chairman Pardo: Mr. Manager, maybe we can add the word durable, durable.

Board Member Behar: I don't think durable.

Board Member Salman: It has to be something like structural or architectural.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Architectural and structural awnings or something like that.

City Architect Riesco: Gentlemen, I think the Board of Architects is the responsible people that look at these things in detail. Trust me. On a weekly basis we scrutinize these elements on every project and whether it's a canvas awning, a steel awning, a metal awning, a copper awning, those things are looked at in great detail by the Board and they will keep doing that – semantics.

City Manager Iglesias: I realize that, and the City Architect is right, but the word enhancement may not be a bad idea, that's what I'm saying, a little enhancement of that may not be a bad idea. And also, do we want those covered areas, do we want the arcades to actually be the only solution to check off that box, because...

[Inaudible – Everyone speaking over each other]

Board Member Bermello: Right now, that's what its leading to and before you know it. You know you can't go back and take those loggias out and say, I made a mistake.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I think some architectural and structural awnings may be a sufficient way to direct the architects who don't do this every day. You guys know what it is, but other people may not. Some direction will be helpful, not a big deal, just one of the suggestions.

City Manager Iglesias: And that's my concern. If the arcade is a check the box, that's a problem, that's what created the lack of streetscape that we currently have, as you said Mr. Bermello, you can't get back for a long time.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Thank you. Can I have the list again.

Chairman Pardo: Let's add the words structural...

Board Member Behar: Awning or canopies.

Chairman Pardo: Awning or...?

Board Member Behar: Canopy.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Very good point – absolutely. The setback reduction in Table 3, I think at the end of the day you kept it.

Chairman Pardo: We changed it.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: You changed it a little bit, yes.

Chairman Pardo: The reason that we changed it is because it says, let me read it out loud, subject to review and approval by the City Architect and the Board of Architects, reduction in step-backs, which are compatible with surrounding areas may be granted in exchange for increased public benefit, including but not limited to courtyard, plazas, arcades, loggias, and pedestrian pass-throughs. Reductions must maintain a compatibility with the urban context. Example, there are double frontage lots on U.S.-1 that have an issue that you can mitigate by having this flexibility in the code, that's why it's under other options and not for everything else. I think we took care of that.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: No objections to that.

Board Member Bermello: Are you okay with that?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes. Yes. No objections, it's just for transparency so everybody knows.

Board Member Bermello: I was one for not, but I agreed later with the Chair to give you some leeway on the board, because there may be issues where you need to do some.

Chairman Pardo: Because those are urban factors.

Board Member Salman: We are not looking to lock it up. We are trying to give some leeway because all sites are different, all programs are different, and all solutions are different. And so, you have to have some leeway to avoid the prescriptive solution to everything.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Absolutely.

Board Member Salman: To allow the expression of higher quality architecture which is the point of this exercise.

Chairman Prado: And you will run into situations like a double frontage lot or a triangular parcel or things like that. Normally, what you would do is go to my colleagues, the Board of Adjustment

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

to request relief and that's one of the thresholds because it's not self-inflicted. It's simply based on the fact of how it was platted, and they cannot enjoy what everyone else can enjoy.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Okay. I think it's very good. Then we had an additional .5 FAR for multi-family zones.

Chairman Pardo: That in my opinion...

Board Member Bermello: Let me address that one because I kind of like the precursor of that. So, you took one item out of a paragraph...

Chairman Pardo: I just highlighted that. I just highlighted that.

Board Member Bermello: You didn't highlight the most important part. So, this is an incentive for developers. Right now, developers here and much elsewhere are driven by most codes to do two things: build as many units and build as high as you possibly can and put as many people as you can in those areas. You know that I know that we all know that, because we all deal with developers. They come and hire us to do exactly that, right. So, the part of this paragraph you did not put is that we are trying to create an incentive for developers go in the other direction, which means they are not trying to put as many units. As a matter of fact, they can only do this if the following happens. First, they are complying with everything else in the code; number two, they are doing half the density, half; number three, they are going no higher than 90 percent of what's allowed, so they are not going to go tall; and number four, they are doing, actually we had a double and I think Mr. Behar recommended they are increasing up to 15-foot setback if it's less. So, the incentive is, if you are doing less units, you are not going high and you are providing more green space along the street frontage, we are going to allow you to make bigger units, not more units, which means you are compliant with every setback, every site step-back, and you're complying under the height. That's the idea here. I think neighbors want family living, less units, less traffic. I've been here now 40 years; every two years we have an election, and every two years everybody talks about the same darn thing. We've got too much traffic, too many people, and we are tired. This is the only area everything we are doing, we are pointing in that direction, bigger units, less units, less height, more greenery. So, yes, if you do all that, you are allowed to not put more units, units for families, instead of doing micro units, I know we don't do micro units, but we certainly have studios, we certainly have one-bedrooms, a lot of them. I'll share this personal thing. I sold my house, I'm building a new house across from the Biltmore, as you know, you helped me in the process getting a permit.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Great job by the way, it's nice.

Board Member Bermello: My wife and I had a heck of a time finding a place to rent in the Gables, you know. If you try to find a 3-bedroom or 4-bedroom in the Gables, you're going to have a hard time finding anything for family living in our community, and the reason is, because I don't care if you're Allen Morris or Armando Codina, you are all hoisted in the direction of studios, one-bedrooms, and 2-bedrooms, and mostly studios. Why? – because those are what generate the most money. So, the idea here is to provide an incentive. It's not forcing anybody to do it, but it's

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

providing an incentive to go in the other direction. Right now, our codes, by the way, we are not unique, because I serve on the City of Miami, as the Manager knows, in the UDRB with my colleague here, and there the incentive is to do micro units, which is 320-foot. You know when we are done with all the micro units what kind of community we are going to have, transient, non-family living, that's a direction that society is going. So, zoning has a lot to do with the issue of quality of life. This is really what it's all about.

City Manager Iglesias: But I think, Mr. Bermello, I think when we look at this, this is not a Med Bonus. I know what you are trying to do, but this is really outside the Med Bonus criteria. So, it's really a bonus for something else, not for Med. So does that really fit here or is that something we should address. Right now, the Commission in the last meeting is looking at in the Central Business core how that's going to be defined, looking at some additional height, instead of a limited density, for a density of 100 units per acre. So is that not better looking at that from that perspective, because this is really not a Med Bonus, right.

Board Member Bermello: The only way you could get this is if you had Mediterranean, this is Mediterranean. If you are not doing Mediterranean...

Chairman Prado: Mr. Bermello, if I can have an opportunity to encapsulate something.

Board Member Bermello: The other thing is that you need some successes and doable deeds that you can point to, and we are close to be able to do this, or you can continue talking about the zoning code and changes for the rest of the next two years. So, I would not kick the can – Listen, if this doesn't work, you are not going to have anybody trying to do it. But if it works, you can extend it to beyond Mediterranean style, but there is no reason why you cannot use, like we are using it now, there is no other area in the code that entices you to do loggias, no area. You don't go to some other area, and you are induced to do a loggia an arcade. It doesn't exist. You can't point to it. It's here.

Chairman Pardo: I would like to encapsulate just briefly something. Let's think of this right now as the bonuses, the adjustments that are made, and then incentives provided. When you look at the Med Bonus ordinance you get possible three things, more than three things, but the tangible thing to the developer is, you get more floor area, you get more height, but you also get more density. The incentive under these development options that we have is now telling the developer that instead of going upward with density, go downward and we are going to make it worth your while by giving you another .5 of FAR to create the larger units.

City Manager Iglesias: I completely understand, Chair, but you are increasing massing somewhere else.

Board Member Bermello: We are decreasing massing.

[Inaudible – Several members speaking at the same time]

Board Member Behar: Not massing – Decreasing density.

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

City Manager Iglesias: You are increasing density but increasing massing. Its .5 FAR.

Board Member Bermello: No, no, you're not increasing massing.

City Manager Iglesias: If you use the .5 FAR, you are increasing area.

Board Member Bermello: Not really. Why? – because right now you can go up to the setbacks...

City Manager Iglesias: Is this going to be a Med 2 Bonus? How would this fit in the bonus program?

Board Member Bermello: You would have to comply with all of them.

Board Member Salman: Here's where the massing comes into play. By reducing the number of units, by definition you are reducing the number of parking, you therefore reduce the mass. You follow me?

Chairman Pardo: So, in other words, if you...

Board Member Salman: Well, we don't help the mass of the parking, you are now taking that reduction...[Inaudible]

City Manager Iglesias: You have to remember that did not reduce the parking requirements for apartment units.

Board Member Salman: No, but the number of units gets reduced, so therefore the total number of parking gets reduced. That's the point.

Board Member Bermello: Let me mention another thing. One of the other things in our city code is that we maintain the FAR concept in pure residential districts where it has no bearing, shouldn't be there. The problem is that for political reasons it never was approved. It was kept out because of the election time. It should have been, as a matter of fact, your consultant, Elizabeth Plater-Zybert recommended, Ramon, you know it, that it done away with. Why – because in a pure residential district, not an MX, the setbacks, the height, and the side step-backs determine what you just said, the bulk. So, the bulk is already determined by that. What we are doing by FAR is allowing for that to be increased with the density factor, which is what this is trying to reduce. This is trying to reduce within the same setbacks, with an increased front setback and to have half the density, half the number of units and a lessen of traffic which is what...

Chairman Pardo: And if I may add. Right now, its 50 percent reduction, so if you have 100 units...

Board Member Bermello: You now have 50.

Chairman Pardo: That requires just to keep the numbers whole, 200 parking spaces. So now you've

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

provided the incentive to reduce it by 50 percent, instead of 100 units and 200 cars, now its 50 units and...

Board Member Bermello: And 100 cars.

City Manager Iglesias: I'm not sure that relates linear, honestly, I don't think it relates linear, but I understand what you're saying.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Manager, the other way to look at it is, you know this is a living working document, right. If you start seeing a single project, a single project it gets brought back and say, you know what, this is not generating what we thought it would. But at the end of the day, we are already seeing what the current code is generating. You see it every day.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: The buildings that are very nice like yours, the one you designed. I understand your point. The only thing that I would like to remind you, Mr. Chairman, is that the Commission reviewed the recommendation from the consultant of no FAR and they chose to keep the FAR.

Board Member Bermello: That was a shame and the day that we come here, if the Commission asks me, what are the things that we still have to do in this community, that's one of them, that's one of them.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Okay.

Board Member Behar: There's a few.

Board Member Bermello: There's a few, but that's one of them.

City Manager Iglesias: And this was a very good discussion. Are we tying this back to Med 2, this would have to be tied back to Mediterranean 2, correct?

Chairman Pardo: But Mr. Manager, did you agree that the massing will be reduced, not linearly, but it will be reduced.

City Manager Iglesias: It could be reduced, yes, it's a linear reduction because bigger units are high-end units, high-end units do not have two cars maybe for one floor, so that's not going to work out linearly, but there may be some reduction.

Board Member Bermello: Every architect will tell you, Mr. Manager, that the biggest problem in designing these buildings is the impact of the parking on the project.

City Manager Iglesias: Yes, it is.

Board Member Bermello: The impact on the parking on the project makes a huge difference, huge. So, if you are able to minimize that, because you are providing an incentive for less units, bigger

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

units, more space. You know my wife and I, we have a 7,000 square foot house, its just the two of us, there's not a lot of people going in and out, we just like space.

City Manager Iglesias: So, it may not be two cars, it may be four cars, that's what I'm trying to say.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Let me propose a design. If you have one unit per building, you may be able to fit all the parking at the ground level and not even have a parking garage, right.

Board Member Bermello: Absolutely. Absolutely. You minimize the bulk.

Chairman Pardo: Wait a minute. If we are going to discuss this, let's discuss it equally and this is the biggest point, I think. Most people don't realize that when they are looking at these mixed-use projects, three times they have successfully been granted parking reductions, that is absurd. Why? – because they are trying to compensate for these theoretical things that aren't working yet, haven't been working, won't be working for quite some time. So, let's say that most people have one or two cars, just for sake of argument, so they have one or two cars, but we've given them not one, not two, but three ways of reducing it. One of the things that neighbors were concerned with at the meeting I went to last night, is parking, because once in these residential areas when they don't have parking, they are going to go park somewhere else.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: But that project is not reducing parking.

Chairman Pardo: But the point is that the amount of units produces much more parking and for me, and pardon me, I know a lot of people at the City of Miami.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: The City Manager knows in Miami there are buildings built with no parking.

City Manager Iglesias: Zero parking.

Chairman Pardo: Right – and when I saw that because the first one that was done was directly next-door to where my client.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And alternatively, they build 38-story buildings with over 1,000 parking spaces within 200 feet of the station. So, both conditions happen.

Chairman Pardo: So, the point is, I respectfully disagree that this doesn't belong in the Med. It does belong because the people that are building now are building for Med Bonus and you know, I understand that the Commission is looking at a specific place in the CBD to give more height.

City Manager Iglesias: For decreased density.

Chairman Pardo: For decreased density as an incentive. What we're doing is, we are giving – do you know what .5 represents for a project of this size when you are reducing density? Its 38 percent

less.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: The impact from automobiles...

Chairman Pardo: The impact of the reduction of...

City Manager Iglesias: I think we've had some very interesting discussion. I think if the committee feels that this could be part of the Med 2 Bonus, basically if you, I'm assuming, is that correct?

Board Member Bermello: You would have to meet all of the guidelines.

City Manager Iglesias: And then we make that clear.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: We understand if the committee has consensus on this then let's forward that to the Commission. It's a very well thought out plan.

Board Member Bermello: And bring out all the guidelines.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I understand.

City Manager Iglesias: It will bring out interesting discussions, especially with the core area that we are talking about now, increased height versus reduced.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: The city's concern is the size of buildings, I think in the discussion, but certainly with the reduction of parking that's...

Board Member Bermello: And a reduction of height. I hear it all the time. I've done a lot of height, but I get it all the time from old people, the Gables is not the way it used to be, the buildings are a little bit too tall. And I think there should be somewhere in the code that allows someone to go in that direction. This will do that. I think, Mr. Manager, I'm predicting you're going to hear more good comments coming from this minor change than what you are right now anticipating.

Chairman Pardo: If you go, Mr. Bermello, if you go to any of these citizen meetings out there on any project, and you tell listen, we are here to tell you we are going to reduce density, I guarantee you that you are going to make it out of that meeting alive, because people are going to be really happy about it.

City Manager Iglesias: Mr. Chair, one of the issues that we discussed here is massing, and you all are very experienced architects and if you feel that those reductions in parking are going to really compensate for that massing, then I think we are good.

Board Member Bermello: Overwhelming, that's the issue.

City Manager Iglesias: And that's a discussion that I want to have with you all.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Thank you. Thank you very much. So, the last item on the list was the very good manual that Mr. Pardo had prepared.

City Manager Iglesias: Before I forget, let's clearly tie that to Med 2. We can clearly tie that to the Med 2 Bonus program.

Board Member Bermello: Yes.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: The manual from 1985, I showed them the one that we had worked on and he actually...

Board Member Bermello: Is that online?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes. I really like the '86, I just think we've done a couple more and have all the original drawings.

Chairman Pardo: That was a good year, 1986.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I just think that we probably should include all of them, all of the manuals that we have, all the information.

Chairman Pardo: I suggested – I met with Mr. Trias twice and I suggested that his version that he did in 2007.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: 2017.

Chairman Pardo: '17 – is very nice, but it was missing certain identification of the elements themselves, it was devoid of that. So, I suggested that simply incorporate the original '86, because you know, back then we only had photocopiers and photographs and film and stuff like that, and that's a very nicely done scanned with these things.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Very nice. Check it out.

Chairman Pardo: So, the original one in 1986, what it did was it actually showed specific points and identified the elements by name and photographically.

Board Member Bermello: These are beautiful drawings.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: The only point I made is, what I did is I researched the original drawings from the '20's.

Board Member Bermello: I think each member of this board should get one of those as a gift from the city.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Bound – and I'll be happy to autograph them.

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

City Manager Iglesias: We'll be happy to get you one, get the committee one of those.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: The point I'm making is, let's keep an open mind and let's include all the information we have. So that was the last point.

Board Member Bermello: I'm all for that.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I'm very happy if you don't want to include any of the recommendations we had, but if you do, please let me know and we'll try to work with you on that, any additional recommendations.

Chairman Pardo: And to summarize also, you're not going to bring up during the Commission meeting the formulas, architectural formulas.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Look, I understand the critique. My perspective, my professional view is that there is not enough language about architecture in the code. Now we provided, maybe too much. I don't disagree with that. But I think that that would help in the discussion by the Board of Architects if some of that language was included. That was my point.

Chairman Pardo: The thing is, Mitch's former partner, may he rest in peace, Pete Spillis, I mentioned to you that he had a saying, his saying was infamous, and the saying was, you can't teach pigs to sing, and the whole point is that when it comes to design I know that you deal with some designers that you scratch your head about, and I understand that, it must be very frustrating sometimes, and then you deal with other designers that are very good and are trying to do a great job.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: In this city its much better than in my previous life. Even in the worst-case scenario we are doing pretty good. This is probably not a discussion for today, but maybe in the next 5, 10 years, whatever, if we want to expand the content, we have that option and whatever you think. And my opinion, my professional opinion based on years of working in this type of work is that the weakest part of the process is not the zoning code, its actually the process. The way that some architects may not be up to the quality that we would like or the way that a shop drawing may not be reviewed, that's really it. And I think that the more we have in the code that enhances that process, and if I can point to somebody, hey look, that shop drawing doesn't meet, look at what it says, the better. Not tonight, not tonight, but its just a thought for you to think about in the future.

Board Member Behar: Just for my clarification. Last time Mr. Trias gave us his recommendations, which included the golden triangle, golden section, including all columns, we are not going to be considering any of that.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And that's my recommendation to you. I would throw that recommendation and what I'm saying is, think about it if you want to.

Board Member Bermello: I think that we all agree that was too prescriptive that we didn't want to go that route.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: But I want to clarify that it was not meant to be prescriptive, it was simply a way to add content for the discussion to take place.

Chairman Pardo: And my conversation with Mr. Trias was that I thought that the Board of Architects as the experienced has the understanding to be able to direct people that need help that come before them in a professional setting as they have for years and years. So that being said, it seems that we have a consensus, and we have a document that can be sent to the Planning Board and to the Commission, first and then the Planning Board – Mr. Manager.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chair, there were a couple of items, I don't know if you all went through everything in detail. I don't know if we have time, if I could just point to a couple of things that I think...

City Manager Iglesias: Mr. Bermello, if you have a couple of things that may add to the document, by all means, because it would make it better, I'm all for it.

Board Member Bermello: I don't know if I could just point to them and read them quickly. It won't take a long time.

Chairman Pardo: Go right ahead.

Board Member Bermello: On the first page of, I'm referring to Exhibit A that was distributed to us by the Manager at the last meeting, from Mr. Trias and staff. On item (C) he added a phrase that on the first line that said, part of the Mediterranean Bonus program, I know its stylistic, but I think it reenforces, I did not see where that would impact negatively to what we had. I highlighted that as something that...

Chairman Pardo: Mr. Bermello, the only thing I wanted to tell you is that during the beginning of the presentation Mr. Trias and I met for 90 minutes in our first meeting, and once I explained to him as far as the verbiage going back to the original ordinance, Mr. Trias said that he dropped all of his objections of the document you're reading from.

Board Member Bermello: To zero.

Chairman Pardo: It was good to go.

Board Member Behar: But these are the recommendations that you believe that will improve.

Board Member Behar: I thought there would be, what I would refer to as, good edits that do not change.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: By the way, this is the original ordinance if anybody wants

it, I have it.

Chairman Pardo: And the thing is that once we got into what happened with the original consultant years ago, and for example, the difference and we discussed it, line item by line item.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: There are special allowances in the original.

Chairman Pardo: And in the original it says special allowances and the difference between the development bonuses, special allowances, and in our Table 3, which are called incentives, there is a nuance of a difference.

Board Member Bermello: Yes. We went back and we put special allowances.

Chairman Pardo: Mr. Trias, he went through it, understood it, and he did not object to them, correct?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes, that's correct, that's correct sir.

Board Member Bermello: In item 2(b), where he had for the Board of Architects to grant bonuses, and I put, and special allowances that promote blah, blah, blah, etc. I thought the inclusion of, for the Board of Architects to grant bonuses, it reenforces the fact that that's the one who grants the bonuses. I did not have an issue with that. Also, in item (D) where it says, terminated vistas and aesthetic enhancements of the urban context. I thought that was also...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: And that was my way to deal with the View Shed.

Board Member Bermello: I thought those were good additions. On page 5-2, where you have the review and authority, he included something that I thought we had discussed, which was, review a concept and provide comments, which was the idea that...

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: The subtlety there is that what I recommended is that it's a voluntary process. What you had recommended was mandatory.

Board Member Behar: Actually, I looked at that one, and I also put a green...

Board Member Bermello: Listen, if that process is there and its recommended as voluntary, I'm going to recommend it to my clients. Why go in the wrong direction when you have free look early on.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: For example, the Mobility Hub, which is a project that the City Manager is working on, is going through that process next week, right.

City Manager Iglesias: We elected to go through the conceptual review process, because it just makes sense, as you said, Mr. Bermello, just makes sense.

Board Member Bermello: So, I kind of highlighted that. On the next page on 5-3, where it says,

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

obtain conceptual review permits, and I put, and approval, I wrote, and approval from the Board of Architects. At the bottom, where he has, compatibility of proposed plan or project designated historic, I thought that was also good.

Chairman Pardo: In our version, it says, obtain conceptual review approval from the Board of Architects.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Right. So, as I initial it that you need to choose. Should it be mandatory, or should it be a voluntary process?

Chairman Pardo: Its obvious that its one of the steps, because its now known as (I).

City Manager Iglesias: If I may say, I think we just want to make sure we track the changes that we want, so we can incorporate it.

Board Member Bermello: I can give you, Mr. Chair, the yellow markings if you want them.

Chairman Pardo: I think we should, in my opinion, I think...

Board Member Bermello: None of these break the bank. I mean if you want to not deal with them, I don't have an issue. There was one item where I thought his input or his comment was very good and its item 5-6, under the building facades and rooflines. In other words, a lot of these projects that we really have been honing in on, when I said you put make up on a pig, its still a pig. The issue of the massing is an issue and how you deal with massing, Mr. Manager that's the issue that every architect when you have a big project, how do you break up the massing; and you put a line here that was horizontal and vertical changes, should also be incorporated in the building roofline, which is obviously one of the ways to accomplish that without prescribing it. So, I thought that comment was a good comment.

Chairman Pardo: It is. And my comment to Mr. Trias' comment was, this is a given, and the reason is because of 502, what the Board of Architects does and now the Board of Architects is not confused about whether massing both vertically and horizontally and the rooflines, etc. And in fact, one of the things in my conversation, my meeting with Mr. Trias was, he actually pulled out a second project that he was looking at, and it was a redesign of the original project, and the thing is that immediately you know, he showed it to me and we won't name the project, but he showed it to me, and I looked at it and I said, you know, its pretty bad. I didn't need the vertical and horizontal added to the thing. We talked about massing. We were talking exactly the same language immediately, correct.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Yes.

Board Member Bermello: I just think if you're an architect and you're reading the code and you read and you read that, it kind of sends you a message that one of the things that the city is expecting you to do in a large building is to give it some movement, not have a monolithic of a large roof that has no breaks, just monotonous and they have the same thing in the building façade,

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

and at the end of the day you end up with a box, that's an ugly box. And I don't care what ornamentation you can put on it, it's still a box. So, I thought this was – I did not find it prescriptive, I just thought it was – I highlighted. Again, I have no problem, but I did read your document.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Thank you.

Board Member Bermello: I studied that, and I thought about it, and I'm telling you the areas that were good.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: The Chairman was very clear in his comments.

City Manager Iglesias: So, if we could highlight some of these that you want to change, we could make those changes and send it back to the committee for the review, if you'd like.

Chairman Pardo: Out of respect for Mr. Bermello, I would defer to him, but to be quite honest, I think we have a document right now.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Chair, I defer to you on this. If there is a discussion, I'm happy to discuss.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I think that the easiest thing is do what the Chairman is proposing and let's see where that goes.

Chairman Pardo: And remember also, unless I'm mistaken, City Attorney, I think from what I understand is, this is going to go in for first reading, then it goes to the Planning Board, then it goes back for second reading. There is going to be public comment on this too. There are going to be citizens.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I expect Mr. Bermello to come to the Planning and Zoning Board meeting and make those recommendations right there.

Board Member Bermello: I'll be there.

Chairman Pardo: But the point I'm making is that, it's not that we're pressed for time, this is very clear. What I'm saying is that we've worked on this document very carefully. I think conceptually we may be talking about semantics and certain expressions or whatever, certain things that have to be or should be emphasized. I would like to have the opinion of everyone, obviously, and I'd like to see if we could get those comments distributed to the rest of the committee, so they can at least view them and see, because I guess that this...

Deputy City Attorney Suarez: Which comments? I'm sorry, which comments would you like to see.

Chairman Pardo: The comments that Mr. Bermello is bringing up now.

Deputy City Attorney Suarez: It should be done here.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Mr. Chairman, can you describe the process. There will be public hearings, there will be additional meetings. If there are some additional comments, we can still do that. For today, I think you've done a great job and I think that certainly we can fine tune some of the language, if you prefer between first and second reading, and there's a chance to do that. I'm very satisfied with what we have.

Chairman Pardo: I think that's the point I'm trying to make that we've pretty much have not perfected it, but we've gotten it to the point where now it could become a public discussion where people then can express their comments and their concerns, and also express endorsement of these things.

City Manager Iglesias: Mr. Chair, the substance is there, and we can certainly make those comments that Mr. Bermello said and can be helpful throughout the process, and do we feel we are ready for the Commission meeting on the 12th.

Chairman Pardo: And the only reason, again, out of respect for Mr. Bermello, I understand that, but we did really look at this carefully. We went back to these things. Me personally, I'd feel more comfortable just getting it out there to the public, because this isn't a done deal yet. We are going to have the public, and land use attorneys, and developers, and they are going to express all sorts of concerns and we are going to have all sorts of public comments coming back. So, I think that between now and then, but I think that if we don't get it to that point, we'll never know what they have to say either. That's the only reason I say that.

Board Member Bermello: I agree Mr. Chair. We can move forward and like Mr. Trias said, there will be plenty of opportunity of tweaks.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Absolutely.

Board Member Bermello: Just at the end, because it sounded a little bit strong for my initial comments about the work product from Mr. Trias, and I want him to know that I found a number of contributions here that I found valuable, so I didn't want you to walk away with anything but a positive kudos from me, okay.

Chairman Pardo: And the other thing that Mr. Trias and I discussed is that, although our purview right now is this particular section, there are certain parts of the code that have tremendous discrepancies between one section and the other that the more you study it, you see these things. We discussed a couple of them and its really amazing. And to be quite honest, and I don't mean to make this sound as a self-laudatory statement, because it shouldn't be, but the people that are stilling on this committee based on their experience, the more we look at this thing, I think we have the ability because we use it of being able to bring those points up, not just one section, but other sections. And I think that a better zoning code, the more coordinated it is, the more sensitive it is, I think you're going to bring better understanding from the citizens of the residents of the city, and I think we'll end up with better projects. So, I wanted to thank staff, you, Mr. Manager,

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

and you, Mr. Trias, because I think this has been a really, really tremendous eye-opener, I think to the public and everyone else. So, I'd like to...

City Manager Iglesias: If the committee feels its ready, we will time certain 5 o'clock meeting on the 12th, for this item, and if you all could vote on that, I would appreciate it and that way we set it for that date. And then of course, on the following day would be the Planning and Zoning, and then the next Commission meeting it would be when we feel that we've addressed all the issues, because as you said, Chair, we are going to encounter different things.

Chairman Pardo: So, we want first to accept, first of all, can we endorse the document that we have.

City Manager Iglesias: I think we will go as one document.

Chairman Pardo: I'm sorry.

City Manager Iglesias: We will go as one document. But I would like all of you to please be at the Commission meeting to defend your document.

Board Member Bermello: Absolutely. We'll be there.

Board Member Behar: I mentioned to you earlier today, instead of waiting until the 12th that could be done earlier.

City Manager Iglesias: The 12th is – the problem is it's been set already for 5 o'clock, Mr. Behar.

Board Member Behar: I have a personal matter that I would not be able to be there on the 12th or 13th at the Planning and Zoning meeting.

City Manager Iglesias: I understand. But I hope the rest of the board can be there, but I do think, unfortunately the 5 o'clock setting has been set for this item and it was postponed last time based on that criterion.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: What I recommend is that the City Attorney and Mr. Ceballos prepare the final draft of the ordinance.

Board Member Bermello: I think there should be one final draft. Do you want to have it as a red line or as a clean copy?

City Manager Iglesias: A clean copy. Let's do a clean copy. Don't you all think it would be better?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Mr. Ceballos has been doing a very good job and he could prepare the final draft and then that's what would be taken to the Commission.

Board Member Bermello: Robert, do you want to have like a statement read in your absence?

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

Board Member Behar: I'll do that.

Board Member Bermello: You may not be there in person, but at least in spirit, we'll read your comments into the record.

City Manager Iglesias: We'll be happy to do that Mr. Behar, happy to do that, at both meetings if you wish. So, we are going to incorporate one document and that's the document that we'll be presenting.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: Mr. Ceballos will prepare that document.

City Manager Iglesias: As soon as the document is ready, we will of course send it to the committee.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: If there are any mistakes, whatever, we have time to fix it. I expect it to be very well done.

Chairman Pardo: Mr. Ceballos, can you hear me?

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: I can hear you.

Chairman Pardo: Okay. You sound like a wizard of oz right now. The question I have is, is it possible for you to add an additional color just so we could see the changes a little easier?

City Manager Iglesias: The ones that we talked about today.

Chairman Pardo: Correct. Of course.

Board Member Bermello: Maybe we get both a red line and a clean copy, but the clean copy is what goes to.

City Manager Iglesias: We can do that.

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: A clean copy would be a strike-through underline that you would see.

Board Member Bermello: Everything you've done in the past that we've got is perfect and easy to follow. You can tell what was done. Gus has done a great job. I think he's ready for a raise, Mr. Manager, it's been easy to follow, it's been great.

Deputy City Attorney Suarez: Gus has done a great job. Just to clarify, you'd like to see the so-called red lines you'd like to see are from the changes that were incorporated as a result of this meeting.

Board Member Bermello: Yes.

Deputy City Attorney Suarez: And then there will be a clean copy that shows the strikethroughs and underline.

Board Member Bermello: Yes.

Chairman Pardo: Correct. Thank you very much.

Assistant City Attorney Ceballos: Not a problem.

Chairman Pardo: I would like – is there anything else Mr. Trias?

Planning and Zoning Director Trias: I'm done. Thank you very much.

Chairman Pardo: I'd like to open up...

City Manager Iglesias: I would just like to thank the committee very much for today. I think we've had a great meeting. I thank all of you as a committee and individually for your great help and everything you've done for us. Thank you very much.

Chairman Pardo: Thank you Mr. Manager.

Board Member Bermello: Mr. Manager, thank you for giving it your personal attention. It means a lot to us.

City Manager Iglesias: Thank you very much. Thank you.

Chairman Pardo: Mr. Clerk, is there anyone here from the public wishing to speak?

Sue Kawalerski: Good evening. Thank you for the opportunity. My name is Sue Kawalerski, I live at 6830 Gratian Street. And I want to echo what Mr. Bermello said at the beginning of this meeting. I had doubts about the outcome. I had doubts about the process and the outcome numbers of weeks ago, and I'm very happy with the outcome and the process. This is something I can sell to the residents. I think you all have done a fantastic job and I really appreciate your service. I know you've spent hours behind the scenes, let alone in public, and I think you have done an outstanding job and I'm very proud of you. Thank you.

Chairman Pardo: Thank you.

City Clerk Urquia: Mr. Chair, no one has requested to speak via Zoom either.

Chairman Pardo: Okay.

Board Member Bermello: Motion to adjourn.

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

Chairman Pardo: There's nobody on Zoom you said?

City Clerk Urquia: No sir.

Chairman Pardo: Okay, very good. No one else from the public. Motion to adjourn.

Board Member Salman: I second.

Board Member Bermello: We are all going to be there, right.

City Manager Iglesias: Can we motion for the meeting on the 12th, if possible.

Board Member Pratt: I'm going to be out of town, so I won't be able.

Chairman Pardo: Actually, Glenn is going to be out of town most of October.

Board Member Pratt: Yes.

City Manager Iglesias: So, when do we present to the Commission, on the 12th?

Board Member Pratt: I don't think you need me to be there. Go ahead and make the presentation.

City Manager Iglesias: So, I think if the committee would motion to present on the 12th and we'll provide you a red line, we'll provide you a clear document, and we are going with one document.

Board Member Bermello: Perfect.

Chairman Pardo: Do you need any...

City Manager Iglesias: Just to formalize it.

Board Member Bermello: I make a motion that we be present at the October 12th meeting, at time certain 5 p.m. at the City Commission that we will be provided with a red line of what transpired here today, changes to our prior document, and also with a clean copy and the clean copy will be presented to the Commission as a consolidated document representing both this board and comments from the staff. That's the motion.

Chairman Pardo: The motion.

Board Member Behar: Second.

Chairman Pardo: Second, Mr. Behar.

City Clerk Urquia: All in favor.

Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting

All: Aye.

City Clerk Urquia: Opposed? Thank you.

Chairman Pardo: So, if everything goes well, the committee did a great job. If it goes poorly, we can blame Pratt because he's not going to be here.

Board Member Bermello: And Behar.

[Laughter]

Board Member Behar: I'm used to the blame.

[Laughter]

Chairman Pardo: Alright. Motion to adjourn.

Board Member Bermello: Motion to adjourn Mr. Chairman.

Board Member Salman: Second.

Chairman Pardo: Thank you.