

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

CITY OF CORAL GABLES
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING
VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT

CORAL GABLES CITY COMMISSION CHAMBERS
405 BILTMORE WAY, CORAL GABLES
MAY 24, 2006, 6:07 P.M.

Board Members Present:

- Tom Korge, Chairman
- Eibi Aizenstat, Vice-Chairman
- Robert Behar
- Pat Keon
- Cristina Moreno
- Javier Salman

City Staff:

- Eric Riel, Jr., Planning Director
- Walter Carlson, Assistant Planning Director
- Lourdes Alfonsin Ruiz, Assistant City Attorney
- Jill Menendez-Duran, Administrative Assistant

Public Speakers:

Page

Elaine Codias	79
Ignacio Zabaleta	83
Bruce Katz	90
Daniel Fryer	98
John Fullerton	100
Jorge Hernandez	108
Michael Steffens	126
Rafael Sixto	129
Amado "Al" Acosta	131
Mamta Chaudhry-Fryer	134
David Adler	140
Paul Posnak	160

- - -

1 THEREUPON:

2 The following proceedings were had:

3 MR. AIZENSTAT: Let's go ahead and call the
4 roll, please.

5 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Eibi Aizenstat?

6 MR. AIZENSTAT: Here.

7 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Robert Behar?

8 MR. BEHAR: Here.

9 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Jack Coe?

10 Pat Keon?

11 MS. KEON: Here.

12 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Cristina Moreno?

13 MS. MORENO: Here.

14 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Javier Salman?

15 (Thereupon, Mr. Salman entered the

16 Commission Chambers.)

17 MR. SALMAN: Here.

18 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Tom Korge?

19 MR. BEHAR: Quite an entrance.

20 MR. AIZENSTAT: Very appropriate.

21 MS. MORENO: Think about -- talk about
22 perfect timing.

23 MR. SALMAN: Did they move me?

24 MR. RIEL: No. Sorry.

25 MS. KEON: They just turned you around.

1 MR. AIZENSTAT: Are we all set with the roll
2 call?

3 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Yes.

4 MR. AIZENSTAT: Okay. Thank you.

5 Next, let's go ahead and move on to the
6 approval of the minutes.

7 Did everybody get a chance to take a look at
8 all the minutes? Any comments, any questions? No?
9 Do I have a motion?

10 MR. SALMAN: So moved.

11 MS. MORENO: Seconded.

12 MR. AIZENSTAT: Seconded. Please call the
13 roll.

14 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Robert Behar?

15 MR. BEHAR: Yes.

16 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Pat Keon?

17 MS. KEON: Yes.

18 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Cristina Moreno?

19 MS. MORENO: Yes.

20 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Javier Salman?

21 MR. SALMAN: Yes.

22 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Eibi Aizenstat?

23 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yes.

24 Eric, a question for you is, should we go
25 ahead and do any swearing of the parties? Are we

1 going to listen to just testimony or how are we going
2 to proceed?

3 MR. RIEL: I don't know. Maybe I'll ask
4 the City Attorney.

5 MS. ALFONSIN: It's a public hearing, so
6 yes.

7 MR. AIZENSTAT: Anybody that would like to
8 speak, if they would please stand up, and raise your
9 right hand.

10 (Thereupon, all who were to speak were duly
11 sworn by the court reporter.)

12 MR. AIZENSTAT: Thank you, and did
13 everybody go ahead and sign in already?

14 MR. RIEL: And also, if you would like to
15 speak this evening, if you could fill out a speaker
16 card.

17 MR. AIZENSTAT: Eric?

18 MR. RIEL: Mr. Chairman, we only -- we have
19 one item on the agenda, the Zoning Code Text
20 Amendment. It's basically Overlay Provisions of the
21 Interim Single-Family Regulations, which amends
22 Article 3, which is basically the single-family
23 regulations.

24 The reason it's on the agenda this evening
25 is, on May 9th, the City Commission passed a

1 resolution, asking the City Manager and the City
2 Attorney to prepare a finalized draft of the -- what
3 they described as the Oversized Residential
4 Properties Ordinance. They basically asked that that
5 ordinance be extracted out of the Zoning Code
6 rewrite, and as a part of the resolution and the
7 motion, they asked that the draft ordinance be
8 presented to the Commission no later than the end of
9 June, and that's the reason that this item is before
10 you this evening. Otherwise, it would have been
11 contained with the remainder of the Zoning Code
12 rewrite.

13 Mr. Smith from the Building & Zoning
14 Department will be presenting that this evening, so
15 I'll turn it over to Mr. Smith.

16 MR. AIZENSTAT: Mr. Smith.

17 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, Members of the
18 Board, good evening.

19 Let me tell you where we started with this.
20 We started with the best parts of our existing Zoning
21 Code. When we worked on it, we looked at doing
22 things and limiting things that may do a lot for a
23 house, but not a neighborhood.

24 We worked on it with property owners, with
25 architects, with some developers, and we worked

1 towards consensus -- consensus on getting a document
2 and a proposal that really does something to reduce
3 the mass and scale of single-family residences in our
4 residential neighborhoods.

5 The format for the proposal follows the
6 format for the Zoning Code rewrite, so that this can
7 also be inserted right back into the Zoning Code
8 rewrite when it's done.

9 And as that goes forward, the first thing
10 that we do is, we establish a purpose and
11 applicability section, which we've done here, and in
12 the purpose and applicability section, we thought
13 that it was important to say something as to the
14 character of our residential neighborhoods, and we do
15 that, and then we provide what type of uses can be in
16 those neighborhoods.

17 (Thereupon, Chairman Korge entered the
18 Commission Chambers.)

19 MR. SMITH: The next section that we have
20 is, what are permitted principal uses and structures,
21 and that's single-family dwellings, utility
22 infrastructure, auxiliary and accessory structures,
23 and then we get into the heart of it, something that
24 our Zoning Code has, but it has it all over the place
25 right now, and that's performance standards.

1 In the proposed Zoning Code, in each zoning
2 district, there's performance standards for each
3 different type of building, performance standards for
4 single-family homes, for multi-family buildings,
5 performance standards for commercial buildings.
6 These performance standards really bring together the
7 performance standards in the Zoning Code that are
8 here and there and over there, and it not only does
9 that, but it modifies them to reduce the height and
10 mass and scale of single-family homes, and it does it
11 within the context of the neighborhood where those
12 homes are located.

13 I want to start with the performance
14 standards, Paragraph C. The first thing we do is, we
15 provide for building sites. The first thing an
16 architect or a property owner or developer needs to
17 know is whether or not what they have is a building
18 site. So we put that right there, the minimum
19 standards for building sites, and it's our basic
20 standards of one platted lot, with a minimum street
21 frontage of 50 feet, and then we reference to Article
22 12, the building site regulations, and that's an
23 important thing, we think. We have a number of
24 provisions in here that reference you to somewhere
25 else.

1 Oh, the other thing that's important to
2 point out is, in our existing Zoning Code, we have
3 R-1, R-2, R-3, R-4, R-5 districts. This will just be
4 an R-Use district, single-family. The 1, 2, 3, 4 and
5 5, as we all know, relates to minimum size of
6 residences. We've taken those out, but the

7 residential district still ends up being divided up
8 into other areas. It ends up being divided up into
9 other areas by two things -- well, three things. One
10 is our site-specific regulations, which give specific
11 regulations for certain subdivisions or neighborhoods
12 within the City, like Cocoplum and Gables Estates,
13 Journey's End, or some of our historic districts,
14 like the French Village and the Chinese Village.
15 Different neighborhoods have some different things
16 that are covered, and this refers you to those
17 site-specific regulations.

18 The other type of property that we deal with
19 are properties located within the flood zones, and
20 those are generally the properties in the southern
21 part of the City, on the east side of Old Cutler
22 Road, down below the ridge, and a lot of those
23 properties are not only in a flood zone, but they
24 also have their own site-specific regulations.

25 Other neighborhoods in the southern end that

1 aren't in the flood district, like Hammock Lakes and
2 the Banyan Drive area and Snapper Creek, they have
3 their own site-specific regulations that were adopted
4 after they were annexed, that in many cases are more
5 restrictive than our normal requirements, anyways,
6 and the consensus was that in those areas of the
7 City, in the southern part, that we don't have that
8 much of a problem with the size of homes. It seems,
9 because they're larger lots, they have their own
10 site-specific regulations or they have specific
11 regulations pertaining to them because they're in a
12 flood district, that those things control those homes
13 adequately.

14 Then we have the third category, and that's
15 all the other properties in the City that do not have
16 site-specific regulations and/or are not in the flood
17 zone. Those properties will be guided strictly by
18 these provisions here.

19 After we establish the building sites, we go
20 ahead and we provide for density, one principal
21 building per site.

22 Then we provide for the facing of lots and
23 buildings. Now, right now in our Zoning Code, the
24 facing provisions for properties are located at the
25 front of the site-specific regulations, and people, a

1 lot of times, don't know that you have to go to
2 site-specifics to find out the general requirements
3 for facing. So we put it right in the front there,
4 and that's an organizational issue that we've dealt
5 with.

6 Then, after the facing, we get into our
7 setback requirements, and with our setback
8 requirements, we do a number of things. First, in
9 Paragraph 4 of the setback requirements, we have some
10 language there that we've worked on that explains
11 what the setbacks are, because right now, in the
12 Zoning Code, it says setback requirements, R-Use
13 Districts, General, and then it just says, the front
14 setback is 25 feet, and on and on. We thought that
15 it was important that we abstract from the Zoning
16 Code, under the supplementary district sections, what
17 it means to comply with the setbacks, how you have to
18 do that, from there and from the definitions. So we
19 put that there, so you know what that means when it
20 says that the front setback is 25 feet and the sides
21 are
22 five and five or whatever. In addition to that, we
23 included language in there that provides that nothing
24 in here prohibits you from having more setback than
25 the minimum setback. You could have more if you

1 want.

2 In terms of the front setback, we looked at
3 that, and we didn't make any changes to that. That
4 stays the same as what is in our existing Code,
5 generally 25 feet, and 15 feet for lots that are 75
6 feet in depth or less.

7 On the side setbacks, we did make a change,
8 and we looked at doing a number of things. First, we
9 increased the side setbacks from five and five on a
10 50-foot lot, in general, the minimum, to seven and a
11 half and seven and a half. But when we had some of
12 the architects look at that, they said that that
13 wouldn't work on the smaller lots, because then you
14 only have the 35 feet to work with, and if you put a
15 two-car garage there, there's 22 feet, another one
16 foot four for the block walls; you have a thin living
17 space in the front with this big garage there. They
18 said, "You have to go ahead and give more room," so
19 they -- we felt that the five-foot minimum was
20 adequate for the smaller lots.

21 What we did was, we're requiring that the
22 side setbacks shall be equal on both sides of the
23 residence. Right now, if you have a lot that's a
24 100-foot lot, you could have five feet on one side
25 and 15 feet on the other. We wanted to even that

1 out. So now they have to be equal. They have to be
2 10 and 10. Or, on a 75-foot lot, you can have five
3 and 10, which equal 15. Now they would have to be
4 seven and a half and seven and a half. But we
5 included a provision in there that they don't have to
6 be equally distributed if an uneven distribution is
7 used to address an existing contextual condition.
8 And we put that in there because sometimes you may
9 have a tree in the way and we may not want them to
10 remove the tree, or we have a lot of homes that are
11 existing and they may want to line up a small
12 addition with their existing house. So when we look
13 at it in the context of what's going on with this
14 property and a neighboring property, sometimes it may
15 make sense to have one a little closer. So we want
16 to look at that in context. But generally speaking,
17 and for most new homes, it will be an equal
18 distribution on the sides.

19 The rear setback, we did increase from five
20 feet to 10 feet, and then we also put here, right
21 after that, the provisions for setbacks on waterways
22 and canals.

23 Then, the next thing that we did was, we
24 moved the provisions for setback requirements
25 for auxiliary and accessory structures right behind

1 the general setback requirements for the principal
2 structures, so that if you're designing a house with
3 a gazebo or a house with a swimming pool, you know
4 what the setback requirements are for those, because
5 it's one right behind the other. But that even
6 references you to the auxiliary section, which has
7 specific setbacks for some auxiliary structures, like
8 swimming pools and screen enclosures, that we'll
9 further address with the full Zoning Code rewrite,
10 because right here we're only dealing with the
11 principal residence, and these provisions we're
12 bringing over so that it's easy to work with and easy
13 to find.

14 The next issue is the height of single-
15 family residences, and this is where we really do
16 something to reduce the height and scale of
17 residences. Right now, our Zoning Code says that a
18 single-family residence can be two and a half stories
19 in height and can be 34 feet in height. And the
20 problem that we have is, the 34 feet in height is
21 appropriate for a two-and-a-half-story residence.
22 But what people are doing is, they're building
23 two-story residences at 34 feet in height.

24 So we took out the half-story that's
25 permitted, because nobody really builds two and a

1 half stories, and we lowered the height to the height
2 for a two-story residence, to 29 feet. And I had a
3 number of architects look at that, and if you really
4 go and look at some of the homes that you see, that
5 you think are out of context when they're next to a
6 two-story home that's older, you'll notice that it's
7 about five feet out of context in height. So, by
8 bringing that down, that, we think, is really going
9 to help with the massing of these homes.

10 The next thing that we have is, we had the
11 height of single-family residences in flood
12 districts, and we left that height at 39 feet. We
13 still limit it to two stories, but we leave it at 39
14 feet, because they're in a flood zone and they have
15 to be elevated so much higher, they need that height
16 in order to build to that height. And most of the
17 residences in the flood districts that are two
18 stories, all the ones that have been redeveloped, are
19 built to that height, and it's almost impractical not
20 to keep that kind of height.

21 The height of the residences -- and we have
22 it in bold here -- is measured from established
23 grade, and established grade will be, in the new
24 Zoning Code and in our existing Code, the same thing,
25 and that is the average elevation of the sidewalks

1 abutting the property, or the average elevation of
2 the street if there's no sidewalk, and we take that
3 average and that's the measuring point for the height
4 of the structure. And the height of the structure is
5 measured to the very top of the structure, except for
6 the chimney, and the chimney can exceed the height by
7 an additional three feet, provided it doesn't have an
8 area in excess of seven feet. And we have that
9 provision in there to make it consistent with the
10 provisions of the Building Code. We do that in both
11 the regular zoning district and the flood hazard
12 district.

13 Then we had the ground area coverage
14 provisions, and those are essentially the same
15 provisions that we have, and although we didn't
16 change these provisions, we did make a change in the
17 landscaping, and when we get to the landscaping, I'll
18 explain how that affects the design of the
19 residences.

20 The next real issue is the maximum permitted
21 floor area for a single-family residence. With the
22 interim provisions, we took five percent away. Well,
23 we're putting it back now, because with the interim
24 provisions, what we did was, we took five percent
25 away, but we said, if you do this and this and this

1 and this, you can earn back the five percent. So
2 we, you know, made it kind of like a bonus program.
3 With these provisions, what we're saying is, we're
4 going to give you the five percent back, but you
5 don't have an option, now you're going to do this and
6 this and this and this and this. And that included
7 the increased landscaping, that includes the
8 reduction in height, includes provisions for flat
9 roofs, which I'll get to in a moment, includes the
10 modifications to the setbacks, and the next thing
11 that it includes is how we determine the maximum
12 permitted floor area. And there was a couple of
13 issues, and one that some of the residents brought up
14 which I hadn't even really thought of, which as I
15 started to look at it, I said, "That's a really great
16 idea," and we included it in there. One of the
17 things that we did was, right now if you have a
18 garage or storage area that's one story in height, it
19 only counts at one half in the floor area, and I
20 know, at a number of the other meetings, there were a
21 number of discussions where a lot of people weren't
22 interested in seeing that provision staying, and
23 giving people, essentially, a bonus for building a
24 one-story garage, and the garage still adds mass to
25 the house, so that we took that out, okay? A garage

1 counts as full.

2 The next thing we did is, we reduced the
3 permitted height before a space would count twice on
4 the maximum floor area. It was 15 feet, average
5 ceiling height. It would only count once unless you
6 exceeded the 15 feet. Because we lowered the height
7 of the residence from 34 feet to 29 feet, we lowered
8 that permitted ceiling height from 15 feet to 13
9 feet. Now, that doesn't mean you can't have a
10 ceiling with a height that exceeds 13 feet and have
11 it count twice. It's the average height. So you
12 could have, in a room, scissor trusses, which give
13 you more volume, and we measure the average height of
14 that. So you could have one point that's higher and
15 one point that's lower, and we go to the average.
16 Or, you could have a sloping ceiling, and we would go
17 to the average height of that sloping ceiling. And
18 that's how we do that now. So it still allows for
19 flexibility within the design, but still helps to
20 bring down the mass of the home by helping to reduce
21 the overall volume of the house.

22 Then, the next thing that we did after that
23 was -- and if you go and if you look at them, you'll
24 see how they add mass to a home. We're going to
25 count the floor space in roofed terraces, breezeways

1 and porches located on the second floor of a home.
2 We looked at a lot of them, and if you look at a home
3 that has a breezeway or a terrace on the ground
4 floor, but not above it, it has a nice scale to it.
5 But when you carry that up and you add that mass to
6 the second floor, as well, that really adds mass to
7 the building. So now we're going to count the roof
8 space in roofed terraces, breezeways and porches
9 located on the second floor.

10 MS. MORENO: But what do you mean by an open
11 porch?

12 MR. SMITH: Well, that's the other thing.
13 We have to strike through "open." There's no such
14 thing. A porch is a porch. You don't have an open
15 porch and closed porch. And that's something that we
16 have in our Code right now, and I've been meaning to
17 fix. And one of the architects that worked with this
18 pointed that out this afternoon, and I said, "Oh,
19 you're right." So wherever it says "open porch," we
20 need to scratch the "open."

21 MS. MORENO: But that means it's covered,
22 right?

23 MR. SMITH: That's correct.

24 MS. MORENO: It's not just an open terrace?

25 MR. SMITH: Right.

1 MS. MORENO: Okay.

2 MR. SMITH: That's covered. A porch is a
3 covered porch.

4 And then, we included in there, the floor
5 space in interior courtyards will count in the floor
6 area, because absolutely, that pushes the mass out to
7 the sides of the building and puts it either on the
8 neighbors or puts it on the street. So, if someone
9 is going to have an interior courtyard, it's going to
10 count on their floor area, and if that interior
11 courtyard is two stories in height, it's going to
12 count twice. So that's a very important thing, and I
13 know that I heard from a number of people that they
14 wanted that included in there. And I had some
15 architects that, you know, thought that that would
16 stifle the design of some homes, but once again, when
17 we did this, we were working towards doing something
18 that would really reduce the mass of the homes, with
19 consensus and with the understanding that limiting
20 things that may do a lot for a house may not do
21 anything for a neighborhood.

22 Now, the next thing, we wanted to specify
23 things that are not counted in the floor area, and we
24 specified in there that one-story roof terraces,
25 breezeways -- scratch out "open," in porches -- that

1 do not have an average floor-to-ceiling height that
2 exceeds 13 feet, won't count. The nice thing about
3 that is, that gives the incentive to have one-story
4 porches on the front of homes or on the side of homes
5 or on the rear of homes, to help push the massing
6 either further away from the neighbors or further
7 away from the street.

8 And then floor space in screen enclosures,
9 that doesn't count now, and we haven't changed that.

10 The other change is the floor space in
11 carports. Carports are a very traditional feature in
12 homes in the City of Coral Gables. Under our
13 existing Code, and I've had a lot of questions on
14 this over the year, we do count them in the floor
15 area, and if they're on the side of the house, we
16 only counted them as one half. But we wouldn't count
17 a one-story porch at one half or -- at one half or
18 anything; why would we count a carport? So we
19 decided to put carports in there as definitely an
20 excluded item.

21 MS. KEON: I have a question. Do you want
22 me to wait?

23 MR. SMITH: Now --

24 CHAIRMAN KORGE: We're going to wait and let
25 him go through everything, and then we'll ask our

1 questions.

2 MR. SMITH: Now, we have the determination
3 of the maximum floor area in flood hazard districts,
4 because those areas are different than the areas to
5 the north, and there, where we don't see as much of a
6 problem, we thought that we could leave things a
7 little bit more the way that they are right now for
8 those areas, but we did make some change as to how
9 that would be counted.

10 The first thing is, the floor space in any
11 garage or garage storage area, we took out the bonus
12 for having a one-story garage. We don't think that's
13 appropriate anywhere. And you can't give a bonus to
14 one area and not offer the same bonus to properties
15 in another area that are in the same zoning district,
16 so we thought that we needed to be consistent there
17 and we took that out.

18 We left the floor-to-ceiling height at 15
19 feet, because they're in a flood zone and they have a
20 little bit more height to work with, and they're
21 larger lots, and generally speaking, they have
22 greater setbacks, so we left those things alone. And
23 then in those areas, the floor space in all roofed
24 terraces, breezeways and porches will be exempt from
25 the floor area provision. So, really, in those

1 areas, it was relatively minor changes to the Code.

2 The next thing that we have is the
3 off-street parking requirements, and in the existing
4 single-family regulations, it says nothing about
5 off-street parking. You've got to go all the way
6 over to the parking requirements and find where
7 you're at in the table for those, and then you have
8 to find the dimensions for it someplace else, so we
9 put it all here together, and that's pretty much our
10 existing provisions for off-street parking for
11 single-family residences.

12 Then, under the landscaped open space
13 provisions, we kept that at the 40 percent that we
14 increased it to with the interim provisions. I
15 haven't seen -- we've seen maybe a dozen or so homes
16 really designed under the interim provisions, and
17 nobody has run into a problem with that 40 percent.
18 They have a bigger problem with setback -- with
19 septic tanks than they have with that 40 percent.
20 But what we did do is, we're providing that at least
21 20 percent of the required 40 percent has to be in
22 the front yard area, and we specify in here clearly
23 that only the landscaping counts towards the
24 landscaped open space requirement. No pervious (sic)
25 areas shall be counted, which means no sidewalks,

1 no -- no sidewalks, no ponds, no fountains, no
2 patios. Strictly landscaped areas count as
3 landscaped open space, because we didn't want to do
4 like we had previously, where landscaped open space
5 included not just the area where plant material was,
6 but also the walkway areas and things like that. So
7 we've clarified that. That's been our
8 interpretation, and we wanted to put it in there so
9 that it didn't need to be an interpretation, people
10 were clear that we're just looking at landscaping.

11 Something else -- oh, and the drainage
12 provisions that we have in our Zoning Code right now,
13 they're staying in there. Everybody has to retain
14 all their drainage on their own property and they
15 cannot drain into adjacent properties or into the
16 right-of-way, the street, the sidewalk or the canals.
17 They still have to maintain that.

18 Flat roofs. One of the things we did is,
19 we're allowing more creative use of flat roofs with a
20 parapet and flat roofs without a parapet, but we're
21 putting some limits on those. I want to give you an
22 example for a flat roof without a parapet. I had
23 someone come in, because with lowering the height of
24 the residence, what happens is, you may want to have
25 a steeped, pitched roof, visually, and by lowering

1 the height, that makes it harder to do that unless
2 you keep it to a one-story residence. Well, you can
3 easily do a roof that then has a flat roof on the top
4 that you never see, that allows you to maintain that
5 steep pitch, and this allows you to do that. And
6 that will help reduce the mass of some of these homes
7 by allowing you to have those roof features that you
8 want, but with a roof that is lesser in area.

9 What these provisions also encourage is --
10 with the flat roofs with the parapet, is two things.
11 It encourages you to either do a flat roof with a
12 parapet where you have predominantly a pitched roof
13 with flat roof elements that help break down the
14 massing, and the flat roofs with a parapet are
15 actually limited even more in height, because those
16 go to 24 feet to the roof deck, and then you can have
17 a parapet no more than 30 inches, or for a maximum of
18 26 feet six inches above established grade. But you
19 have to understand, the roof deck is the structural
20 deck. On top of that goes your insulating concrete
21 and your furring strips and your other things to put
22 down the roofing material. So, above the roofing
23 deck, you have a relatively thick layer of roofing
24 and materials, but the parapet is still limited to
25 that 30 inches, and we think that that will give

1 enough height to allow the slopes that you need
2 behind the parapet to conceal the flat roof.

3 What our existing Zoning Code says is that
4 you shall have a minimum parapet height. We changed
5 that to a maximum parapet height, to help limit the
6 size and scale of those elements and yet to allow
7 people to have the -- behind the parapet, it can be
8 three or four inches or whatever the Building Code
9 allows. So that really will help to reduce the scale
10 of those residences.

11 And in the section on the flat roof with the
12 parapet, I noticed that I had a couple of little
13 technical corrections to make. In Paragraph A of
14 Section 14-3, I have, "The residence has a flat roof
15 with a parapet with" -- the second "with" has to come
16 out. And then, the maximum of 24-inch high parapet,
17 we need to change that to 30 inches, because 24
18 inches and 24 feet equals 26 feet, not 26 feet six
19 inches. And then, we want to take out, "The pitched
20 roof shall have a pitch of not less than two and a
21 half in 12 and not greater than four in 12," and say,
22 "The roof shall be pitched in accordance with the
23 Florida Building Code." And those same changes need
24 to be made in Paragraph B, below. That was just
25 brought to my attention this afternoon, and I thought

1 that they were appropriate changes.

2 Then we have the provision for roof
3 projections, and we made a change to that, for
4 buildings with setbacks from five to 10 feet. The
5 existing Code allows you to go out two and a half
6 feet with the roofs, with balconies and with bay
7 windows. We didn't think it was appropriate to have
8 balconies and bay windows projecting out into a
9 five-foot setback, two and a half feet. The roof
10 projection, fine, because you have to have a roof
11 overhang, but going out that with a bay window, that
12 puts a living space within two and a half feet of the
13 side property line, or a balcony with two and a half
14 feet of your neighbor's side property line.
15 That's -- we didn't think that was appropriate, and
16 people normally don't do that, anyways, so out of
17 that first paragraph, we deleted balconies and bay
18 windows.

19 Then, architectural type. In that first
20 paragraph, we put in there some better language for
21 the Board of Architects, providing that they shall
22 require from the designing architect such changes as
23 are necessary to comply with these provisions, and
24 then after the list of specific items that they look
25 at, we've put in there that, "The Board of Architects

1 shall review a new building or structure or a
2 substantial addition to an existing building or
3 structure that is to be constructed in context with
4 both sides of the street, on the block where it is
5 located and surrounding properties."

6 Now, I want to talk about that for a minute,
7 because there's a great example I'd like to use when
8 you talk about context, and here, what we're talking
9 about this -- and I think that, really, what we need
10 to do, eventually, is, we need to specify which
11 neighborhoods are which, okay? Because you have --
12 on North Greenway, you have larger homes, because
13 they're required to have two lots per site, and it's
14 on a golf course. They're bigger homes. Behind
15 that, you have Asturia, with smaller homes. Now, you
16 don't want a big house on Asturia, but you do want a
17 house in context with the houses on North Greenway,
18 on North Greenway, and we believe that this gives the
19 Board of Architects the flexibility to make that
20 determination until we, you know, map out what our
21 neighborhoods are in Coral Gables, because it's very
22 hard for me to come up with a definition of
23 neighborhood that you can apply to an area and say,
24 "This is a neighborhood."

25 But from all the time I've spent in Coral

1 Gables and talking to a lot of the architects and
2 other residents, they know what their neighborhood
3 is. We know that North Greenway is a neighborhood.
4 We know that Tahiti Beach is a neighborhood that's
5 within the neighborhood of Cocoplum. We know that
6 above that, on Old Cutler, you've got a neighborhood
7 on one side of Old Cutler, on the west -- on the east
8 side, that's different from the neighborhood on the
9 west side, because the lots are bigger. On Riviera,
10 on the water side, you've got one neighborhood -- and
11 when I'm talking about neighborhood, I'm talking
12 about neighborhood in the context of architecture,
13 not in the context of all the things neighborhood,
14 but on one side of Riviera, because they're on the
15 water, you've got bigger homes, and across the
16 street, you've got smaller homes, because they're not
17 on the water and they were smaller lots. But we know
18 those are neighborhoods, and we can map those out so
19 that we know what we're looking at when we talk about
20 a specific neighborhood, and that's, I think, a
21 follow-up step to this that we ought to undertake and
22 do.

23 The other thing is -- it's in the Zoning
24 Code rewrite, it's not really in this section -- is,
25 the requirement for custom-designed homes in Coral

1 Gables is still in there, and one thing that some
2 people have been bringing up to me, they call and
3 they complain about notice provisions. They don't
4 know that a new home is going in. They don't know
5 that, you know, a big addition is being done to the
6 house. And I thought very long about that. It would
7 be almost impractical, with the number of
8 applications that we have, to try and do a mailing to
9 neighbors, but it may be practical for us at this
10 time to consider increasing the size of the sign that
11 we post these properties with, from eight inches by
12 five inches to at least eight and a half by eleven.
13 That's not -- still not a big sign, but that's
14 something that will afford better visibility to the
15 neighbors, and that's something that we'll have to
16 take up in the Zoning Code rewrite, because that's in
17 a different provision, but I want you to know that
18 we're thinking about that.

19 And the other thing that we're doing, so
20 people know that new homes are coming in and new
21 things are coming in, is, we started today -- for the
22 first time, we put our agenda for the Board of
23 Architects on the web site. So people can go to the
24 web site now, every week, Wednesday afternoon, maybe
25 late, maybe five o'clock, but see the agenda for the

1 Board of Architects.

2 Then, the next thing is, in the Zoning Code,
3 there's a provision in there for single-family
4 residence, apartments and duplex, for utility poles,
5 and we included in there provisions for underground
6 utilities. If someone is going to build a new home,
7 they should put their services underground. If
8 someone is changing their service, they should put
9 the new service underground. If someone is doing a
10 substantial remodeling to their home, which is what
11 we call an Alteration Level 300 of the Florida
12 Building Code, the existing Building Code, that's
13 equal to the old 50 percent rule, so they're, you
14 know, practically redoing the whole thing, they
15 should put their service underground, and I think we
16 all know why. So we included that in there.

17 And then finally, we had to have the
18 definition for interior courtyard, so we had that
19 included in there, as well.

20 And that's really my presentation. If you
21 have any questions, I'll be more than happy to answer
22 them.

23 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Why don't we take questions
24 from the Board here now, and then after that, bring
25 forward the public comments, and then maybe you can

1 rebut or answer any questions the public had, as
2 well --

3 MR. SMITH: Sure.

4 CHAIRMAN KORGE: -- after they're finished,
5 or as they're presenting their issues, so --

6 Cristina?

7 MS. MORENO: I have two questions. They're
8 both in the setback area. When you talk
9 about terraces, is that covered or uncovered?

10 MR. SMITH: Uncovered. If it's covered,
11 it's a porch.

12 MS. MORENO: Okay. So what you're saying
13 is, you cannot have a terrace into the setback area
14 at all?

15 MR. SMITH: That's correct.

16 MS. MORENO: Is that consistent with what we
17 have now?

18 MR. SMITH: Yes, it is.

19 MS. MORENO: Okay, and then my second
20 question is, you said that you took away the
21 seven-and-a-half-foot setback requirement because of
22 the desire to permit two-car garages. I'm not sure
23 that I agree with that value judgment. I'd rather
24 have a one-car garage and the greater setback
25 requirement.

1 MR. SMITH: Well, there's nothing that
2 prohibits two-car garages.

3 MS. MORENO: But in practical terms, if you
4 say seven and a half feet, it's going to look like a
5 weird house, so you're encouraging a one-car garage.

6 On a 50-foot lot, a two-car garage is still going to
7 look bad, I don't care whether you put five feet or
8 seven and a half feet. So I would encourage putting
9 back the seven and a half feet.

10 Those are my comments.

11 MR. SMITH: Okay. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Go ahead --

13 MR. BEHAR: Pat.

14 MS. KEON: I had a question about -- in --
15 it's on Page 5 -- well, I don't know where it starts,
16 but it's on Page 5, but where you talk about what --
17 oh, I'm sorry, here, on b, where -- the item that
18 says structures that are not computed into the gross
19 floor area.

20 MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

21 MS. KEON: In the areas where you compute
22 them as half, the screened porches and that where you
23 compute them as half, you note that you ask for a
24 covenant, stating that the porches will never be
25 enclosed.

1 MR. SMITH: Yes.

2 MR. KEON: In these areas where you don't
3 count them at all, do you also ask for a covenant
4 that these areas won't be enclosed? Because you're
5 not counting them --

6 MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

7 MS. KEON: -- and they could be enclosed at
8 some point, that would increase them. So, if you're
9 not counting them, do you then at some point ask for
10 that same type of covenant?

11 MR. SMITH: We can include language to that.
12 That's --

13 MS. KEON: I don't know if it's appropriate.
14 That's what I'm asking you. Is it appropriate that
15 you would ask for the same type of covenant?

16 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Why would you even need a
17 covenant?

18 MR. SMITH: Actually, yes, I think it is.

19 MS. MORENO: I think so, too.

20 MS. KEON: Okay.

21 MR. SMITH: I hadn't -- I hadn't, you know,
22 really thought about carrying that down there, but --

23 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Why would you need a
24 covenant?

25 MR. SMITH: For the porches, the one-story

1 porches and terraces --

2 MS. KEON: Right.

3 MR. SMITH: Yeah, because we're not counting
4 them.

5 MS. KEON: Right, so --

6 MR. SMITH: So someone could come in and
7 slap windows in them.

8 MS. KEON: Later on, right.

9 MR. SMITH: Later on. So, yes, absolutely.

10 MS. KEON: Right, okay. So you would then
11 ask for a covenant to go with that?

12 MR. SMITH: I would ask for a covenant on
13 that and on carports --

14 MS. KEON: Right.

15 MR. SMITH: -- because someone could come in
16 and turn that into a garage.

17 MS. KEON: Yes.

18 MR. SMITH: And then that would be a
19 problem.

20 MS. KEON: Okay, and also, with reference to
21 what Cristina had just asked you about, with the
22 setbacks being seven and a half feet or five feet, I
23 don't know that there's a number that -- you would
24 decide what the number is, but what I would like the
25 architects maybe to address is this issue of what

1 proportion of the front of the house should be a
2 garage. I mean, I don't care whether it's a one-car
3 garage or a two-car garage, but I know that in some
4 of the other things we had looked at, at one point, I
5 think it was that the garage area shouldn't exceed 30
6 percent of the front of the house, so that you
7 maintain some scale, so you didn't have this -- you
8 know, so from the street, what you weren't looking at
9 was a garage, you know, and then the little front
10 door and the living space all behind, so from the
11 street, you know, what you really saw was the garage,
12 which I don't think is -- aesthetically, it's not a
13 very pleasing look to a street.

14 MR. SMITH: Well --

15 MS. KEON: So I would ask that, you know,
16 maybe you would consider that, or you would go
17 back -- either ask our architects here to comment on
18 it or go back to the architects you had spoken with,
19 as to what would be an appropriate proportion of the
20 front of a house that would take up -- be taken up by
21 a garage.

22 MR. SMITH: Well, on a -- we're talking
23 about a 50 by 100-foot lot. That's where the issue
24 comes up.

25 MS. KEON: Uh-huh.

1 MR. SMITH: And it's not in proportion;
2 it's a dimension. It's 23 feet, four inches. That's
3 the width of a two-car garage, period, and so that's
4 what it's going to be.

5 MS. KEON: I know, but even at that point,
6 if the front of the house -- if you have a 50-foot
7 lot and you can only -- and the front of your
8 house -- then it can only be 40 --

9 MR. SMITH: It's 40 feet.

10 MS. KEON: It's 40 feet, is the most that
11 you can build; is that right? That's the frontage?

12 MR. SMITH: That's the width.

13 MS. KEON: So, if half of that or more than
14 half of that is taken up by a two-car garage, it
15 strikes me that that is not particularly attractive
16 and does not fit in the context of the neighborhoods
17 where there are small homes or there are 50-foot
18 lots.

19 What I would like to see is a provision or a
20 discussion as to a provision of what portion of that
21 40 foot of allowable space could be built with a
22 garage and still aesthetically be pleasing.

23 MR. BEHAR: I think you make an excellent
24 point. Now, the answer, I --

25 MS. KEON: I don't know that, and not --

1 MR. BEHAR: To figure it out. But you bring
2 up a valid point.

3 MS. KEON: -- being an architect, I don't
4 know that, but I would like -- I would like to see
5 that built in here, so that I don't -- you don't walk
6 down the street and see garage doors.

7 MR. SMITH: Well, the alternative, really,
8 because you can't reduce that 23 feet four inches --
9 the alternative is either to allow two-car garages on
10 lots that are less than X feet in width or not.

11 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Right.

12 MS. KEON: Well, I mean, I don't know that.
13 I mean, there may be a point at which, if people ever
14 adopt those little tiny cars, that a two-car garage
15 could be smaller. I don't know that, but all I know
16 is that if there is -- you know, aesthetically, there
17 is a portion -- a proportion of the front of the
18 house that would maintain the aesthetics of that
19 home, of that 40 feet of building allowed on a
20 50-foot lot, I would like to see that maybe built in,
21 so that you do give the flexibility to architects
22 that I keep hearing they want, because you don't want
23 things to be formulaic, because you want them to have
24 -- be allowed to be creative in how they build or
25 whatever else. You know, I would -- I would urge you

1 to look at that, maybe, as a proportion of the
2 frontage, as opposed to a specific number, and I
3 would like the architects here, and maybe those in
4 the audience, to maybe comment on that.

5 MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

6 MR. SALMAN: If I can add some comment to
7 Pat's thoughts. You know, we are giving back a
8 pretty generous maximum gross square footage. If we
9 force or allow a two-car garage on a 50-foot lot,
10 then you're almost forcing them to go to a second
11 story, because your square footages will require it,
12 and the cost of construction and the value of
13 construction is such that it would require it.

14 If you look at a lot of the historic houses
15 or just houses that have been built up until now on
16 50-foot lots -- when I say now, up to within the last
17 five to 10 years, they almost invariably have a
18 single-car garage. We're required a single-car
19 garage, and it ties back into Cristina's requirement
20 for a seven-and-a-half-foot minimum side setback. I
21 don't necessarily agree with the seven and a half
22 feet. I think the way the Code works right now,
23 where five is a minimum, as long as you have 15 on
24 the other side, works because you do get that
25 variety.

1 Getting to seven and a half becomes -- is,
2 again, another 50-foot lot issue, and really, the
3 problem of these proportions and these big, what are
4 called monster homes, is when you start maximizing
5 that 45 -- or 48 percent lot coverage ratio, and on
6 the smaller lot is where it becomes very, very
7 visible. So I would encourage you to look at maybe
8 limiting to a one-car garage on a 50-foot lot.

9 MR. SMITH: I just did some quick numbers
10 here, and I'll tell you what I think we might be able
11 to do, and it wouldn't be hard to do, actually, and
12 let's see what you think of it. If you have -- if we
13 say, if you have a lot that's 65 feet in width or --

14 MR. SALMAN: Or less.

15 MR. SMITH: -- less, you're limited to a
16 one-car garage that faces the street.

17 MR. SALMAN: Bingo.

18 MR. SMITH: Faces the street.

19 MS. MORENO: Great.

20 MR. SMITH: Because what that gives you,
21 then, is that gives you the 23 feet four inches, and
22 then it gives you about 27 feet of facade next to it.
23 So the facade is in greater proportion than the
24 garage.

25 MS. KEON: But I'm asking you, again, that's

1 22 to 27. That's almost half of the house is a
2 garage. I'm asking you to ask for -- from aesthetic
3 purposes, if you can ask your architects to tell you,
4 is that aesthetically pleasing, or is 12 feet or 15
5 feet more appropriate? I mean, there are proportions
6 that make things look good. I mean, that's -- row
7 houses have proportions, townhouses. I mean, things
8 have proportions, and because of those proportions,
9 they are aesthetically pleasing. That's all I'm
10 asking, is if you would ask the people -- I know Mr.
11 Hernandez is here, and if you want to wait --

12 MR. HERNANDEZ: We can testify later about
13 that. We can --

14 MS. KEON: You know, or if someone has
15 that -- maybe you could tell me, or Robert can tell
16 me.

17 MR. SALMAN: Let's all discuss it and let's
18 have a consensus.

19 MS. KEON: Okay, but --

20 MR. BEHAR: I think so. I think we --

21 MS. KEON: -- at some point, if you'll come
22 back --

23 MR. SMITH: We'll come back to that.

24 MS. KEON: If you'll come back.

25 I have one more question to you, and that is

1 just on Page 4, where you have determined -- Number
2 10, where you talk about the Board of Architects will
3 require -- was this in the prior Code, this language,
4 "Board of Architects shall require such changes in
5 the plans"?

6 MR. SMITH: Yes, that's in the --

7 MS. KEON: That was in the prior Code?

8 MR. SMITH: That's in the interim Code.

9 MS. KEON: Okay, that's not in the old Code?

10 MR. SMITH: No.

11 MS. KEON: That's in this Code?

12 MR. SMITH: That strengthens the --

13 MS. KEON: That was put in --

14 MR. SMITH: That's correct.

15 MS. KEON: -- in order to give the authority
16 to the Board of Architects?

17 MR. SMITH: Yes.

18 MS. KEON: Okay. From a zoning standpoint,
19 from the attorney, is that too subjective? I mean,
20 is that objective enough? Can you -- is that --

21 MS. ALFONSIN: Can you refer me again --

22 MS. KEON: I'm sorry.

23 MS. ALFONSIN: -- to exactly what you're
24 addressing?

25 MS. KEON: On Page -- on Page 4.

1 MS. ALFONSIN: Yes.

2 MS. KEON: Number 10, where it talks about,
3 Determination of Maximum Square Foot Floor Area,
4 General, starting on Line 32. At the very end, it
5 says, "The Board of Architects shall require such
6 changes in the plans and specifications for
7 single-family residences as are necessary or
8 appropriate to the maintenance," da, da, da, da, da,
9 "the carrying out of the provisions of this code," on
10 and on. Is that -- is that --

11 MS. ALFONSIN: You're asking if it's
12 objective enough?

13 MS. KEON: No. I'm asking you if it is too
14 subjective to be defensible in a Zoning Code.

15 MS. ALFONSIN: I think you have to take it
16 in the context of the entire paragraph.

17 MS. KEON: Okay, I just would like somebody
18 to come back at some point and tell me that before
19 this gets passed. You don't have to do it now, but
20 maybe at some point you could tell me, because I
21 know, in the Zoning Code, in the -- opposing some
22 issues in zoning codes in municipalities, a lot of it
23 comes down to how subjective or objective the
24 criteria is, so come back to it. That's all. Thank
25 you.

1 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Robert?

2 MR. BEHAR: Dennis, is there any
3 provision -- for example, let's take a lot that's a
4 hundred foot in depth -- that I could build a
5 two-story residence for 65 percent or 65 feet of that
6 lot depth, two stories, without any break, 10 feet
7 of -- either 10 feet from the -- depending on the
8 width of the property, but as little as seven and a
9 half feet, up to 10 feet, if it's a 100-foot lot, but
10 I could do a two-story wall without any break?

11 MR. SMITH: That's up to the Board of
12 Architects to look at.

13 MR. BEHAR: I would recommend, I would
14 suggest, that maybe we consider that, for a portion
15 of the lot, you have to make a -- some sort of break,
16 so you don't get a two-story wall, and the Board of
17 Architects, maybe, you know, suggests that they have
18 different openings, but I think maybe the massing
19 could be broken up somehow if we make a provision to
20 do that. That's one concern.

21 The second is, you know --

22 MR. SMITH: How would you suggest that we do
23 that?

24 MR. BEHAR: Dennis, maybe for up to 40
25 percent of the lot depth -- 35, 40 percent, and I'm

1 thinking, what program can you put, you know, maybe
2 it's two bedrooms and a bathroom and that gives me
3 30 -- you know, 40 feet in length, and then I have to
4 provide some sort of balcony, something that breaks
5 that two-story mass.

6 MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

7 MR. BEHAR: Okay? At least so I don't have
8 a continuous two-story wall -- with windows, I
9 understand, you know the fenestration will help, but
10 I think the massing maybe should be broken up a
11 little bit.

12 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Well, one way --

13 MS. MORENO: Does the architectural type,
14 Colonial, Spanish, Venetian, Italian or other
15 Mediterranean, help?

16 MR. BEHAR: I don't think it would help
17 any.

18 MS. MORENO: No?

19 MR. BEHAR: I don't think it would help any.

20 CHAIRMAN KORGE: The only way to address
21 that would be to state in here, without directing how
22 it would be done, that that's one of the purposes the
23 Board of Architects should accomplish in reviewing
24 the plans. In other words, we'll give them more
25 specific directions, "We don't want a two-story wall

1 going 75 feet," and then it's up to them, working
2 with the designing architect, to come up with a
3 solution.

4 MR. BEHAR: Tom, but being on the Board of
5 Architects in the past, it's very difficult to
6 really, you know, after you have a preliminary
7 drawing, to say, "Oh, go back and change this." I
8 think that -- I think you have to start, the same way
9 you --

10 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Well -- well, it seems to
11 me that if it's in here as a specific direction, the
12 designing architect will be on notice --

13 MR. SMITH: He's going to read that.

14 CHAIRMAN KORGE: -- not to do that.

15 MS. MORENO: Uh-huh.

16 CHAIRMAN KORGE: And so he will immediately
17 start with a plan that will take that into account.

18 I guess the reason why I'm suggesting that
19 as a possibility is because I don't know that we can
20 come up with a uniform formula that would keep
21 everybody happy.

22 MR. BEHAR: I understand, but something
23 to -- that would --

24 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Yeah.

25 MR. BEHAR: -- limit, prevent from having a

1 two-story wall for the entire --

2 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Right, and that
3 addresses -- that also goes back to the point that
4 Pat was making before, is this directive to the Board
5 of Architects too general? Should we be more
6 specific, in light of the goals that we're trying to
7 achieve here? And it seems to me that probably we
8 could be more specific. If we know what the massing
9 problems are, in general terms, then we can say, "We
10 don't want this. We don't want this mass that is a
11 solid wall going 75 feet," for example.

12 MR. SALMAN: And through the Chair, I think
13 what your concern is, is really where -- when they're
14 really right at the setback. If they're beyond the
15 setback, then they could go, you know, continually
16 further down on that two-story portion.

17 MR. SMITH: And I'll tell you what. If you
18 look on Page 9, under Architectural Type, there's a
19 specific list there, things the Board of Architects
20 has to look at, and one of the things we can include
21 in there is the impact of two-story walls on adjacent
22 properties. How do you like that?

23 MR. BEHAR: That's perfect.

24 MR. SALMAN: Can we add the words
25 "continuous two-story walls"?

1 MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

2 MS. KEON: Through the Chair, is there
3 anything wrong with just stating that you can't
4 have -- you know, you can't have it? Because I agree
5 with him, and I hear people say all the time that
6 they've paid an architect to design a home that is in
7 accordance with the Code and whatever, and then they
8 go before the Board of Architects and they have to
9 then change the code (sic) because of the opinion of
10 somebody on the Board, and then there is a
11 significant cost to the homeowner for the changes
12 that have to be made.

13 You know, I just think if you don't want
14 long, uninterrupted walls, you need to say you don't
15 want long, uninterrupted walls, and whether it's
16 that, you know, over a certain amount it needs to be
17 stepped back, you know, whether it needs to break and
18 step back, whether it needs to be interrupted or
19 whatever else.

20 And again, I really think that those people
21 that are designing homes and that have the background
22 and the education as architects can tell you that
23 there is a proportion at which it is no longer
24 aesthetically pleasing.

25 Is that not so?

1 MR. SALMAN: (Nods head).

2 MS. KEON: I do believe that, Dennis, and so
3 I really would like you to, you know, just address
4 just that issue of proportion with those people that
5 have expertise in that field, that say, you know, at
6 what point does a wall, you know, need to be broken
7 in order -- you know, or this long whatever, expanse,
8 need to have a break in it, in order for it to be
9 aesthetically pleasing.

10 MR. SALMAN: I'm thinking, also, of some of
11 the historical homes that are almost a square, where
12 they actually do exceed 40 percent of that depth on a
13 two-story portion, and really the only fenestration
14 is very nicely proportioned windows --

15 MS. KEON: But --

16 MR. SALMAN: -- so that the mass of the wall
17 goes away. I agree with Dennis that it becomes a
18 provision that they look at within their review of
19 the style, and again, I have a problem with the
20 style, but we could talk about that as a separate
21 issue. But we would insert language to the point
22 where it would say something like, "Continuous
23 two-story walls along the setback in excess of 40
24 percent of the lot depth," and that's just something
25 that they have to look at and check off and say,

1 "Hey, you know what? He did it, and he did it very
2 nicely."

3 MS. KEON: That's right.

4 MR. SALMAN: "And we'll let it go." And I
5 guess that answers that question.

6 MR. BEHAR: Whatever that percentage is --

7 MR. SALMAN: Whatever it is.

8 MR. BEHAR: -- needs to be, you know, worked
9 out, arrived to, but just, in principle, something
10 that would prevent to build a two-story home for, you
11 know, the length of the setback to setback. That's
12 one issue.

13 The other, I think one of the most
14 attractive Old Spanish homes in the Gables -- a lot
15 of them incorporate courtyards, and I know -- I think
16 you're penalizing the use of courtyards by counting
17 both floors as square footage, as FAR. I think that,
18 yes, it will push the mass towards the -- to the
19 neighbors, but that's why we're increasing the
20 setbacks, and I think that the usage of courtyards in
21 a home is very charming, very attractive, and I think
22 I would promote to do that, maybe by not counting
23 both floors with the FAR, just the ground floor of
24 the area, and if I understood correctly, the area
25 that that courtyard will encompass, you're counting

1 both floors as floor area. Maybe we should consider
2 only reducing it to the ground floor, because I think
3 a courtyard could be very attractive.

4 That's number two, and the last one I have
5 is the roof pitches. I think you're limiting to,
6 what, four and a half, and something --

7 MR. SMITH: No, we took that out.

8 MR. BEHAR: Okay.

9 MR. SMITH: That's just whatever the Florida
10 Building Code --

11 MR. BEHAR: Will allow?

12 MR. SMITH: -- provides.

13 MR. BEHAR: Okay.

14 MR. AIZENSTAT: So the five by 12, you can
15 do?

16 MR. BEHAR: So, yeah, five --

17 MR. AIZENSTAT: So a five by 12 is
18 allowable?

19 MR. SMITH: Yes. Oh, yes.

20 MR. AIZENSTAT: Because that's very common
21 in the industry.

22 MR. SMITH: Yeah.

23 MR. AIZENSTAT: Okay.

24 MR. BEHAR: That's my comments.

25 MS. MORENO: Robert, what about if the

1 interior courtyard counts double only if it exceeds a
2 certain size?

3 MR. BEHAR: That would work.

4 MS. MORENO: Would that work, then? So
5 that -- what you don't want is a house that is all
6 around a courtyard. You know, that's what you don't
7 want. But if it has a small area --

8 MR. SALMAN: Why not?

9 MS. MORENO: You know --

10 CHAIRMAN KORGE: He doesn't want us to push
11 the mass to the sides of the --

12 MS. MORENO: Because if you do that, then
13 you push everything to the side.

14 MR. BEHAR: But you're increasing the
15 setbacks, right?

16 MR. AIZENSTAT: But you're increasing the
17 setbacks, and either way, people are going to try to
18 maximize. With the value of the properties the way
19 they are, people are going to try to maximize what
20 they can build, and people are going to build to the
21 setback lines, no matter how you look at it.

22 MR. SMITH: And the thing with the
23 courtyards, I'm sorry, but I believe that we're
24 trying to do something to reduce the mass and scale
25 of these homes, and those increase the mass and scale

1 of these homes, and if we take that out, we're going
2 to still have larger homes.

3 That's something that is going to benefit
4 the neighborhood and the compatibility issue much
5 more than allowing the courtyards. I would love to
6 see the courtyards there, but they are making homes
7 out of scale, because I see a lot of them, and the
8 most complaints I get about, are homes with these
9 courtyards in them.

10 Now, when you look at the definition of
11 interior courtyard, okay, it doesn't mean you can't
12 do a courtyard. You can do a courtyard that has a
13 wall that's four feet in height, okay? And that is a
14 very traditional courtyard --

15 MS. MORENO: Yes, it is.

16 MR. SMITH: -- in a lot of the Old Gables
17 style homes. It's the more contemporary homes where
18 you get the big courtyard in the middle that is a
19 problem, and that's what's causing the problem.

20 MR. BEHAR: If you have U-shaped house --

21 MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

22 MR. BEHAR: -- right, open to the back --

23 MR. SMITH: Right.

24 MR. BEHAR: -- and you have a pool in that
25 area, and it's two stories, is that counted twice for

1 that area?

2 MR. SMITH: No, that's not, because that's
3 not a courtyard, and that's giving relief to the
4 people behind you by having that open space towards
5 the rear of the property.

6 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Excuse me for interrupting,
7 but how is that not a courtyard? The definition is
8 at least two sides with building walls. If you've
9 got three sides with building walls, is that --

10 MS. MORENO: And enclosed on all of the
11 other sides.

12 MR. SMITH: Keep reading. Read the
13 definition.

14 CHAIRMAN KORGE: I'm reading it. Just
15 explain to me, so I understand.

16 MS. MORENO: It's enclosed on four sides.

17 MR. AIZENSTAT: If you don't have a wall
18 back there, then you're not enclosing it.

19 CHAIRMAN KORGE: I got you.

20 MR. SMITH: "And enclosed on all the other
21 sides."

22 CHAIRMAN KORGE: I got you.

23 MR. SMITH: Okay.

24 CHAIRMAN KORGE: I got it.

25 MR. SMITH: Good.

1 CHAIRMAN KORGE: My mistake.

2 MS. KEON: Can I ask a question?

3 MR. BEHAR: So only when you have a
4 four-side enclosure, it's considered a courtyard?

5 MR. SMITH: That's correct.

6 MR. BEHAR: Okay.

7 MR. AIZENSTAT: But you can have up to four
8 foot and it's still considered an enclosure, right,
9 if you go to a four-foot wall?

10 MR. SMITH: It's not considered a courtyard
11 if you have a four-foot wall.

12 MR. AIZENSTAT: So, if you close it by three
13 sides and then you put a four-foot on the fourth
14 side --

15 CHAIRMAN KORGE: It's not courtyard.

16 MR. AIZENSTAT: -- it's not a courtyard?

17 MR. SMITH: No, it's not, and we have a lot
18 of those and people do that in the front of their
19 homes all the time, and we didn't want to eliminate
20 that. That helps --

21 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yeah, because that's a nice
22 character.

23 MR. BEHAR: That's fine.

24 MR. SMITH: It's the -- this is aimed at the
25 ones where people are doing the donuts and it's

1 pushing it out, or the one where --

2 MS. MORENO: It's kind of an uncovered
3 atrium, is what they're building.

4 MR. SMITH: That's correct. Or the cases
5 where -- and we've had some where people will do a
6 U-shaped house and then have an eight-foot wing wall
7 in the front that effectively encloses it and makes
8 it look even more massive.

9 MS. KEON: If you build a second story over
10 this courtyard, then it counts as one, is that right?
11 Because I guess then you have the ground floor above
12 it?

13 MR. SMITH: Right.

14 MS. KEON: Okay. Okay.

15 MR. AIZENSTAT: I have several comments and
16 questions. The first one basically relates to the
17 subject itself, Overlay Provisions of the Interim
18 Single-family Regulations. I just want to make sure
19 that I understand it correctly and so does the
20 public. By overlay provisions, you're saying that
21 we're going to incorporate these new provisions into
22 the existing that we have now, which will in turn
23 become our permanent single-family Code, once we
24 complete the whole rewrite procedure; is that
25 correct?

1 MR. RIEL: Yes.

2 MR. SMITH: Yes.

3 MR. AIZENSTAT: The next question that I
4 have --

5 MR. SMITH: Eric did that part.

6 MR. AIZENSTAT: Good, good. The next
7 question I have, you touched on the signs, the size
8 of the signs.

9 MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

10 MR. AIZENSTAT: The size of the signs,
11 currently, in the City of Coral Gables, is eight and
12 a half by five, is that --

13 MR. SMITH: Eight by five.

14 MR. AIZENSTAT: Eight by five.

15 MR. SMITH: 40 square inches.

16 MR. AIZENSTAT: But that is for any sign, as
17 far as realtors and so forth, it's the same size?

18 MR. SMITH: It happens to be for any sign,
19 but in -- the way that it works is, it doesn't say
20 all the signs have to be that size. It says, under
21 signs for real estate signs, they have to be that.
22 Under the Board of Architects, it says they have to
23 be that. Under the Board of Adjustment, it says they
24 have to be that. In the Zoning Code rewrite, we're
25 going to have the provisions for the signs for public

1 notice --

2 MR. AIZENSTAT: Right.

3 MR. SMITH: -- at eight by five, and I think
4 that it may be appropriate to increase that a little
5 bit, because too many people don't see them.

6 MR. AIZENSTAT: Well, my only comment on
7 that is, I agree and I disagree. I think the fact
8 that the colors that the City uses, people actually
9 do recognize the signs, whether they're the orange
10 sign, the green sign or the yellow sign.

11 I think, by doing that, you're kind of
12 admitting that the signs that the common person or
13 the lay person uses, the brokers or so forth, the
14 eight and a half -- the eight by five, is not a good
15 size and people don't see that size. So I would be a
16 little worried about that. I would just want to look
17 into that a little more.

18 The next question that I have for you is,
19 when you're mentioning lots that are 50 by 75 foot in
20 depth within the City --

21 MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

22 MR. AIZENSTAT: -- that makes them about
23 37 -- 3,750 square foot lots. That was based on
24 that --

25 MR. SMITH: No, most of the -- when they're

1 the 75-foot depth, they usually are 100 foot wide --
2 long.

3 MR. AIZENSTAT: But are there any lots that
4 are 75 by 50?

5 MR. BEHAR: No.

6 MR. SMITH: No. Uh-uh.

7 MR. AIZENSTAT: Okay. I just wanted to be
8 clear on that, because the way --

9 MR. SMITH: Along some parts of Riviera,
10 they are 75 by 100.

11 MR. AIZENSTAT: It wouldn't be a buildable
12 site?

13 MR. SMITH: Huh?

14 MR. AIZENSTAT: It wouldn't be a buildable
15 site, under 5,000.

16 MR. BEHAR: I don't think we have any.

17 MR. AIZENSTAT: Okay, I just want to make
18 sure on that, because the way I interpreted it was
19 that there could be some sites that are 50 by 75.

20 MR. SMITH: Uh-huh. We have some that are
21 40 by 100.

22 MR. AIZENSTAT: And because they're not --
23 okay, but 75 by 50, we don't have?

24 MR. SMITH: No.

25 MR. AIZENSTAT: Okay.

1 CHAIRMAN KORGE: So 40 by 100 would not be a
2 buildable site?

3 MR. SMITH: Yes, it would be.

4 CHAIRMAN KORGE: It would be, but you'd have
5 to build on -- never mind. Okay.

6 MR. AIZENSTAT: The next question which I
7 get into is in the height of residences, specifically
8 in flood hazard districts. Who determines the height
9 that a house has to be built above a certain grade
10 for flood?

11 MR. SALMAN: FEMA.

12 MS. KEON: FEMA.

13 MR. AIZENSTAT: That's FEMA?

14 MR. SMITH: That's FEMA.

15 MR. HERNANDEZ: FEMA.

16 MR. AIZENSTAT: Okay. Is that a number that
17 is given by FEMA that is specific and does not
18 change, or is that a number that has changed from
19 time to time?

20 MR. SMITH: It has changed. It changes
21 probably every 10 or 12 years. They'll come in and
22 they'll do a study.

23 MR. AIZENSTAT: The reason -- the reason I'm
24 asking that question is because you're going to --
25 the way I read it, you're going to 39 feet because of

1 the flood.

2 MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

3 MR. AIZENSTAT: If that number changes, what
4 do you do with that 39 feet?

5 MR. SMITH: We look at it. At times, it's
6 been as high as 42 feet.

7 MR. AIZENSTAT: Right. So then would it be
8 not more appropriate to go ahead and decide that you
9 need to go X amount of feet above whatever that grade
10 line is, as opposed to being specific in the Code and
11 saying 39 feet?

12 MR. SMITH: No, because what happens then
13 is -- you mean, so many feet above the flood
14 elevation?

15 MR. AIZENSTAT: Exactly.

16 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Right.

17 MR. SMITH: The way the flood zones work,
18 they come in from the bay.

19 MR. AIZENSTAT: Okay.

20 MR. SMITH: So you're going to have homes
21 that are much taller, you know, at the bayfront, and
22 the homes are going to get shorter as they come
23 inland, because in some areas, like if you have -- if
24 you're in a VE zone, a VE-14 zone, the bottom of your
25 structural member has to be at 14, not the finished

1 floor. So then you add two feet on top of that.
2 That house is starting at maybe 16 feet, where a
3 house two doors down is starting at 11. So you'll
4 see these big differences in height. I think you
5 keep a constant point --

6 MR. AIZENSTAT: You'll be okay with that?

7 MR. SMITH: -- with the crown of the road.
8 It's been working out fine.

9 MR. AIZENSTAT: Okay, good.

10 The next comment is -- first of all, are
11 septic tanks counted in your green area?

12 MR. SMITH: Septic tanks?

13 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yeah, the area of septic
14 tanks that you use, that's counted as part of the
15 green area?

16 MR. SMITH: Yeah, and whatever is above it
17 is counted as green space.

18 MR. AIZENSTAT: What I'd like to ask,
19 actually, the architects on our Board is, there's a
20 20 percent that would be required in the front of
21 your landscaping. How do you feel about that? Is
22 that too much? Is it too little?

23 MR. SALMAN: It actually works out to be --

24 MR. SMITH: About eight percent.

25 MS. MORENO: It's 20 percent of 40 percent.

1 MR. SALMAN: When you actually -- when you
2 actually do the calculation for green area
3 requirements for septic tanks --

4 MR. AIZENSTAT: Right.

5 MR. SALMAN: -- you're over that number,
6 anyway, so 20 percent is not a hurdle.

7 CHAIRMAN KORGE: That's 20 percent of 40
8 percent, correct?

9 MR. SMITH: That's correct.

10 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Okay.

11 MR. AIZENSTAT: Okay, and is that going to
12 take people to actually put their septic tanks in the
13 front, as opposed to the rear?

14 MR. SALMAN: The Code requires that now.

15 MR. AIZENSTAT: They're required to do that?

16 MR. SALMAN: When you change or upgrade, you
17 have to move it to the front or do an accessible
18 route.

19 MR. SMITH: Yeah.

20 MR. AIZENSTAT: Okay, thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Okay. I guess I'm up.

22 The first question -- I'm just going page by
23 page. Page 2, the rear setback is being increased,
24 correct?

25 MR. SMITH: Yes.

1 CHAIRMAN KORGE: How is that going to
2 affect -- will that affect swimming pools at all?

3 MR. SMITH: No. Swimming pools are in the
4 auxiliary structure provision, and we're looking at
5 the setbacks for swimming pools and we're going to
6 include that with the Zoning Code rewrite.

7 CHAIRMAN KORGE: So that could be a
8 five-foot setback, as opposed to 10?

9 MR. SMITH: Right now it's five feet for the
10 swimming pool.

11 CHAIRMAN KORGE: So you haven't changed that
12 in this?

13 MR. SMITH: No, uh-uh, because we're not
14 doing anything on swimming pools with this.

15 CHAIRMAN KORGE: You answered my question
16 on Page 3.

17 Page 4, at Paragraph 8, regarding the
18 swimming pools again, as auxiliary buildings, is that
19 existing law? You'll see, that's like the fourth
20 sentence, "Auxiliary buildings or structures,
21 including swimming pools, may occupy additional
22 ground coverage, but the total ground area occupied
23 by the main building or structure and auxiliary
24 structures shall not exceed 45 percent of the
25 building site upon which the structures are located."

1 Is that the existing law?

2 MR. SMITH: That's the existing Code.

3 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Thank you.

4 Paragraph 9, the square footage. When we
5 get to the large lots, not the smaller ones, but the
6 larger ones, when we get into an acres lot, are we
7 reducing the square footage on an acre or larger lot?

8 MR. SMITH: No, we're not, because we --

9 CHAIRMAN KORGE: It's the same as under the
10 existing Code?

11 MR. SMITH: It's the same as the existing
12 Code.

13 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Okay. What -- I wanted to
14 ask this question before, but on Page 5, where you
15 have on the screened porch a requirement that a
16 covenant shall be submitted, stating that the
17 screened porch will never be enclosed, why would we
18 need such a covenant?

19 MR. SMITH: Because a lot of people buy a
20 home with a screened porch and they buy it with the
21 intent to take the screens out and put windows in,
22 and we want the covenant so that the buyer knows,
23 "Oh, I can't go ahead and put windows in there, like
24 the seller is telling me to."

25 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Okay, just to be clear,

1 then, if we didn't have a covenant required, they
2 still wouldn't be able to put those?

3 MR. SMITH: They still wouldn't be able to
4 do it.

5 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Got you. Okay, I
6 understand. That makes sense.

7 MR. SMITH: This is for notice.

8 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Okay.

9 On porches, where you deleted open porches,
10 deleted the word "open" --

11 MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

12 CHAIRMAN KORGE: -- I would suggest, if it's
13 not in the defined terms that we've been provided --

14 MR. SMITH: Porch is a defined term. Open
15 porch is not.

16 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Okay. So porch is already
17 defined there. I didn't bother to look.

18 MR. SMITH: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN KORGE: On Page 6, Paragraph 13b, I
20 read it to be 20 percent of 40 percent, but it's
21 not really clear. I would put in there some
22 parenthetical language to clarify that we're talking
23 about 20 percent of 40 percent, just a suggestion.

24 MR. SMITH: Okay. We can say at least 20
25 percent of the required 40 percent landscaped open

1 space.

2 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Yeah.

3 MR. AIZENSTAT: I read it the same way as he
4 did.

5 MS. MORENO: I had the same question, is it
6 20 percent of 40 percent or 20 percent of the total?

7 MS. KEON: 20 percent of 40.

8 MR. SMITH: It's 20 percent of the 40
9 percent.

10 MS. MORENO: Yeah. It reads better 20
11 percent of 40 percent, but I think if all of us had
12 questions, it's better to clarify it.

13 MR. SMITH: Yeah. No doubt about it.

14 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Okay. Page 9, we have --
15 on Page 9, at the top of the page, "the classical
16 style of Colonial, Spanish, Venetian, Italian or
17 other Mediterranean or similar harmonious
18 architecture."

19 Then we go down, after Number 16 of all the
20 enumerated items, "The architectural type for a given
21 location, unless specified to the contrary, shall be
22 in harmony with the architecture of its particular
23 neighborhood."

24 So, if the neighborhood's architecture style
25 is, you know, a 1950s ranch style, then everybody has

1 to continue in the 1950 ranch style; is that correct?

2 MR. SMITH: No.

3 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Well, that's the way I read
4 it.

5 MR. BEHAR: Right.

6 MR. AIZENSTAT: That was my problem.

7 CHAIRMAN KORGE: You know, that's what it
8 says, literally. So you need to work on that. I'm
9 just saying that the way I read this is that if
10 you -- if you're on a block that has all 1950 ranch
11 style and you want to put Mediterranean or some other
12 style in, you can't do it. It's not in harmony with
13 the existing neighborhood, so you've got to stay with
14 the style that has been adopted in that existing
15 neighborhood.

16 MR. SMITH: Okay.

17 CHAIRMAN KORGE: That doesn't make sense to
18 you?

19 MR. SMITH: No.

20 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Architectural -- "The
21 architectural type for a given location, unless
22 specified to the contrary, shall be in harmony with
23 the architecture of its particular neighborhood."

24 So, if you knock down a 1950 style home, you
25 know, low ranch style home, in a block that's all

1 ranch style homes, you have to replace it with a
2 similar ranch style home.

3 MS. MORENO: Yeah, I had that same problem
4 when we were talking about that area north of Eighth
5 Street on Ponce --

6 MR. SMITH: Uh-huh. Uh-huh, okay.

7 MS. MORENO: -- because I thought that if
8 you were in neighborhood where everybody was one
9 story, that you couldn't build a two-story, and I
10 don't think that's what we want.

11 MR. SMITH: No, uh-huh. I understand what
12 you're saying, but I think what we want to -- okay, I
13 have to bring some of the language from the top --

14 MR. BEHAR: Contextually.

15 MR. SMITH: -- down to the bottom.

16 MS. MORENO: Uh-huh.

17 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Right. There was something
18 else --

19 MS. MORENO: Because you do want to provide
20 for some change, especially in areas like that Ponce
21 area, that east of -- I mean, north of Eighth Street
22 area.

23 MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

24 MS. MORENO: If people want to now put in
25 nicer homes, you don't want to prevent them from

1 building a two-story home, absolutely.

2 MR. SMITH: Oh, and right off of LeJeune,
3 there's a big neighborhood of '50s ranch homes that,
4 you know, are in the process of being redeveloped.

5 MR. SALMAN: Excuse me. Through the Chair,
6 part of what makes our community so distinct is not
7 the architectural style of the actual buildings; it's
8 the way we have organized the boundaries between the
9 buildings, the open spaces, the uniformity of it,
10 such that architectural style, which is my problem
11 with this whole thing about creating a limit to it --

12 MS. MORENO: I agree with that, too.

13 MR. SALMAN: -- limits possibilities for
14 growth, and changes architecture from a stylistic
15 approach to a design of a building to an actual
16 creation of a work of art or architecture, and I'd
17 like to hear what my other colleague has to say about
18 it, but certainly, I don't like being limited to a
19 style of architecture. I think that we, as
20 architects, when we do things, sometimes we abstract,
21 sometimes we interpret.

22 You know, I defy Mr. Hernandez to describe
23 his as being Colonial or Mediterranean. I think he
24 has certain elements of all those issues, but
25 fundamentally, he has a deep understanding of the

1 open areas and the respect for the language of the
2 boundaries that we've created.

3 MR. SMITH: Well, and the thing is, the fact
4 of the matter, there are neighborhoods where we have
5 allowed contemporary architecture. So we don't
6 disallow that, and I think that the answer to the
7 question here is in Line 5, okay, where we say, you
8 know, "style of Colonial, Spanish, Venetian, Italian
9 or other Mediterranean or similar harmonious
10 architecture." I think where it says "similar
11 harmonious architecture," we need to change that to
12 "architecture that is in character" or "architecture
13 in character with the neighborhood," to allow other
14 styles.

15 MS. MORENO: I hate that, and I'm not an
16 architect. I think one of the beauties of Coral
17 Gables is, you have a variety, and though I may not
18 like our California ranch style house, it is a
19 variety of architecture, and it should be permitted.
20 It shouldn't be prohibited.

21 MR. SALMAN: It's the predominant one.

22 MS. MORENO: As is the case if you wanted to
23 build a very modern home. You know, why should we
24 prohibit that? It may not be my taste, and, you
25 know, there's styles of architecture in Coral Gables

1 that we're not including here. There's Key West
2 homes in Coral Gables. There's plantation style
3 houses. There's New Orleans style houses. And you
4 don't have any of that in here.

5 MR. SALMAN: Bahamian.

6 MS. MORENO: I don't want us to end up
7 looking like a planned unit development. That's not
8 what we are. We're about variety, and all this stuff
9 about harmonious and looking at the neighborhood on
10 the both sides and the context, you end up looking
11 like a planned unit development. That's not Coral
12 Gables.

13 MR. SMITH: Well, I'll tell you what --

14 MS. MORENO: I have felt strongly about this
15 from way back when we did the Mediterranean Style
16 Ordinance.

17 MR. SMITH: I know. I know. You know, and
18 it's kind of hard to take the Mediterranean style
19 architecture out of Coral Gables.

20 MS. MORENO: I'm not saying to take it out.
21 I'm just saying, don't mandate. I live in an Old
22 Spanish, 1923 home. That is my taste. But I don't
23 have to make it your taste.

24 MR. SMITH: Yeah.

25 MS. MORENO: And I don't have to say, "Frank

1 Lloyd Wright, you can't build in Coral Gables," you
2 know, "I.M. Pei, you can't build in Coral Gables," or
3 whoever, all these other architects that have come up
4 with different styles. Why am I saying that to --
5 you know, stagnating Coral Gables to one style.

6 Sure, it's a predominant style, it's part of what
7 makes us, but it's sufficiently established that it
8 doesn't need to be mandated.

9 MR. SMITH: Well, that's a policy decision
10 that the Board has to make, whatever direction you'd
11 like to recommend.

12 MR. BEHAR: I would agree with you. I
13 purchased a lot outside the City of Coral Gables. At
14 some point, I will build myself a contemporary modern
15 house. At that time, I have to move out of Coral
16 Gables. So I would agree with you a hundred percent.
17 Now, how do we work with that? I don't know.

18 MS. MORENO: Well, maybe some of the other
19 people -- maybe we should let the audience speak.

20 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Well, I have a couple more
21 things and then --

22 MS. MORENO: Okay, sorry.

23 CHAIRMAN KORGE: It's all right.

24 I had skipped over one question I had on

25 Page 3, regarding the height of the buildings.

1 MR. SMITH: Okay. Regarding what?

2 CHAIRMAN KORGE: In particular, we specify,
3 in Paragraph 6, the height of 29 feet above
4 established grade, including, and I quote,
5 "ridgeline, domes, steeples, towers, cupolas,
6 decorative features and such other similar
7 structures," and then excluding the chimneys.

8 Just out of curiosity, if we're going to
9 include these things that tend to project over the
10 building, like a tower or whatever --

11 MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

12 CHAIRMAN KORGE: -- aren't we telling
13 architects, "Don't use those," because it's going to
14 bring the height of the rest of the building down?

15 MR. SMITH: No, because you can use those
16 at a lower height. You may use those on a one-story
17 element or a lower story element, or on an element
18 that comes up to the height of the roof.

19 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Let me restate the
20 question, then. Does that really create a massing
21 problem, a tower? Like, you know, you see these --
22 sometimes you'll see some of these two-story
23 buildings in the front, where they'll have a circular
24 staircase and then a big tower that goes up and then
25 it has a --

1 MS. MORENO: A little cupola.

2 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Yeah.

3 MR. SMITH: You're pushing up the height of
4 the house, because right now, if they want to do it,
5 one of their options is to lower the height of the
6 house. We're doing everything here to try and get
7 them to lower the height, the scale and the massing.

8 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Well, no, they're not going
9 to lower the height of the house. That's not
10 realistic. What's going to happen --

11 MR. SMITH: Sometimes they do, to
12 accommodate some of those types of features. They'll
13 lower a portion of the house to do that. It becomes
14 a design issue. You don't have to have those
15 features at the very top of the house.

16 MS. MORENO: But there's a historic home --

17 MR. SMITH: You can have them on the side.

18 MS. MORENO: There's a historic home on
19 Alhambra that has that feature, and it's beautiful.

20 MS. KEON: But -- excuse me. I think that
21 when they're on larger lots and they're larger homes,
22 I don't think that you -- they don't seem to give you
23 that sense of being so huge, and I think what you're
24 directing this at is on those homes -- if you took
25 those same elements and you put them on a 50-by-100-

1 foot lot, it just -- it makes them look -- that
2 additional amount of height that you grant to that
3 home makes them look so huge and imposing in a
4 neighborhood, where on a larger lot, a 100-foot lot
5 or a 125 or a 200-foot lot, it doesn't, but on those
6 50-foot lots -- and I don't know if at some point you
7 need to change -- you know, if you want to not affect
8 that by -- you know, or make it different when the
9 lot size is bigger, but on those 50-foot lots, I
10 think that that's a -- that's a really significant
11 issue, is the height.

12 CHAIRMAN KORGE: They did that on --

13 MR. SMITH: And that's --

14 MS. MORENO: I think I agree with her.
15 That's the problem.

16 MS. KEON: Yeah.

17 MR. SMITH: That's an existing provision
18 that hasn't been a design problem that anybody has
19 come forward and --

20 CHAIRMAN KORGE: So that's not an issue?

21 MS. MORENO: This is existing? Okay.

22 MR. SMITH: Where they've had design
23 problems is with the chimneys, because of the
24 Building Code requirement, but nobody has ever
25 presented that as a problem to their design or their

1 ability to design.

2 CHAIRMAN KORGE: But the height has always
3 been higher before now. Now you've got -- you're
4 bringing the height down, right? We're bringing down
5 the height of the building.

6 MR. SMITH: Absolutely.

7 MS. KEON: Yeah.

8 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Okay, we're bringing down
9 the height of the building, so we're bringing down
10 the height of the interior ceilings, necessarily.
11 There's some push and pull, I suppose, but
12 ultimately, the higher ceilings, which are desirable,
13 are brought down. So I suspect -- I may be wrong
14 about this, but I suspect that anybody building a new
15 house will go to the maximum height, to get the
16 largest volume of the ceilings, which means to me
17 that things like these towers and so forth --

18 MS. MORENO: Will disappear.

19 CHAIRMAN KORGE: -- are not going to work.
20 They're just not going to work.

21 MR. SMITH: They go to the maximum height
22 now, though.

23 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Yeah, but the maximum
24 height now is five feet higher. So we're going to
25 basically kill that. I just want to be clear about

1 it. It seems to me that those features are going to
2 be less usable in the future, and I don't know that I
3 agree with your assessment that those features add
4 significantly to the massing of the building.
5 Normally, those features are, you know, in the middle
6 of the building, and they're like a peak at --
7 they're not on the edges, that kind of impose onto
8 the neighbors. But that's just my view.

9 Then I had one more question, on Page 10,
10 where we are going to bury the utilities.

11 MR. SMITH: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN KORGE: I just want to be real
13 clear on this. Are we burying just the connecting
14 line to the building, or are we also burying the
15 distribution lines?

16 MR. SMITH: No, just the service. That's
17 just the connecting line --

18 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Just the connecting lines.

19 MR. SMITH: -- to the building.

20 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Okay, that's what service
21 lines literally means?

22 MR. SMITH: That's correct, yes.

23 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Okay.

24 MS. MORENO: Do we have that already?

25 MR. SMITH: No, we don't. And we're not,

1 you know, whole scale requiring people to do it.

2 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Right.

3 MR. SMITH: But when they do something
4 substantial, they need to do it. We need to start
5 doing that.

6 MS. KEON: Absolutely.

7 CHAIRMAN KORGE: I read the requirements,
8 and when it would be required, and it didn't strike
9 me as unreasonable --

10 MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

11 CHAIRMAN KORGE: -- or unnecessarily
12 burdensome.

13 MR. AIZENSTAT: And the utilities do
14 cooperate and allow a person to -- I know they do
15 with Florida Power and Light, but sometimes with
16 cable or so forth, they tell you that they won't or
17 they can't.

18 MS. KEON: They all do.

19 MR. SMITH: No, on your property? Yeah.

20 MR. SALMAN: They all do. You've just got
21 to provide them a conduit up to the pole, and they
22 specify the conduit, and they'll come and pull it for
23 you. Your cost, from a construction point of view,
24 is really the trenching and the setting of the
25 conduit.

1 MR. SMITH: It's the trenching.

2 MR. SALMAN: The cost is minimal, and
3 really, Dennis is codifying something which is almost
4 a standard practice now when you do a major
5 remodeling on a house.

6 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Okay, are there any more
7 questions from the Board?

8 Why don't we invite members of the public to
9 speak? Do you want to read off the list of people
10 who have signed up --

11 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN KORGE: -- for us, please?

13 MR. BEHAR: Thank you, Dennis.

14 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: The first speaker is
15 Elaine Codias.

16 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Please state your name and
17 address for the record.

18 MS. CODIAS: It's Elaine Codias, 1604
19 Casilla Street, Coral Gables.

20 I'd like to say that generally I would
21 support the proposed changes, especially the lowering
22 of the maximum allowed height for new buildings. I
23 think this would be great.

24 There are, however, a couple of issues I
25 wanted to comment on. One is something that Mr.

1 Smith raised, and that's the issue of notification.
2 If a building is going to be torn down or there's
3 going to be a major renovation, what is the
4 notification that would occur to the neighbors? Is
5 it simply the posting of the sign for the hearing?

6 CHAIRMAN KORGE: I believe so.

7 MR. SALMAN: That's it.

8 MS. CODIAS: Okay. I would like to suggest
9 that more notification than that would be very
10 helpful, at least to the -- perhaps to the
11 neighborhood that would be considered by the
12 architects, in other words, both sides of the street,
13 maybe, and the buildings in back.

14 And I think Mr. Smith also said he thought
15 that was impractical, but right now, I think for a
16 variance hearing, are not letters sent out?

17 MS. KEON: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Yes.

19 MS. CODIAS: And I think you could make the
20 point that most variances have to do with much
21 smaller changes than what we're talking about in
22 tearing down a whole building and rebuilding. So
23 that's one comment.

24 The second issue is as regards buildings
25 that are being constructed which are very similar in

1 design, and I've brought this up several times in
2 front of this group and others. There are four
3 buildings in our immediate neighborhood that look so
4 similar as to look like a subdivision. I have
5 pictures of them with me. I've brought them before.

6 Now, as I understand it, this issue would be
7 covered by Section 15-5, the duplication of
8 elevations and/or exterior architectural design, and
9 as I read through the proposed changes, I don't see
10 any changes proposed to that section.

11 MS. MORENO: Excuse me, I have a question
12 for Robert.

13 How does the Board of Architects know
14 whether a building duplicates another building?

15 MR. BEHAR: If the architect -- to my
16 knowledge, if the architect is repeating -- or, he
17 cannot repeat a project, because you have to sign a
18 letter saying that this is not duplicating a project,
19 but to my knowledge, and maybe Dennis could help us,
20 I don't know, how else will you be able to do it, to
21 know?

22 MR. SMITH: Yeah, right now, what the
23 architect has to do is, he has to have a statement on
24 his plans that he signs and seals, stating that he's
25 not duplicating any elevation. But that is something

1 that sometimes the architect will take on this street
2 and do it this way, and then flip the house, two
3 streets over, that, you know, I would like to see
4 addressed, as well. But that section of the Code,
5 which is in the administrative part of the Zoning
6 Code rewrite, is not a part of what we're doing here
7 tonight.

8 MS. CODIAS: Well --

9 MS. MORENO: Okay, can you take note of
10 that, Eric, so we address it there?

11 MR. SMITH: That will come with the Code
12 rewrite.

13 MS. CODIAS: But it's Section 15-5. You
14 have rewritten Section 15-1 tonight.

15 MR. SMITH: Yes, because that deals with the
16 design, the specific design of the residence, and
17 it's under the performance standards. What you're
18 talking about will be under the administrative
19 provisions of the Code, because it's a part of the
20 application process, that they have to provide the
21 affidavit.

22 MS. CODIAS: So there are going to be
23 changes considered for that section, you're saying?

24 MR. SMITH: Right now, there are none in
25 the Zoning Code rewrite. It's going to be the same

1 language. But you can ask for there to be changes.

2 MS. MORENO: I have just asked Eric to make
3 note of it, so that when we review that provision, we
4 consider that.

5 MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

6 MS. CODIAS: Okay, because right now, 15-5
7 says you may not duplicate. Well, these houses are
8 not duplicated exactly, but they look like -- you
9 know, they have very slight changes to make them look
10 not duplicated. But it looks like a subdivision,
11 basically, and I don't think that's something that we
12 want in these neighborhoods of custom-built homes.

13 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Right.

14 MS. CODIAS: So --

15 MS. MORENO: They will.

16 MS. CODIAS: Okay, thank you.

17 MS. MORENO: Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Thank you.

19 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Ignacio Zabaleta.

20 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Please state your name and
21 address for the record.

22 MR. ZABALETA: Good evening, Mr. Chairman,
23 Members of the Board. My name is Ignacio Zabaleta,
24 with Eastshore International, 2727 Salzedo Street.

25 I want to thank Dennis for the document he's

1 put together. It's very thoughtful, and what a
2 difference a year makes. Hopefully, some of my input
3 will assist you in making your decisions and maybe
4 give you a little bit of helpful direction.

5 I'd like to say first, though, that on Page
6 5, the issue of the garages is a little problematic
7 still for me, for a couple of reasons, and the first
8 one, the -- I guess the justification for counting
9 the garages as -- at full, for FAR. Right now, the
10 way it's written, we're allowed to count it as half
11 if it's one story, if we maintain at one story. That
12 was taken away because of a massing concern, and I
13 would -- I would ask the architects on the Board and
14 also in the audience. I think they would concur that
15 in the item number five there, Line 4, "Screened
16 porches shall be computed at one half" -- I think the
17 design professionals would agree that the mass of a
18 screened porch is no different than the mass of a
19 garage. You're still dealing with a solid, and so
20 really, the massing aspect doesn't hold a lot of -- a
21 lot of weight for me.

22 If you're giving the 50 percent break to the
23 screened porches, I think you should maintain it for
24 the garages, and at the very least, if you would, as
25 a compromise -- say we have a two-car garage -- let

1 us take the second parking space at half. In other
2 words, penalize us the full amount for the initial
3 parking garage space, but then the second and
4 subsequent, up to the maximum of four, I believe it
5 is now, at 50 percent. And the reason I do this, I'd
6 like you to consider the effect that it has on air
7 conditioned area.

8 I took six projects that we have currently
9 on the boards, as it were, and I'll just run down and
10 tell you how this provision would affect those. A
11 two-car garage on a project we're doing on Tivoli, we
12 were able to count it at half since we maintained it
13 as a one-story.

14 CHAIRMAN KORGE: What lot size is that?

15 MR. ZABALETA: It's a hundred by hundred.

16 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Yeah.

17 MR. ZABALETA: The total FAR for the garage
18 was 273 square foot. Under the proposed, the figure
19 would go to 545 square feet, which would eliminate
20 approximately a 17-by-17-foot air conditioned area
21 that we could incorporate into the house.

22 In Gables Estates, we are on a three-car
23 garage project, a house with a three-car garage. We
24 were allowed to take the garages -- again, they're
25 one-story, massing being the concern -- 424 square

1 feet. Under the proposed, it would be 848, which
2 would take away a potential 21-by-21-square-foot --
3 21-by-21 area of AC space.

4 CHAIRMAN KORGE: And what size lot was
5 that?

6 MR. ZABALETA: That is between half an acre
7 and three quarters of an acre.

8 CHAIRMAN KORGE: I'm sorry?

9 MR. ZABALETA: Between half an acre and
10 three quarters of an acre.

11 There's another property we're working on in
12 Gables Estates, the same deal.

13 In Snapper Creek, a three-car garage, with
14 storage and work bench and that sort of thing. We
15 were able to take that 50 percent credit, 557 square
16 feet. That would jump up to 1,113 square feet, which
17 eliminates a 24-by-24-foot area that we could provide
18 for the owners.

19 Journey's End, a three-car garage, the same
20 thing.

21 In Gables Estates, a project with a four-car
22 garage jumps from 736 square feet, which we were
23 allowed, to --

24 MR. BEHAR: Let me interrupt.

25 MR. ZABALETA: Yes.

1 MR. BEHAR: What's the floor area, the FAR
2 for that house, for those particular -- the last one,
3 Journey's End. How much floor area are you building?

4 MR. ZABALETA: Journey's End, 8,000 square
5 feet.

6 MR. BEHAR: And you're allowed to do the
7 8,000 square feet?

8 MR. ZABALETA: That's AC at full and garages
9 at half, because we kept them at one story.

10 The four-car garage in Gables Estates, 736
11 square feet. We were able to count that at the 50
12 percent. It would jump to 1472, so as -- it becomes
13 an incremental penalty here.

14 Given all the other constraints that we're
15 faced with, setbacks and so forth, it's really
16 troublesome, and I'd ask you to consider mitigating
17 that Line Number 6 in some fashion, to at least give
18 us a break in garage storage areas that exceed the
19 one required.

20 The same thing on Page 6, as it applies to
21 the larger lots. That would be Line Number 9. We
22 would hope that you would let us maintain what -- or
23 keep what the Zoning Code now says, which is if we
24 keep the garage at one story, that we be allowed to
25 count it as 50 percent in the FAR.

1 On Page 9, regarding the issues of
2 harmonious architecture, I think it's a matter of
3 semantics, really. You could strike "similar
4 harmonious" at the top and "harmonious" at the
5 bottom, and put in "compatible." My wife and I are
6 certainly very different. She's a German Swede.
7 We've been married for 20 years. So I think we're
8 compatible, yet outwardly, we may not be harmonious
9 in our --

10 And I think the more salient standing point
11 here which you should keep in mind at the end of the
12 paragraph that continues to Page 10, when you have a
13 historically designated building structure, it's very
14 important that you distinguish any addition that you
15 do to that building from the existing, the original.
16 There's specific language as to a clear separation.
17 They don't want you -- the Secretary of Interior
18 standards does not -- would not allow you to continue
19 that language, in other words, if we had -- take any
20 of the historically registered homes on North
21 Greenway, as Dennis was pointing out. We could not
22 replicate, in an addition, the vocabulary used in the
23 original structure, because you would diminish the
24 value, the historic value, of that structure.

25 So, in the same way, we can do an addition

1 which is compatible. It can be a completely
2 different expression. It could be a transparent
3 glass addition. That's not saying it's not
4 compatible. It is compatible within the standards of
5 the Secretary of Interior. So keep that in mind when
6 we're talking about styles and harmony and so forth.
7 Compatible doesn't necessarily mean it has to be the
8 same.

9 And that's really all I have for you.

10 CHAIRMAN KORGE: I have one question for
11 you.

12 MR. ZABALETA: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN KORGE: On Page 4, the maximum
14 square foot floor area for single-family residences,
15 on the large lots, the ones where you -- at the 30
16 percent for the remainder of the building site
17 area --

18 MR. ZABALETA: Uh-huh.

19 CHAIRMAN KORGE: -- does that work for the
20 really large lots in Gables Estates and those areas?

21 MR. ZABALETA: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Okay. Thank you.

23 MR. ZABALETA: You're welcome. Thank you.

24 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Bruce Katz.

25 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Can you state your name and

1 address for the record?

2 (Thereupon, Mr. Behar left the Commission
3 Chambers.)

4 MR. KATZ: I'm Bruce Katz. I live at 645
5 Majorca. I'd like to thank the Board here, and I
6 have a couple comments.

7 We didn't touch upon an issue which I think
8 is important, which is the aggregation of lots. I
9 know, certainly, it's been brought up at previous
10 meetings throughout the last year or two.

11 I think, you know, it's interesting how it
12 was brought up earlier that on Greenway, all the
13 houses there have to be double lots, and because all
14 the houses are double lots, they all look good
15 because they're all of a similar size. The problem
16 is, some people with a lot of money can buy two,
17 three, four contiguous lots and make a gigantic house
18 that is absolutely not in character with the rest of
19 the neighborhood, but at the same time will meet the
20 requirements as put down by this Code, other than
21 perhaps a review by the Board.

22 I had suggested before and I still think
23 it's a good idea that if somebody wants to buy more
24 than one lot, contiguous lots, or aggregate lots,
25 that's okay, but you can't build a house bigger than

1 you could have on the biggest of those lots. So the
2 advantage of buying contiguous lots at that point
3 would be that you can put it in the center and have a
4 lot of greenery around the edges. But that's
5 something that is going to come up, because the
6 amount of land that we have here is obviously very
7 limited, and as more and more money comes into play,
8 you're going to find people making offers that cannot
9 be refused, and then it's just not going to work for
10 the rest of us.

11 I wanted to state that I definitely agree
12 with Robert Behar about the Berlin Wall, if I can
13 call it that. I think it's terrible, and I think
14 that's a good issue that needs to be addressed.

15 I also wanted to say that I agreed with Pat
16 Keon on the idea of the smaller front garages.
17 Without a doubt, that makes a lot of sense. I mean,
18 if somebody wants to have a massive two or three-car
19 garage, then they shouldn't be buying a lot that's
20 only 50 feet wide. And if they can't afford it,
21 well, I don't know what to say, other than, maybe
22 Coral Gables is not the place for them, or they have
23 to be content with a one-car garage, but you know,
24 it's interesting that we're talking about a smaller
25 front garage. You know, I think that definitely is a

1 better solution than what we have right now. I think
2 a better solution would be a detached garage in the
3 rear, which is what I have in my 1925 house. I would
4 almost mandate that, if we possibly could, because by
5 putting the garage in the rear, it looks a lot
6 better.

7 On Majorca, I live in the 600 block. If you
8 look at the 700 block, there was somebody who had a
9 double lot, they built a house many years ago on one
10 lot and they sold the second lot and they've built a
11 new house there now, and it's an Old Spanish house
12 and they did a very good job and it has a detached
13 garage in the back. And so I think that would be
14 the answer.

15 I live in a two-story home that's 24 feet
16 high. I don't have to duck my head, certainly, when
17 I go in. I'm six foot one. So, you know, I think we
18 have to be realistic that 29 feet is definitely a
19 workable number, and if in 1925 they could design a
20 two-story home that's 24 feet, today with all the
21 computers and all the studies, we can do one at 29
22 and no one is going to suffer, and I think I also
23 agree very much with Dennis that we don't need to add
24 any more of these items that's going to go above the
25 29-foot limit. I think that number should be kept

1 sacred, and that's it.

2 Just a couple more quick items here. I
3 guess the side setbacks seems to be an issue that
4 some people feel very strongly about on both sides,
5 and I think it's good that people express. I happen
6 to agree with Cristina Moreno, who, you know,
7 basically mentioned, why do you need a two-car garage
8 on a small lot?

9 If there was some way, right now, we could
10 magically open up every single garage in Coral Gables
11 and look at them on a projected television at this
12 very moment, I would really seriously doubt that more
13 than -- and we could do this at two o'clock in the
14 morning, it doesn't matter. I would seriously doubt
15 that more than 20 percent of the garage spaces are
16 taken up by garages. I think we have to look at the
17 fact that this has been a way that people have been
18 able to get more space by calling it a garage, but
19 it's not. It's not a garage. They've been able to
20 get more space for the years, and I applaud the panel
21 at trying to finally close this loophole, and I also
22 would recommend that you try your best to resist
23 temptation to alter what seems to be good here.

24 But getting back to the side setbacks, I
25 really believe that the minimum of -- the minimum

1 should be 10 feet on each side except on the very
2 small houses.

3 So the idea that you could have one side 15
4 feet and the other side five feet, I think is wrong,
5 and the reason why I think it's wrong is, in the
6 meetings that I've been up here in the last two
7 years -- I mean, this has been going on, it seems,
8 forever, but it's good, because it's important. I've
9 heard reasons -- I remember one time where we should
10 allow someone to have only five feet on one side
11 because if you have 15 feet on the other side, you
12 could bring a boat to the back of your house, and
13 once again, I'm not here to be for or against that
14 particular use, but the person who's on the five-foot
15 side is being penalized. So, if you need 15 feet to
16 bring a boat in, you either dock the boat somewhere
17 else, other than at your house, or you buy a bigger
18 lot. But the person should not be penalized and have
19 only a five-foot setback.

20 And, you know, there's a gigantic loophole
21 here, where you talk about existing contextual
22 condition, and I understand that we need a way out
23 for certain limited occasions, but I'm concerned that
24 this is going to be used for more than just limited
25 occasions, and I wish there was a way we could close

1 this with language that would be a lot stronger.

2 I feel that this is an excellent opportunity
3 to close a very big problem. Let's face it. The
4 whole reason this whole started -- this whole thing
5 started, two years ago, was because of the appearance
6 of homes that seemed too large -- I'm not going to
7 use the word McMansion, by the way. I don't think I
8 want to use it, so I won't mention it -- but too
9 large for the particular area, and so many of them
10 sprung up that finally people said, "Enough," and
11 that's why we got together.

12 So I think what happened is, people took
13 advantage of, quote, unquote, loopholes in the law,
14 and they created houses that might have looked nice
15 for the people living in that house, but for the
16 neighbors, didn't. And I think we have to resist the
17 temptation now. We seem to be well on the way
18 towards returning Coral Gables to the type of
19 community it was for many years. I think we have to
20 resist the temptation now to bend back and allow
21 these bigger houses, because bigger houses that ruin
22 everybody else's view and ruin everybody else's
23 feeling of a neighborhood are just not fair.

24 You know, it's interesting that in my
25 neighborhood, in the last three years, I've seen

1 about seven or eight bigger houses go up, and one of
2 the things that I heard in previous meetings is,
3 people buy a house, they own land, and it's their
4 dream, their right, to one day save up their money
5 and build a bigger house and we're taking that away
6 from them, and yet it's interesting to note that
7 these bigger houses, the majority of them are sold
8 within one or two years after being built, and all
9 they were are profit centers. And while there may be
10 the occasional person who still lives there, I think
11 if we were to investigate and see these much bigger
12 houses, they were not for people who wanted their
13 lifelong dream, to build and live there, because they
14 flipped them.

15 And, you know, if we get to Page 4, the
16 maximum square foot area, you know, I don't know what
17 to say, because it's almost like it's just a
18 clear-cut division. On one hand, you have the
19 residents of the area, of the neighborhood, who
20 basically are trying to get the homes to be smaller.
21 On the other hand, you have the architects, who are
22 trying to get the homes to be bigger, and each side
23 has some very valid points.

24 I'm sorry that we gave back the five
25 percent. I kind of liked it the way it was earlier.

1 And even though we're getting some concessions in
2 return, you know, as Mr. Korge said earlier, with the
3 cost of land what it is today, people are going to
4 build to the limit. I'd love to at least bring it
5 back down by five percent, and maybe some people
6 won't want to make those concessions and at least
7 some of the houses are going to be smaller.

8 As far as the carports not counting at all,
9 once again, I think a carport in the back of the
10 house, like a detached garage, I could live with it
11 not counting, but I think a carport on the side
12 should count at least 50 percent.

13 Anyway, I know a lot of people have to
14 speak, and I certainly don't want this to drag on. I
15 thank you for your attention.

16 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Thank you.

17 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Daniel Fryer.

18 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Do you want to take a
19 break? Excuse me one second.

20 (Inaudible comments by Ms. Keon to Chairman
21 Korge.)

22 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Does anybody else want to
23 take a break at this point?

24 MR. AIZENSTAT: Take a five-minute break.

25 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Let's just take a

1 five-minute break and be back here at about 10
2 after.

3 (Thereupon, a recess was taken.)

4 CHAIRMAN KORGE: We're back on the record.
5 I don't know where Robert is.

6 MR. AIZENSTAT: Robert had to leave.

7 MR. SALMAN: Yeah, he's got a graduation he
8 has to attend.

9 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Oh, okay.

10 So let's continue. Will you call the next,
11 please?

12 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Mr. Fryer.

13 MR. FRYER: Good evening. Daniel Fryer, 640
14 Majorca Avenue. Thank you very much for holding the
15 meeting tonight to get public input.

16 In looking over the proposed single-family
17 residence Code, it has a lot of things I like.

18 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Excuse me, before you say
19 anything further, if we can, let's try to stick --
20 and I'm sure you're going to do this, anyway -- to
21 the proposal we're looking at and not digress too
22 much --

23 MR. FRYER: No, no, it's only on the
24 proposal. It's only the proposal.

25 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Thank you.

1 MR. FRYER: Okay. What I was going to say
2 is, it has a lot of things that I like, as a
3 resident, living in North Gables and trying to
4 preserve our quality of life. It has a lot of things
5 I don't like. But I realize that life is about
6 compromises, and I think that Staff has worked really
7 hard. I think Dennis has done a good job at trying
8 to meet in the middle and get things in here that
9 work so all sides can agree and accept it.

10 I would like to see more, obviously, but I
11 think that if we do things like -- for instance, I'm
12 sorry, but I don't agree with your comments about the
13 raising the height of some of the extra things. I
14 think the height should be the height. I think that
15 defeats the purpose.

16 I also don't agree about the garages,
17 accepting them as half the FAR, rather than full,
18 because again, that defeats the purpose. It's about
19 compromise. I think most of the properties the
20 gentleman was talking about were in the south, which
21 have larger lots. Our big concerns about these large
22 homes are on the small lots and in the North Gables.

23 So, looking at all the pluses and minuses,
24 and in the spirit of compromise, I think that
25 overall, with some of the things we mentioned, like

1 Pat mentioned about the garages, and maybe some other
2 things about setbacks, I think, all in all, this is
3 very good, it's going to help a lot, and I urge you
4 to pass this forward to the Commission.

5 Thank you very much.

6 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Thank you very much.

7 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Tom Fullerton?

8 MR. FULLERTON: Good evening, everybody.

9 CHAIRMAN KORGE: State your name and address
10 for the record.

11 MR. FULLERTON: John Fullerton, 1422 -- 2214
12 Granada Boulevard, Coral Gables.

13 I just have a few things, and some of which
14 are impacting me personally, in my own old house,
15 1922. That house was built on a -- not a bad-sized
16 lot, it's 100 by 150, but because it's on the corner
17 of Granada and Castile, it's pushed to the back
18 and -- well, to the rear side back, side setback, and
19 the front, so I have a large front and side setbacks,
20 but I have no back yard whatsoever. So, if I wanted
21 to do something back there, I would be very, very
22 limited. I know there are mechanisms, I'm sure there
23 are mechanisms, for hardship and so forth within this
24 Code, but I wanted to make sure that we didn't
25 arbitrarily do things that affected certain houses

1 differently from others. So I think that should be
2 taken into consideration.

3 I'd like to know for -- I think Dennis
4 mentioned some ideas for alternative side setbacks in
5 certain situations, and who determines that, or what
6 is the mechanism for establishing when you might have
7 a different setback from another one? Would I have
8 to come to you before we get that, or can I get it --
9 well, I'd probably get it from the Historic
10 Preservation Board, perhaps.

11 MR. AIZENSTAT: The Board of Adjustments.

12 MR. FULLERTON: But normally --

13 MR. SMITH: The Board of Architects and
14 Staff.

15 CHAIRMAN KORGE: The Board of Architects?

16 MR. FULLERTON: Will the Board of Architects
17 be given that authority? I think that's a good
18 point.

19 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Is that clear in here? Do
20 we know that? I mean, can you figure that out when
21 you read this, Dennis?

22 MS. MORENO: I think he did put it in there.
23 Let me look for it.

24 MR. SMITH: We can clarify that, absolutely.

25 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Well, if it's not in here,

1 then you need to be a little more specific.

2 MR. SMITH: We'll clarify that.

3 MR. FULLERTON: And perhaps that would lead
4 to a resolution in my own case, where I have so
5 little flexibility because of the specific setbacks
6 of my situation, where the architects could make that
7 decision.

8 As to the parking garages for 50-foot lots,
9 this has nothing to do with me, but where the Code
10 might now say a one-car garage is all that is allowed
11 on a 50-foot lot because of those proportions that
12 has been mentioned, the traditional way of doing that
13 in Coral Gables is obviously the one where you drive
14 under a carport --

15 MS. MORENO: Yeah.

16 MR. FULLERTON: -- go to the back yard, you
17 have maybe a 12 or 15-foot side setback for that
18 driveway, and you have a two-car garage in back. I
19 think to prevent somebody from having a two-car
20 garage, when this is an option, I think may be
21 unnecessary.

22 I think, in general, increasing the
23 setbacks, while on the surface it sounds like a great
24 idea, I want more space between my house and the next
25 guy -- however, whenever you do -- whenever you push

1 something in one direction or another, obviously
2 something has to give in one of the other dimensions,
3 and I think the result might be even more massive
4 situations. You might have more setback, but the
5 house itself may be pushed into a shape or mass which
6 is less agreeable than when you give -- when you
7 leave the setbacks the way they are, basically.

8 And disproportionate side setbacks, that is,
9 five and 15 on a 100-foot lot, or something like
10 that, I think that's a great idea, because the
11 garage -- the two garages on the two houses may be
12 together, and so now you've got this back-of-the-
13 house kind of area, grouped, and the two larger
14 sections of the house having the bigger setbacks, it
15 may be better because now you have more setback for
16 more landscaping, more use of your own yard on one
17 side than the other. So I would not, under any
18 conditions, make it required that you center the
19 house on the site, no matter when.

20 The height is also another issue. I just
21 heard a gentleman say that we should have that
22 whatever that height is, is the height. I disagree
23 with that. I think that we should have some
24 creativity allowed in these variations in roof
25 heights. I'm very concerned about the idea of a

1 sloped roof being turned into a partial sloped roof
2 and a flat roof on top of that, which basically is a
3 mansard roof, which, when you look at it in three
4 dimensions -- when you look at it straight on, it may
5 feel like a hipped roof, but what it is, really, is a
6 mansard roof, and I think that might prevent gabled
7 roofs from ever being built, again, in some cases
8 where height becomes the controlling issue. I think
9 height should be given some creative thought, and
10 allow certain elements to penetrate that ceiling.
11 There might be a special roof configuration which
12 looks better than just cutting it off at a certain
13 height. I really don't like mansard roofs.

14 MS. MORENO: John, does the average of
15 height provision give you any relief on that?

16 MR. FULLERTON: Average height is another
17 way of doing it, I think better, a little more
18 creative. It gives you a little more flexibility.

19 MS. MORENO: But didn't he put that? He put
20 average height.

21 MR. FULLERTON: I didn't read it that way.
22 Maybe I'm -- I thought it had to be 29 feet, no
23 matter what.

24 In Page 4, where we talk about the square
25 footage of the floor area, in the paragraph on

1 Page -- on Line 36, it talks about harmony and
2 aesthetic quality of the surrounding neighborhoods.
3 I know you guys have talked about that a lot, and my
4 suggestion is that in order to really oversee this
5 properly, you need a staff person. You need like
6 Miami Beach has, a staff report on some of these
7 homes that might become controversial. You need
8 somebody to look at it from a professional point of
9 view on behalf of the City, and I think, a couple of
10 years ago, we had a joint meeting between the
11 architects' board, preservation, P & Z and so forth,
12 and I think, at some point during that discussion, we
13 said how important it would be to have a staff
14 architect to look at these things and provide some
15 reports.

16 CHAIRMAN KORGE: That is in the rewrite, I
17 think. Aren't we --

18 MS. MORENO: We're requiring a City
19 Architect.

20 MR. AIZENSTAT: We're looking at an
21 architect.

22 MR. FULLERTON: Great, great.

23 I think when we did the rewrite for the
24 Mediterranean Ordinance, we recommended that, also.

25 MS. MORENO: Uh-huh. Yes.

1 MR. RIEL: It's actually going to be
2 included in the City Manager's budget proposal for
3 this year.

4 MR. AIZENSTAT: Right. So there's a
5 position.

6 MR. FULLERTON: There was a discussion
7 earlier about the screened porches never being able
8 to be enclosed. There are certain times when the
9 screen porches do not -- if they were enclosed, did
10 not exceed the FAR allowed on a site. So I don't
11 think you can categorically say you can never enclose
12 them. I think that would put a burden on the
13 property owner to figure out a way to get rid of a
14 specific provision on a screened porch.

15 MS. MORENO: What you're saying is, we need
16 to clarify that it cannot be enclosed if, by
17 enclosing it, it exceeds the permitted FAR.

18 MR. FULLERTON: Exactly. The whole idea of
19 counting garages at full square footage, I think, is
20 a dangerous one, also, because I think it's a
21 disincentive to build garages. If I had a house that
22 I was designing or -- and I had the choice of
23 building an extra bedroom or a garage, or a two-car
24 garage, I would build the bedroom and build a one-car
25 garage, and I think we need garages. I think we need

1 to take cars off the street and off the -- you know,
2 out from the open. I like the feeling of carports,
3 too. I think they're a nice thing. I wouldn't count
4 them heavily against the designer.

5 Courtyards, I understand the idea of putting
6 courtyards within a donut and that makes the building
7 more massive, but it's a traditional and classical
8 way of building Mediterranean homes, and to penalize,
9 I think, that as a design concept might not be as
10 good. I think it can be done creatively so a massive
11 house may be able to work within those contexts. But
12 I have a courtyard at my house. It's external to the
13 footprint of the house, more or less, but it's
14 surrounded by eight-foot walls, and I'm afraid if I
15 went to the Board with my house right now, it would
16 be denied, because it might -- it feels like it's got
17 an eight-foot wall around it. I couldn't cover it,
18 or wouldn't cover it, and if I did, I would certainly
19 expect it to be counted against me, but I wouldn't
20 want it to count against me as it's designed now.

21 The impact of two-story walls on
22 neighborhood property. A good idea, something that
23 you need to look at, but who's going to look at it?
24 I think we get back to the staff issue there.

25 The undergrounding of utilities, I would

1 have loved to have had mine underground this past
2 storm. However, my pole and my house are separated
3 by some huge trees. I don't know how to get it over
4 there without affecting the root ball of the trees,
5 which might weaken the tree, in which case it would
6 pull out the power in a storm, anyway. So there's
7 got to be a creative way of allowing that to happen,
8 some way. I'm not sure what that is, but it is
9 something to consider when you're demanding that
10 people put it underground.

11 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Well, I would assume that
12 if it was impossible, for some physical reason, to do
13 that, you'd go to the Board of Adjustment. That
14 would be the proper remedy for that.

15 MR. FULLERTON: Well, it so happens that my
16 power was knocked out because the tree knocked down
17 the power from the pole to my house. If I'd had it
18 in the ground, it would have done the same thing,
19 because it would have ripped the power out of the
20 ground. So I'm damned if I do and damned if I don't.

21 So, anyway, thank you very much.

22 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Thank you.

23 MR. AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

24 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Jorge Hernandez.

25 MR. HERNANDEZ: Hi. Good evening.

1 CHAIRMAN KORGE: State your name and address
2 for the record.

3 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, Jorge Hernandez, 337
4 Palermo. I just wanted to thank all of you for
5 taking this up again, and thank Dennis and the Staff
6 and Eric, and I think we're in a very different place
7 tonight than we were like six or eight months ago,
8 because I think there's been a real sort of attempt
9 to foster compromise, which is always gratifying to
10 see.

11 I have some very specific points that I
12 actually am offering to help answer some questions,
13 Pat's, for example, and Cristina's, so let me just
14 start there.

15 The first one is about the garage and the
16 percentage of the garage relative to the front facade
17 of the house, and I must say that I wholeheartedly
18 agree with John, that if -- John Fullerton, who
19 spoke just before me -- that if we can somehow
20 promote that garages be pulled to the back, that that
21 would be the most correct way to build in Coral
22 Gables, because it's the time-honored way, and it
23 also pulls that activity away from the street.

24 I built a new house for myself in '92, on a
25 50 by 100-foot lot, and was able to pull the carport

1 to the back of the house. We still live there.
2 Today I wouldn't be able to do it, because with the
3 10-foot rear setback, it wouldn't work, but that's
4 okay. We're here based on compromise, but I just
5 think, if there's ever going to be any tweaking,
6 maybe we need some language in there that encourages
7 that.

8 When garages are a function of the front of
9 the house, which is, I think, what you all were
10 discussing -- let me just give you some calculations
11 that I did for 50-foot, 75-foot, 100-foot and
12 150-foot garages, while I was sitting there.

13 MS. KEON: Lots.

14 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Lots.

15 MR. HERNANDEZ: I'm sorry, lots.

16 MR. AIZENSTAT: Lots, on the width.

17 MR. HERNANDEZ: I'm sorry, yeah.

18 MS. KEON: 50, 75, 100 --

19 MR. HERNANDEZ: 50, 75, 100 and 150, which
20 is the standard increment of lot width. Of course,
21 there are some lots that are irregular, but the most
22 standard are 50, 75, 100 and 150.

23 If we do not change the side setbacks,
24 which -- in other words, if we honor the side
25 setbacks that are here in this document, then a

1 50-foot lot would yield a 40-foot-wide house. If we
2 establish the ratio of one third, one third, two
3 thirds, which is kind of a classical ratio -- there
4 are many, but the one third/two thirds is an easy one
5 to think of -- then a third of 40 feet is 13.2 feet,
6 and 13.2 feet is just a little more than the width of
7 a garage and -- I'm sorry, just a little less than
8 the width of a garage and the two block walls on
9 either side. So, if that garage is being articulated
10 slightly forwards or backwards, the way the zoning
11 technician will measure that articulation is the
12 12-foot minimum width of the one-car garage, and the
13 two eight-inch block walls. That's really 13 feet,
14 four inches. So, with 13 two, we're about an inch
15 and a half off, but that's maybe workable, okay? So
16 that one works for a one-car, and you would only have
17 a one-car, then, on a 50-by-100, and I think if the
18 garage is a function of the front facade of the
19 house, and we heard it mentioned earlier, I think
20 it's appropriate that 50-by-100-foot lots only have
21 one-car garages.

22 MS. KEON: As a very well respected
23 architect, from an aesthetics point of view, is it
24 appropriate to have the front -- the garage space be
25 half of the house?

1 MR. HERNANDEZ: No. No. I'm promoting this
2 one third/two thirds ratio.

3 MS. KEON: Okay.

4 MR. HERNANDEZ: You were asking for a
5 ratio.

6 MS. KEON: That is -- okay.

7 MR. HERNANDEZ: And I'm saying --

8 MS. KEON: But what I want you to tell me is
9 that that's right.

10 MR. HERNANDEZ: So let me continue the math.

11 MS. KEON: Okay.

12 MR. HERNANDEZ: Let me continue that. So,
13 on a 75-foot-wide lot, you have a 60-foot-wide
14 frontage, assuming that the house is absolutely
15 pulled across the front. A third of that is 19.8
16 feet. So there's a situation where, on a
17 75-foot-wide lot, you would still not be able to have
18 a two-car garage, because a two-car garage requires
19 23.4, if you count the clear interior required
20 dimension plus the two eight-inch block walls, and I
21 leave it to you to say whether a 75-foot-wide lot
22 should be able to accommodate a two-car garage.

23 Then you go to 100. On a 100-foot lot, you
24 have an 80-foot frontage. A third of that is 26
25 four. You'd be able to get a two-car garage on a

1 100-foot lot, but not a three.

2 If you go to a 150-foot lot, a 150-foot lot
3 would have a 120-foot-wide facade, assuming it's all
4 on one line. A third of that would be 39. You could
5 get a three-car garage.

6 So it would read 50, one-car; 75, one-car;
7 100, two-car; 150, three-car, and maybe that point in
8 the middle where it's a little tough is the 75 feet,
9 but I think that one third/two thirds is certainly
10 worth considering. That's the numbers that you come
11 out with, if you do that calculation. Anyway, I
12 offer that for your assistance.

13 That's precisely the reason why I don't
14 think we should change the five-foot setback to seven
15 and a half, as was discussed earlier, because if you
16 do the calculation, then you have, for a one-car
17 garage, a ratio much greater than a third of that
18 facade. So, for that 50-foot lot to go to the
19 seven-and-a-half-foot-wide setback, your lot -- your
20 frontage gets very narrow and the garage takes up an
21 even larger percentage of that front facade.

22 I agree with what was previously said, that
23 we should only require the covenant of the enclosed
24 porches when the porches, if enclosed, would exceed
25 the FAR limit, and about the two-story, very long

1 walls, I think we have to be careful with the
2 language because -- what's the gentleman's --

3 MS. CHAUDHRY-FRYER: Bruce.

4 MR. HERNANDEZ: Bruce? Bruce, who spoke
5 earlier, has a 1920s house that is fairly cubic in
6 nature, and I have a 1992 house that's fairly cubic
7 in nature. We don't have any articulation -- and
8 there are a number of historic houses that are more
9 cubic in nature, two-story cubic volumes. Those more
10 cubic houses, of course, don't go the full depth of
11 the lot. They don't go from front to back, which is
12 what Mr. Behar was talking about, and I think that
13 either we have to put -- I don't believe we should
14 find in that case a length, a number. I think there
15 should be language that would allow the Board of
16 Architects to make a decision as to whether one house
17 is just too long, unarticulated or not.

18 The reason I say that is the following.
19 There is -- there are a number of historic houses
20 that are based on Charleston side yard houses, and I
21 don't know how many of you have been to Charleston,
22 but Charleston is built up of these very long, thin
23 houses with no articulation on the side. Because
24 that's the palette of the town, it's not unacceptable
25 there.

1 The problem is that when you're here in
2 Coral Gables, if most of the houses are put into the
3 middle of the lot and then you see one house go deep,
4 full from front to back, it looks like an anomaly,
5 and it is an anomaly. The reason that I wouldn't tie
6 it to a number is, if you happen to be building next
7 to one of those historical houses that is like a
8 Charleston side yard house, then it would be
9 reasonable that you would propose a very long
10 element, two-story element like that.

11 The other reason why I don't think we should
12 put a number and just put language that could be
13 interpreted is, there are also some existing houses
14 that are two-story that have an unarticulated, long
15 wall, and if you have a condition which is
16 detrimental, it's very nice to then mirror it, think
17 of them as two backs --

18 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Right.

19 MR. HERNANDEZ: -- because if you don't do
20 that, you're looking -- your new house will be
21 looking at that guy's Berlin Wall. So, i.e., if we
22 put language that we state it's generally undesirable
23 but we leave it up to the Board of Architects, then
24 they can use contextual arguments to see whether it's
25 appropriate or not, given the actual location of the

1 lot in question.

2 On courtyards, I think that when I first
3 read it, I thought that the language was too
4 restrictive, but as I read it again, I realized that
5 it's very cleverly written, because it's saying you
6 can have a U, but you can't close the back of that U,
7 or you can have an L, but you can't close the other
8 two sides if the wall is greater than the four feet,
9 and of the Old Spanish houses that I know that are
10 courtyard houses, there are very few of them. In
11 fact, the only full courtyard house that I know in
12 town is Vizcaya. Maybe El Jardin, too, Carrollton's
13 house. But you have to have a very large house to
14 really surround the perimeter of a decent-sized
15 courtyard, which is why the ones that try to do it
16 with the square footages of modern programs, they
17 don't look good.

18 CHAIRMAN KORGE: But on a two or three-acre
19 site --

20 MR. HERNANDEZ: That's perfectly
21 reasonable.

22 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Would you be able to do it,
23 though, under these regulations?

24 MR. HERNANDEZ: No, you can't.

25 CHAIRMAN KORGE: See, I have a concern about

1 these regulations as they apply to sites that are not
2 a problem in North Gables -- not, in fact, anywhere
3 outside of probably Gables Estates, where you've got
4 two, three, four-acre sites. People are, you know,
5 going to be restricted in ways that really are
6 inappropriate for those sites, only for those sites,
7 and you might --

8 Dennis, you might want to think a little bit
9 more about those massive sites, because it's
10 appropriate to build mansions on sites of that
11 size -- not McMansions, but real mansions. So I
12 just -- and I'm not an architect, so I can't
13 visualize the concern the way the architects can, but
14 I would suggest that you might talk to some of the
15 architects who design in those neighborhoods, to see
16 if you might want to address that issue for the
17 really large sites, and you can do it, I suppose, by
18 referencing the size of the lots and providing
19 different rules for those size of lots.

20 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, that might be a good
21 idea. Certainly I don't think, you know, if we were
22 looking at 50, 75, 100 and 150-foot-wide lots --

23 CHAIRMAN KORGE: No question.

24 MR. HERNANDEZ: In that case --

25 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Yeah, no question.

1 MR. HERNANDEZ: -- they would not apply.

2 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Right.

3 MR. HERNANDEZ: You really should keep the
4 language as it is. If you're talking about a
5 three-acre lot or a two-acre lot, then you might
6 rethink it, but, you know, I think that's a good
7 assignment to send back.

8 MS. KEON: Even a one-acre lot?

9 MR. HERNANDEZ: That's a tough -- you know
10 why that's tough? Because if you have a one-acre lot
11 and you're in a flood zone, now you can build 39 feet
12 tall to the ridge and a complete perimeter. So
13 that's a -- none of the people that have come -- none
14 of the concerned citizens that have come talking
15 about quality of life in neighborhoods would be
16 affected, but I think if you start to see that, one
17 after the other, in Gables Estates, people might get
18 a little tired of it.

19 MS. KEON: But they're in the flood zone.

20 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah.

21 MS. KEON: Okay.

22 MR. HERNANDEZ: Because of the flood zone,
23 because the flood zone gives you that additional --

24 MS. KEON: Right.

25 MR. HERNANDEZ: -- height of wall. But, for

1 example, there is a three-acre lot for sale in
2 Snapper Creek now, which is the old -- oh, the CEO of
3 Burger King, the original -- McLamore, the old
4 McLamore lot, and that lot would not be able to
5 have -- I mean, it would be slightly punished, let's
6 say, you know, by it. But, I mean, those lots also
7 will yield like 15 to 20,000 square feet.

8 MS. MORENO: All you're doing is counting --
9 you're not prohibiting, you're just counting it
10 double, so --

11 MR. HERNANDEZ: You're not prohibiting it.
12 I mean, you're saying, "Okay, instead of 20,000
13 square feet, if you want a courtyard, the house is
14 going to be 17,000 square feet."

15 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Well, I don't know, I don't
16 want to dwell on that here, because I don't think
17 anybody is really focusing on that.

18 MR. HERNANDEZ: Concerned on that, right.
19 Well, the interesting point that you make, which is
20 the similar point that Pat Keon was making earlier,
21 is that the more sophisticated we become, the more
22 you realize it is really about context and
23 site-specific issues, that what's right on a 50-foot
24 lot may not be right on an acre, and vice versa, and
25 that's where you really are beginning to author law

1 that's really sophisticated.

2 About the chimney, I think that the
3 three-foot extension of the chimney is fine. The
4 maximum height that was mentioned earlier, I think
5 that, again, in the spirit of compromise, which is
6 what this exercise has been about, that we probably
7 can hold the new slightly lower height and there
8 would still be an opportunity for expression of
9 two -- maybe not in the way you're saying, like a
10 pinnacle at the center, but there would still be an
11 opportunity for modeling that skyline or the profile,
12 let's say, of the house.

13 MS. MORENO: Can it be an absolute height
14 limitation, or does it have to be an average height
15 limitation?

16 MR. HERNANDEZ: You know, I've worked in
17 other municipalities that do the average height of
18 the roof, and I think the max height is more
19 protective and better, because then you start getting
20 into trickery about how to effectively lower that
21 midpoint of the roof. And there are many ways to do
22 it, I can tell you, but if you just say this is the
23 highest line, and that's what it is, it's very
24 clear.

25 About the garage, I actually think, again,

1 if we came to the table and everybody was supposed to
2 yield a little bit, I think that counting -- counting
3 the garage at full is not going to be a deal
4 breaker. In fact, we've been -- for the architects,
5 I mean. We've been -- and it certainly will be an
6 incentive, rewarding those property owners that came
7 forth in the first place with concerns about our
8 neighborhoods.

9 We've been operating under an interim Code,
10 which took a five percent reduction, and there hasn't
11 been a huge outcry on the part of, you know, owners
12 of empty lots or large lots. So the fact that this
13 proposal now restores the FAR as it was, but then
14 simply says, "Okay, but we're going to count
15 courtyard spaces and we're going to count garages at
16 full," I think is a very reasonable compromise.

17 I think that covers all my notes. The last
18 thing I wanted to talk about, which is a -- if indeed
19 you guys aren't going to pass this at this meeting,
20 if you're going to send it back for a little more
21 homework, send Dennis back to do a little more
22 homework, the one that is very interesting to me is
23 the discussion you started to have about style and
24 type and character, okay? And I'll tell you why.
25 The language that is in the Code, that Dennis kept in

1 the Code, is really old language. He -- I didn't
2 know that, but in the original -- and maybe he wants
3 to talk about it. In the original Building Code,
4 they did make references to these styles, Colonial,
5 Bermuda, Mediterranean and so on and so forth, and I
6 agree with the sentiments of the Board that that's
7 kind of retarded tare, in a way. It is. I mean,
8 ironically, on the one hand, we are in a community
9 whose prevailing image is known and is valued, and
10 that's the Mediterranean Revival style. Does that
11 mean we want to condemn ourselves into that mold
12 forever? Well, in the residential properties, I
13 don't think that's terrible at this point. If they
14 started demolishing, which is very hard to do, as you
15 know -- if we started demolishing and losing a great
16 number of the Mediterranean Revival homes, then I'd
17 say, "Wait a minute," and ironically, I think that's
18 what happened with the Mediterranean Ordinance. When
19 those glass -- you know, 1960s glass prism
20 skyscrapers started to get built, people said, "Wait
21 a minute. This is looking like Houston or Dallas or,
22 you know, every other downtown, and we have a
23 character," and whether you think the Mediterranean
24 Ordinance has been a hundred percent successful or
25 not, we can argue that, but it was a response to

1 seeing the City transform its image, in terms of the
2 high-rise buildings.

3 I think there seems to be no threat that the
4 residential districts are going to lose that
5 reference to the image of Mediterranean Revival
6 homes, so I think we need to figure out a way of
7 doing what the Board is trying to describe, which is,
8 we don't want to curtail creativity, we don't want to
9 prescribe styles so tightly that it becomes
10 caricature, which I think is a potential problem,
11 okay?

12 Now, the reason why, you know, at the top of
13 it, and I don't have my page open to that point, but
14 at the top of the -- it's Page 9, I guess, and at the
15 top, the word style is used, and at the bottom, the
16 word type is used. I know there are other people
17 speaking, so I don't want to stay here too long, but
18 they're different. Type and style are different
19 things. They're not interchangeable words, okay?
20 And the best example that I can give you is, if you,
21 in your mind's eye, go back to Charleston, South
22 Carolina, most all of the houses in Charleston, South
23 Carolina, are side yard houses, and that's called a
24 Charleston single house. But it's built in Greek
25 Revival, it's built in Gothic Revival, it's built in

1 Federal, it's built in Antebellum. So those are the
2 styles. In other words, style, in some cases, one
3 can think of a little more like clothing. It's a
4 little more superficial.

5 But typology is much more fundamental, for
6 example, if you say a courtyard type house. You
7 wouldn't say a courtyard style house; you would say a
8 courtyard type house. That's about typology. It's
9 about some essential morphology about that building
10 organization that connects it to many other buildings
11 through the course of time. So, when you talk about
12 essential morphology, you're talking about type.

13 Now, the courtyard type house can be a
14 Mediterranean Revival house, it can be a, you know,
15 Late Gothic, and so on. And so style has more to do
16 with those kinds of superficial embellishments, and
17 type has to do with the actual morphology of the
18 structure, and a case that you were making, Mr.
19 Salman, was very interesting, because you said maybe
20 what unifies Coral Gables is more the way we deal
21 with the space between structures, that is, that
22 structure of the space between edifices, than the
23 style of the edifices themselves, and I think that's
24 absolutely correct.

25 So, if that -- and this is a tough rewriting

1 assignment to send Dennis back with, but if there's
2 going to be one, that's an interesting one to really
3 try to tackle, because I agree with some of the
4 people that said, "I may want to do a house that's
5 more contemporary, but I don't want to do an a-- "
6 That contemporary house does not necessarily have to
7 be acontextual, and there are many examples of
8 architects, current architects -- I don't know how
9 many of you might know, for example, Barragan. Who
10 is Barragan? The famous modern Mexican architect who
11 actually authored in a modern Mexican style that is
12 very respectful of Mexican traditional architecture,
13 but it's modern.

14 MR. SALMAN: It's abstracted.

15 MR. HERNANDEZ: Excuse me?

16 MR. SALMAN: It's more abstract.

17 MR. HERNANDEZ: It's more abstract, but it
18 has qualities that would make it work exactly next to
19 a Colonial.

20 So I agree with the discomfort that the
21 Board is having with the language in Page 9. It's
22 not an easy homework assignment. I think that this
23 Board is sophisticated enough and we've come to a
24 point in this process that you have led us to, which
25 I think we can all be really glad of, that it's

1 sophisticated enough that we can try this and finally
2 rewrite it in a way that we're not just copying old
3 language, but it really states what you're trying to
4 state.

5 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Maybe you could help Dennis
6 with that.

7 MR. HERNANDEZ: I'd be happy to. I hope I
8 would, you know, be able to get a good grade on the
9 assignment, but anyway -- but that's it, and I just
10 wanted to thank you one more time.

11 MS. MORENO: Dennis, it's a group project.

12 MR. SALMAN: It's a group project.

13 MS. MORENO: Group project.

14 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, anyway. Thank
15 you.

16 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Michael Steffens.

17 MS. MORENO: John, you're running out so you
18 don't get assigned to the group project.

19 MR. STEFFENS: Dennis thought he was
20 finished with this.

21 Mike Steffens, 161 Aragon Avenue. I wanted
22 to thank Dennis for this ordinance. I think it's
23 head and shoulders above where we were, or you guys
24 were, several months ago.

25 I want to make a couple of very general

1 points, but one specific point regarding the garage
2 FAR, and especially related to smaller lots, because
3 Jorge had made the comment that, you know, the new
4 Code had taken away five percent of the area that you
5 were allowed to build, and this Code is giving it
6 back to you, but it's then reducing that area by
7 counting the garage in full, which is, in effect,
8 almost equivalent to the five percent, especially on
9 the smaller lots.

10 But what wasn't stated was that you were
11 able to get that five percent back through design
12 incentives, so you could get back to where you were
13 originally and count the garage at half, under the
14 interim Code. So, you know, this Code would be
15 penalizing you more than the interim Code was.

16 My general comments are, I think the main
17 idea here would be flexibility, and I think that's
18 what you've heard from most of the people that have
19 spoken. Flexibility in style or typology, allowing
20 you to create the kind of architecture that you want
21 to create, and I think that that Page 9 that
22 everybody has been talking about, most of the
23 language in there is in the existing Code, and the
24 existing Code, as Dennis has said, allows you to
25 build a modern house if you want to.

1 I was on the Board of Architects and we
2 approved a couple of modern houses, and I was on the
3 Historic Preservation Board and we approved a couple
4 of modern additions to historic houses. So there is
5 the flexibility there that allows you to do that.

6 There's the flexibility on interpreting the
7 side wall issue, because some houses can handle that
8 correctly and some houses can't handle that
9 correctly. There's flexibility on the setbacks, so
10 that if the pattern of the neighborhood is, all the
11 houses are pushed to one side of the setback, so it
12 almost becomes like the Charleston houses that Jorge
13 was talking about, but it could be with '50s ranch
14 burgher houses that are pushed to one side, then you
15 have the flexibility to do that, so you're
16 maintaining the pattern of the neighborhood.

17 And then the flexibility with garage
18 locations. You know, if you want to put a two-car
19 garage in the back of a 50-foot lot, maybe you need
20 flexibility with the rear setback, that will allow
21 you to push that back to five feet and allow that to
22 happen.

23 So I think maintaining the flexibility
24 within the Code that allows the creativity to happen
25 is a key issue.

1 Thank you very much.

2 MR. AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Thanks.

4 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Rafael Sixto?

5 MR. SIXTO: I'm Rafael Sixto, at 1700
6 Ferdinand Street. I'm an architect, and I also would
7 like to state that I think where this rewrite is at,
8 compared to where we were a couple of months ago, is
9 a vast improvement. I think that the combination of
10 an increase in rear setback, a combination of
11 decrease in height involving some 34 to 29 feet, that
12 with the increase in landscape from 35 to 40 percent,
13 will go along way towards decreasing this oversized
14 home issue, which is what this is all about. That
15 alone will go a tremendous ways in doing what we're
16 all trying to do here.

17 There's some tweaking of the language with
18 regards to context and -- vocabulary and context, all
19 that that has already been discussed, no question.

20 One item that I'd like to suggest, perhaps,
21 is to look into the notion that even in smaller lots,
22 50-foot-wide lots, an element that projects up to a
23 height of 34 feet, that perhaps is not more than 10
24 percent of the lot coverage, would be an added value
25 to the architecture. I think it would provide a

1 little bit of movement in the roof line and the
2 streetscape. That sort of thing is what I think Mr.
3 Thomas Korge was speaking about, of possibly keeping
4 the ceiling heights and volumes within contemporary
5 homes to where they want to be, at nine, 10-foot
6 ceiling heights, but not do away with the interesting
7 character of perhaps a little tower element that
8 might project up to 34 feet high. If that tower
9 element is kept to within maybe 10 percent of the lot
10 coverage or something to that effect, then perhaps
11 that is not objectionable, and even in smaller lots.

12 As regards to the other major issue that I
13 see here, the width of garage on smaller lots, I
14 think the -- Jorge said the one third to two thirds
15 ratio is probably a good ratio. We might want to
16 extend that just a little bit to a 40/60 ratio, not
17 more than that, and we might also consider, for the
18 75-foot width lots, which are perhaps the border --
19 you know, the borderline lots, why not reduce the
20 minimum width of a garage to 11 foot four? 12 foot
21 is very generous. It's -- most architects would
22 agree that a 12-foot-wide garage is very generous. A
23 two-car garage at 11 foot four each, that would be 22 foot
24 eight, plus the eight and eight -- 24 foot wide on
25 a -- say, on a 75-foot-wide lot, you take away the

1 setbacks, it leaves you a 60-foot-wide -- if my math
2 is correct -- 75 times 20 -- yeah, say -- it leaves
3 you a 60-foot-wide buildable lot, with a 24-foot
4 two-car garage, assuming 11 foot four. That's still
5 a 40/60 ratio, which is not terribly objectionable,
6 but ideally, one third/two thirds would be better.
7 But those are issues you have to contend with, so I
8 know it's late and I don't necessarily want to get
9 into all the details, but I think that's -- those are
10 my points.

11 MR. AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

12 MS. MORENO: Thank you.

13 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Al Acosta.

14 MR. ACOSTA: Good evening. I'm Amado,
15 nickname "Al," Acosta. It seems like I'm up here
16 almost every two weeks. Thank you for having me
17 here. The address is 1225 South Alhambra Circle, and
18 what we're here is on behalf of the Riviera
19 Neighborhood Association.

20 As you recall, a lot of our presentation had
21 to do with the preservation of neighborhood
22 character, and we commend the work that Mr. Smith has
23 done in coming up with what amounts to a significant
24 effort and improvement and a compromise, as has been
25 stated.

1 I'd like to address just on the character.
2 On A for section -- on Page 1, there is language in
3 here about, "The intent of the Code is to protect the
4 distinctive character of Coral Gables," and it goes
5 on and it concludes, "By preserving the community
6 character of the Gables, the Zoning Code safeguards
7 both individual property values, as well as the
8 quality of life that best serves the collective
9 interest." And that is very commendable.

10 Then, at the end, on Page 9, it says, "The
11 Board of Architects shall require such changes in the
12 design of the structure so as to preserve traditional
13 aesthetic treatments." However, we encourage this
14 Board to consider a specific method already outlined
15 in these definitions as to how the design will meet
16 with the established character of the neighborhood.
17 I don't think it is detailed enough, and that may
18 lead to wondering how you go about that.

19 We urge this Board to consider that the
20 designing architect include a section in his proposal
21 that clearly shows how it blends, how it is
22 harmonious with the existing surroundings, and they
23 may do whatever method they want, whether it's
24 photographs or any number of architect's renderings
25 and the existing design. If you have that delineated

1 and it's already a routine factor that is presented,
2 then there is a method by which the neighbors can get
3 involved and look at and say, "Yes, it is
4 compatible," or, "No, we disagree with that."

5 So we urge you to take that consideration in
6 a method that is already established ahead of time,
7 and I think that will alleviate a lot of headaches
8 for a lot of people, in our opinion.

9 In regard to the setbacks, as to which side
10 one gets five feet and the other one gets 10 feet, we
11 visualize the -- what you're trying to do in here is
12 the flexibility on the design, but all it takes is
13 for one neighbor to request a quasi-judicial hearing
14 on the design, and the whole thing is going to be
15 shot down for months and months and months, as to who
16 gets the five foot and who gets the 10 foot, on each
17 side of the house. So we don't offer any specific
18 advice, but we think that's a problematic area.

19 We commend the design proposal for 29 feet.
20 We agree that it should be a maximum height and not
21 an average height, because again, it's very difficult
22 to establish average, when, for instance, you don't
23 have any in the neighborhood yet. So we think that
24 the maximum should be established.

25 We agree with the treatment of the FAR for

1 garages. I think that will go a long ways, although
2 we also -- I also agree in what I heard here tonight
3 from Jorge that there should be flexibility as to
4 just how you treat garages.

5 Mr. Fullerton brought up the matter of the
6 underground access to the homes. We think that is
7 admirable, and it's not because I am an underground
8 utilities contractor, but definitely, it will add to
9 the character of the neighborhood.

10 I just want to throw in a technical point in
11 here, that -- the point that you -- that he brought
12 up in relationship to the getting across trees,
13 existing trees. There is a method known as boring,
14 and you can dig under and direct a pipe, and trees
15 are no problems, believe me. Technically, it's very
16 feasible. It's done every day. Also, for instance,
17 when going under paved access driveways and -- you
18 know, drives and all that.

19 So, with that, I conclude our part. Thank
20 you.

21 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Thank you.

22 MR. AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

23 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Mamta Fryer.

24 MS. CHAUDHRY-FRYER: My name is Mamta
25 Chaudhry-Fryer. I live at 614 Majorca Avenue.

1 I think that this draft that's before us
2 tonight strikes a really fine balance between the
3 concerns that we've all heard here of those who build
4 homes in the Gables and those of us who have to live
5 next door to those homes. I think that it recognizes
6 the uniqueness of our residential neighborhoods
7 without straitjacketing the design and creativity of
8 the architects, and I think that it keeps what is
9 good about the old Code, while making meaningful
10 changes that impact the massing that brought us all
11 to discuss this in the first place.

12 The thing that most impinges on neighbors is
13 the height, setback and volume, as we've talked about
14 in the past, and if the whole intent is to reduce the
15 oversized homes, then the height will certainly go a
16 long way to do that.

17 The setbacks, obviously we would have liked
18 to have seen greater side setbacks, and I know
19 Cristina Moreno brought up the seven and a half, but
20 we're also reasonable people and we realize the other
21 constraints that would cause by having the greater
22 side setbacks, so the side setbacks actually stay
23 exactly the same as they were before, except for
24 equitable distribution, unless there's a mitigating
25 situation, for instance, if there's an old tree that

1 you don't want to cut down, or if there's already an
2 existing 15 feet of space on this side of the house,
3 then you could get away with a smaller setback here
4 than have it close to that.

5 So it, I think, allows the flexibility that
6 architects have asked for, and by closing some of the
7 loopholes, it takes away that massive appearance of
8 the house that may not have been counted on paper, as
9 far as the square footage, but it counts on the
10 ground. You know, that's what you see, when you see
11 the house. So that affects our quality of life
12 considerably, and I think this draft addresses it.

13 I think the Board brought up some excellent
14 points about proportion and scale. You know, if you
15 take away everything we've been talking about and
16 boil it down to its essence, what we are talking
17 about here is proportion and scale in our residential
18 neighborhoods.

19 The draft also alludes to neighborhood
20 character, and I think it might be helpful, at some
21 point, as Dennis Smith was saying, to map and
22 characterize the neighborhoods.

23 Ignacio Zabaleta said -- he was talking
24 about harmony in existing neighborhoods, and
25 compatibility, and the last time we had a discussion

1 about compatibility, the Board was afraid that it
2 would mean all the houses would have to fit a
3 pattern. So, you know, maybe this is just, we have
4 to figure out the semantics of it, because, like
5 Ignacio, I'm married to a man who's definitely very
6 different- looking from me, and we've been married 27
7 years, so -- which is a testament to my great
8 patience.

9 But one of the things that I do want to
10 point out is that on our street, on Majorca, Bruce
11 Katz, who spoke before you earlier, has a 1925 Old
12 Spanish two-story, very classical. We have a
13 one-story 1940s Mediterranean. We have around us
14 ranch style houses. We have down the street a Key
15 West style house. But if you drive down or walk down
16 Majorca, it is an extremely harmonious and compatible
17 street. So, you know, we're not saying that you have
18 to have them all exactly in the same pattern. We're
19 not asking for it to be cut from a pattern, but we
20 are asking for that magic word -- whenever we find
21 it, we will -- I'm sure Dennis will include it,
22 whether it's harmony, whether it's appropriateness in
23 context.

24 You know, even if it's a modern house, as
25 somebody pointed out earlier -- as Jorge said, you

1 know, it can be modern, but it can still fit in the
2 context. So I think that's a really important step
3 forward that we've made.

4 I did want to talk about the miscellaneous
5 accessory structures, which we're not talking about
6 now, but I understand that's going to be a
7 continuation of this conversation, right, whenever we
8 get to it? Okay, because that still would affect the
9 single-family homes, as far as the fountains and
10 planters and pools.

11 Earlier today, Elaine Codias had brought up
12 this thing about notification, and you know, those
13 little notices that are up there are only up on one
14 side of the property. So, if you're walking by
15 another side, you might miss it. And I'm not sure
16 that I want to see great big signs, saying, you know,
17 something is under construction here, but maybe if
18 it's visible from both sides, and also, the fact that
19 it's only up for a week, you know, what if you're out
20 of town that week and the house next to you is going
21 to be demolished and this is your only chance you get
22 to walk by that particular side of the house, in that
23 particular week?

24 Dennis said that now the computer system
25 allows them to post the Board of Architects' agenda

1 there. Is it possible for it to generate automatic
2 e-mails -- I know we send out the City newsletter on
3 e-mail -- to the contiguous properties that are going
4 to be considered as the context? I think the
5 notification is important. If you're going to tell
6 neighbors when somebody is requesting an arch on a
7 wall, which is maybe two feet higher than allowed,
8 and we show up to talk about it, then if you're
9 talking about a whole house, maybe we should also be
10 notified of that.

11 Throughout this discussion, over the last
12 many, many moons that we've all had, one phrase that
13 kept coming up was, we need to empower the Board of
14 Architects, and I feel that this draft really does
15 that. It gives a lot of authority to the Board to
16 make certain decisions about the context of the
17 houses, but I'm also happy to see that it empowers
18 the citizens, whose civic involvement and stewardship
19 of the community we have has brought us to this forum
20 over and over again, and a lot of people wrote to me
21 to say they couldn't come tonight because it's the
22 Memorial Day weekend, but they wanted to convey to
23 you that they are still very engaged in this, and
24 very appreciative of all the steps that we're taking
25 to move forward, and I do think this is a huge step

1 forward, and I hope that now it's just a question of
2 finessing what remains to be done, rather than
3 starting anew. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Thank you.

5 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: David Adler?

6 MR. ADLER: Good evening. Dave Adler, 9401
7 Journey's End Road, in the City. I think -- and I'm
8 a home builder. I'm one of the ones erecting these
9 large houses, mostly not on small lots, on very big
10 lots, and I understood the concern of this Board, the
11 City and most of the citizens were the overpowering
12 sizes of houses on neighborhoods and mostly on
13 smaller lots, 150 feet, 75 feet, 50.

14 So I think Dennis and his Staff and Eric
15 have done a terrific job, as I read through this, in
16 relationships to that issue. I'm still a little bit
17 concerned, however, if I understand how it's going to
18 work, on the effects it will have on the very large
19 lots. Although I don't think it's the intent of this
20 Board, I think that the way it's written still causes
21 a problem. And I think Dennis tried to mitigate that
22 concern by saying if they had site-specific
23 regulations for those neighborhoods, like Journey's
24 End or Gables Estates or Cocoplum or Snapper Creek --
25 and I'm sure a bunch of those do have site-specific

1 regulations -- that those site-specific regulations
2 would govern, and not necessarily this.

3 But the concern I have, if I'm understanding
4 it, is, let's just take Journey's End. Journey's End
5 has site-specific regulations, but it does not talk
6 about height. It may talk about FAR, it may talk
7 about setbacks on a particular lot, it may talk about
8 style of the house, but it doesn't mention height.
9 Then the height in this is going to apply.

10 So I think we have to be very careful on
11 those larger lots, because each site-specific program
12 talks about different things. And so this really
13 will apply to a three-acre house in certain regards,
14 or three-acre lot, excuse me, in certain regards. So
15 I think we need to still address these things on size
16 and not just site-specific.

17 I don't have a real problem in large lots
18 when it comes to FAR in here, even the counting the
19 garage and things. I think that on real large lots,
20 this is plenty big enough for the architects to
21 design. I do have a concern with the height in this
22 regard, and I'll explain why, on the very large
23 lots. And I have a lot of respect for Mr. Zabaleta,
24 and I certainly have a lot of respect for Jorge, I've
25 known him for many years, and he didn't mention it,

1 and I'm concerned about it. Let me give you some of
2 the math.

3 Even if it's not in a zone, a flood zone,
4 and you just take up on the ridge in Journey's End,
5 the crown of the road, you know, whatever, let's just
6 say it's at six, okay? It doesn't matter. Or 11, it
7 doesn't really matter. I think there's still a Code
8 that you still have to go about one and a half feet
9 above that. There's either some FEMA -- or Dade
10 County has some sort of thing, so the minimum, you're
11 going to be one and a half feet above, even if you're
12 not in a flood zone, and then you take a house --
13 remember, these houses are 15,000, 10,000 feet.
14 They're very large houses. And you put a 12-foot,
15 12-and-a-half-foot first floor, not abnormal. You
16 have an eight-foot French door, six feet wide. You
17 put an arch on top of it, it's another three feet.
18 You're at 11 something. By the time you give

19 clearance between a crown molding and everything
20 else, 12 to 12 six is a very in scale height. You
21 put another two feet from there to put in your
22 mechanical systems, your HVAC and everything else
23 that you've got to run through these things -- some
24 of the architects don't give you two feet. I love to
25 see two feet, so we can put it in there.

1 And then you go upstairs, to a second floor
2 height. Well, 10 feet is not abnormal on a big
3 house, to have on a second floor. People just want
4 10 feet.

5 Anyway, if you add all those up, what do you
6 come to? You're at 25 six. Well, 25 six only leaves
7 you three and a half feet till you're 29. It doesn't
8 work. There are a lot of spans that have 40-foot
9 spans, and by the time you do that, you're talking
10 seven and a half feet, eight feet of roof on a ridge,
11 you know, and so my concern is, I mean, that 29 feet
12 may work in a small lot, but when you go into these
13 big houses on these big lots, there was absolutely
14 nothing wrong with 34 feet, absolutely nothing. It's
15 not out of character. Every house in there is 34
16 feet, and yet I wouldn't be able to do it, which
17 means if I'm building myself a new house, in this
18 thing, I'd have to go to an eight-foot upstairs. Who
19 wants an eight-foot ceiling in a house like this?

20 So my concern is that you figure out in this
21 rewrite, on site-specific lots, that if they get to
22 an acre, if they get to two acres, if there's some --
23 I don't know how you do it, I know it's a difficult
24 thing, but I think you're burdening those lot owners
25 with something that they don't need to be, and that's

1 my only concern. I think on the small stuff it's
2 very good, and I believe they're very talented men,
3 so if they tell you they can design the small
4 stuff to it, then I'm sure they can. Thank you.

5 MR. AIZENSTAT: Just a question, if I may.
6 When you talk about your additional two feet that you
7 need for your mechanical and so forth, when you build
8 your second story, do you use trusses or do you use
9 concrete in those type of homes?

10 MR. ADLER: My second floor deck --

11 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yeah.

12 MR. ADLER: -- is concrete.

13 MR. AIZENSTAT: It's totally concrete?

14 MR. ADLER: Yeah, it's all concrete.

15 MR. AIZENSTAT: Because if you had trusses,
16 you'd be able to work with it and be --

17 MR. ADLER: Yeah, but nobody is building a
18 house like this with a truss system on the second
19 floor.

20 MR. AIZENSTAT: Okay. Thank you.

21 MS. KEON: What's a large lot?

22 MR. ADLER: What's a large lot?

23 MS. KEON: When you say a very large lot --

24 MR. ADLER: In my opinion -- and it's purely
25 my opinion.

1 MS. KEON: But okay. What's a very -- what
2 constitutes a --

3 MR. ADLER: An acre and over, 42,000 feet
4 and over, I think in almost anybody's definition.

5 MS. KEON: If you were going to break as to
6 where you were going to begin to look at maybe
7 changing the height requirements or something, at
8 what point, where would we start?

9 MR. ADLER: Well, you see, that becomes a
10 problem, because the person walks in with forty-one
11 thousand and two, and says, "My God, I'm 800 feet
12 less than an acre." You know, I don't know how you
13 do that in regulations. I think in anybody's
14 makeup -- I think if you said, "I live in an acre lot
15 in Coral Gables," they would say, "You've got a big
16 lot."

17 MS. KEON: But for a builder's acre, it's
18 different than a regular acre, right?

19 MR. HERNANDEZ: I think three quarters might
20 be okay.

21 MR. AIZENSTAT: It's smaller.

22 MS. KEON: Is that a builder's acre?

23 MR. ADLER: Yeah, three quarters is a
24 builder's, 34,000 --

25 MS. KEON: Is a builder's acre. Okay.

1 MR. ADLER: -- 35,000, is a builder's acre.

2 MS. KEON: So we could start with a
3 builder's acre and we would probably be -- it may be
4 a good starting point.

5 MR. ADLER: And most of the lots I build on
6 are two, you know, on really large lots.

7 MS. KEON: Okay, but even if we started with
8 a builder's acre, we could maybe move from there.
9 Okay.

10 MR. ADLER: Thank you.

11 MS. KEON: Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN KORGE: It's late, but I want to
13 get some questions.

14 MR. ADLER: Sure.

15 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Aside from height for these
16 over -- these really large builder's acre plus lot
17 size, what other changes do you think would be
18 appropriate?

19 MR. ADLER: Well, I think most of these -- I
20 think most of these regulations are good. The only
21 other change is, obviously, the FAR. I'm building a
22 home for a local citizen, a very big person in this
23 community, in Gables Estates right now. They are on
24 a 40 something thousand square foot lot, and yet they
25 ran into the maximum FAR on that property, and you

1 could say, "Wow, it's a 42,000-square-foot lot,
2 that's a big house." Yes, it is. It's a very big
3 house. So the garage issue would become an issue in
4 that regard.

5 CHAIRMAN KORGE: In that house, what were
6 the setbacks?

7 MR. ADLER: 30 and 30 on the sides, 75 from
8 the water and 50 from the front.

9 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Yeah. So it -- really, I
10 think this really needs to be revisited, when you get
11 to the builder's acre plus.

12 MS. KEON: Yeah.

13 CHAIRMAN KORGE: I really do. I don't know
14 how. I'm glad I don't have to figure it out, but --

15 MR. SMITH: Well, you know, it's not a
16 problem in Gables Estates, because they have a height
17 site-specific. It's not a problem in Hammock Lakes
18 or --

19 MR. HERNANDEZ: Snapper Creek is not a
20 problem.

21 MR. SMITH: -- Snapper Creek, because they
22 have height site-specifics. The reason it's a
23 problem for him is because Journey's End doesn't have
24 a height site-specific.

25 MS. KEON: Excuse me, but I thought that he

1 said, and I thought you agreed with him in the
2 discussion, that if this were passed, that this would
3 take precedence over those that were site-specific,
4 but they don't.

5 MR. SMITH: No. No, they don't.

6 MS. MORENO: No, they don't.

7 MS. KEON: Right.

8 CHAIRMAN KORGE: No, it's the opposite.

9 MS. KEON: Right.

10 MR. SMITH: Right.

11 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Except to the extent that
12 site-specific does not apply.

13 MR. SMITH: Exist.

14 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Right.

15 MR. SMITH: There's no height site-specific,
16 and that's the problem for Journey's End. There's no
17 height site-specific.

18 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Is it just unique to
19 Journey's End, or are there other areas of the City
20 where this problem could arise?

21 MR. HERNANDEZ: Dennis, what about Old
22 Cutler Bay?

23 MR. SMITH: Old Cutler Bay --

24 MR. HERNANDEZ: It doesn't, either.

25 MR. SMITH: But they're all -- Old Cutler

1 Bay is all in the flood zone.

2 MR. HERNANDEZ: It's flood. It's flood.

3 MR. SMITH: Yeah. You see, with Journey's
4 End, what's unique about it is, along -- I think it's
5 Journey's End Lane --

6 MR. ADLER: One half of it.

7 MR. SMITH: -- you have one half of it that
8 is out of the flood plain and one half that's in, and
9 the way to deal with that is to deal with it by
10 amending the Journey's End site-specifics to give
11 them a height provision at 34 or 35 feet, which is
12 what we do in Hammock Lakes and Snapper Creek, and
13 Gables Estates is even a little bit higher.

14 CHAIRMAN KORGE: But it's just a height
15 issue, right? That's the only real issue, in respect
16 to the discrepancies between the site-specific regs
17 and these regs?

18 MR. SMITH: Right. For Journey's End, I
19 think it's --

20 CHAIRMAN KORGE: But other than Journey's
21 End, I mean, in other words -- I'm not saying this
22 very well. We've got --

23 MS. KEON: Right.

24 CHAIRMAN KORGE: We've got an area of the
25 City that is regulated primarily by site-specific

1 rules.

2 MR. SMITH: Right.

3 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Some of those rules
4 don't -- to the extent those rules apply, these
5 proposed regs would not, but there may be some
6 things, like the height limitations, that are not
7 found in those site-specific regs.

8 MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

9 CHAIRMAN KORGE: I guess the question I'm
10 asking is, aside from this one issue with Journey's
11 End, do we have a similar issue, or other, you know,
12 FAR issues or anything else, for the other
13 site-specific areas, that you're aware of?

14 MR. SMITH: I don't believe so, and I don't
15 know that it's as much an issue as Mr. Adler makes it
16 to be in Journey's End, on that one side of the
17 street. But, you know, I can see where, in Journey's
18 End, they do have a little bit larger lots. That's
19 the one subdivision in Coral Gables that probably has
20 the largest lots, except for Snapper Creek, okay? I
21 think those two are equal with the really big lots.

22 CHAIRMAN KORGE: They all have a different
23 height requirement, except for --

24 MR. SMITH: They have a different height
25 requirement than --

1 MS. MORENO: But I think Dennis's
2 suggestion works.

3 MS. KEON: Yeah.

4 MS. MORENO: Amend the site-specifics --

5 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Right.

6 MS. MORENO: -- for Journey's End to cover
7 that.

8 MR. SMITH: That's it.

9 MS. MORENO: That's a better idea.

10 MR. SMITH: That takes care of it, because
11 the -- and because the provision for the interior
12 courtyard counting does not apply to the areas down
13 there where they have the -- where they're in the
14 flood zone. That was taken out of there because they
15 have bigger lots, that can accommodate the
16 courtyards. Where I would --

17 MS. MORENO: How was that taken out, in the
18 site-specific?

19 MR. SMITH: No, no --

20 MR. SALMAN: It was taken out.

21 MR. SMITH: Out of the provision in the
22 flood zones. The interior courtyards, they don't
23 count in that area.

24 MR. HERNANDEZ: Right.

25 MR. SMITH: But north of Sunset, the

1 northern part of the City, where we have big lots, I
2 would argue they should count, and I would argue that
3 the height limit should be there, because if someone
4 has a three-acre lot, I want to limit their height
5 and limit their mass as much as possible.

6 MR. HERNANDEZ: Right.

7 MR. SMITH: So, you know, that is more of a
8 restriction on them, and I think that that's
9 appropriate.

10 CHAIRMAN KORGE: So would it affect -- if
11 you go up Granada, you know, from Sunset, heading
12 north, there are a lot of large houses on that first
13 block, some really beautiful houses, too. Would they
14 have been able to be built under these rules, do you
15 know, off the top of your head?

16 MR. SMITH: Some of them yes and some of
17 them no. When we look at the historic homes, some of
18 them comply with the floor area requirements today
19 and some of them don't. It will be the same thing
20 with this. Some will comply with these requirements
21 and some won't.

22 CHAIRMAN KORGE: But you don't think it
23 would materially affect the ability to build
24 comparable houses?

25 MR. SMITH: No, I do not.

1 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Okay. Thanks.

2 MR. SMITH: I think it will keep people from
3 building houses that are not compatible --

4 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Got you.

5 MR. SMITH: -- more so.

6 MR. HERNANDEZ: I was just going to add one
7 thing, because we were having that same side bar
8 discussion, and that is, there was an earlier comment
9 about amassing lots, and while I don't think you can
10 restrict that activity -- I don't agree with the
11 person who made the statement earlier. I don't think
12 you can restrict a person from buying three lots and
13 building those to the allowable potential. What you
14 can do is make sure that if the neighboring context
15 is now 29 in terms of overall height, and somebody
16 gets five lots on Sorolla, that even though that's
17 going to be a larger house, it's going to feel
18 compatible with the others because it has the same
19 height limit. So I think we have to make a
20 distinct -- and in that case, the distinction is not
21 solely based on size. It's based on size and
22 location. And that's what I mean by the fact that
23 this matrix is getting quite sophisticated now,
24 because while in Journey's End, it's perfectly okay
25 to say, you know, you can raise the height limit, it

1 wouldn't if a person amassed a builder's acre on
2 Sorolla or on Milan or so on and so forth, or
3 Greenway.

4 MS. MORENO: Yeah, so I think Dennis's
5 suggestion of amending Journey's End is the right
6 one.

7 MR. HERNANDEZ: Right.

8 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Well, can we do that at the
9 same time that we're doing this?

10 MR. SALMAN: They have a separate agreement.

11 MR. SMITH: I think that would be a
12 separate -- that would have to be a separate and a
13 follow-up application --

14 MR. RIEL: Right.

15 MR. SMITH: -- because you would have to get
16 the Journey's End homeowners' association. You know,
17 I mean, Mr. Adler is one person. You may have a lot
18 of people there that may be against that. They would
19 have to, you know, look at that and bring that
20 forward to us in an application.

21 MS. MORENO: How long will it take them to
22 accomplish that?

23 MR. SMITH: Eric?

24 MR. RIEL: It's depending upon when we get
25 it, and --

1 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Excuse me for interrupting,
2 but why do they have to apply? I mean, you know, if
3 we're rewriting the whole Zoning Code, that's part of
4 the Zoning Code. Why do they have to actually apply,
5 themselves, for a change that is being imposed on
6 them because of the change we're making to the
7 overall Zoning Code? I mean, it would strike
8 me as --

9 MS. MORENO: This is different. This --
10 we're taking something they have away by this change,
11 as opposed to --

12 CHAIRMAN KORGE: So why should they have to
13 apply not to have to --

14 MS. MORENO: As opposed to the other way
15 around.

16 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Yeah.

17 MS. MORENO: That's Tom's point. You know,
18 we could exempt Journey's End from this. I think the
19 answer is to exempt Journey's End from this until
20 they get their site-specifics done, because otherwise
21 you're going to have a period where this is going to
22 apply to those houses, when we don't intend it to,
23 until they get their process going.

24 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Well, stated differently --
25 let me just continue that thought. Stated

1 differently, they'd be exempted from this, and they
2 would be subject to the old rules.

3 MR. SMITH: Right.

4 MS. MORENO: Right.

5 CHAIRMAN KORGE: So this would -- we would
6 have to state in here, if we did that, that Journey's
7 End -- referencing that would remain subject to the
8 old rules until those are -- until there's a
9 modification of site-specific rules.

10 MR. SMITH: What you can do, okay, and if
11 you look at -- we already do something like that
12 right now, okay?

13 MR. SALMAN: Uh-huh.

14 MR. SMITH: If you look at -- let's look at
15 Page 7, flat roofs without a parapet. "Except on
16 Lots 1 through 18, inclusive, Block 89, Lots 20
17 through 36, inclusive, Block 91, Riviera Section Part
18 Three."

19 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Got you.

20 MR. SMITH: Okay?

21 MS. MORENO: Let's do the same thing.

22 MR. SMITH: You can do the same thing on the
23 height provision or -- you know, for Journey's End.
24 We can say, except on lots whatever, block whatever,
25 Journey's End, and those will be --

1 MS. MORENO: Yeah, but be careful, because
2 then what you would end up doing is --

3 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Having no height
4 limitation.

5 MS. MORENO: -- having no height limitation.

6 CHAIRMAN KORGE: You have to reference --

7 MR. SMITH: No, no, no, no, no --

8 MS. MORENO: Oh, because it's an overlay.

9 MR. SMITH: -- because the height would
10 be --

11 MS. MORENO: The underlying.

12 MR. SMITH: -- 39 or whatever.

13 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Okay.

14 MR. SMITH: Okay? And all others shall be
15 this, except as provided for in the site-specific
16 regulations.

17 MS. MORENO: Okay.

18 MR. SMITH: I have to check -- we have to
19 check with Liz and see if we can do it that way
20 still.

21 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Okay.

22 MS. MORENO: I think -- because I don't want
23 to create a period of time where they're subject to
24 29 feet, because I agree with Mr. Adler, yeah, that
25 it's going to look weird to have all the houses be 35

1 feet high, or 34 or 39, and then this house at 29
2 feet. It would look odd.

3 MR. SMITH: I always have to disagree with
4 him a little bit. He builds big houses.

5 MR. ADLER: I just want to clarify one
6 thing, just so everybody understands and it's on the
7 record, okay? One, I'm not just talking about
8 Journey's End. I think you have to be careful of all
9 the other places -- just as an aside, okay, just
10 because I live there, it doesn't mean I'm just
11 talking about Journey's End -- and I want to make
12 sure that this Board understands that I'm not
13 speaking on behalf of Journey's End Homeowners'
14 Association.

15 MS. MORENO: We understand that.

16 MS. KEON: No, no, no, we understand that.

17 CHAIRMAN KORGE: We understand that.

18 MR. ADLER: I'm just one member. I don't
19 represent them. They may totally disagree with
20 everything I just said here, and I want to make sure
21 everybody understands that.

22 MR. SMITH: Well, one thing I would say is,
23 I think that this will apply, really, only to
24 Journey's End, because if you go further up Old
25 Cutler, once you get on the other side of the wall,

1 then you have homes that are right across the street
2 from other homes that are going to be at the 29-foot
3 height limit, and I think this is primarily a
4 Journey's End issue.

5 MS. KEON: Gables Estates?

6 MR. SMITH: No, it's not a Gables Estates
7 issue, because they have site-specifics.

8 MS. KEON: Right. Right. So it's really
9 only them, so you could do whatever you need to do
10 to make sure that because they have larger lots and
11 everything --

12 MR. SMITH: That they're not affected.

13 MS. KEON: -- that they're not affected by
14 this.

15 MR. SMITH: Yeah, but as you go up Old
16 Cutler, they're across the street from other homes
17 that are going to be at 29, or are at 29 or less.

18 MS. KEON: But aren't they enclosed behind a
19 wall and sort of separated?

20 MR. SMITH: They're enclosed behind a wall.

21 MS. MORENO: No, he's talking about other
22 homes, not Journey's End.

23 MS. KEON: Oh, other homes, sorry.

24 MR. SMITH: The other homes, going north on
25 Old Cutler.

1 MS. KEON: Right, yeah.

2 MR. SMITH: I don't want to do something to
3 affect them just because they're on the ridge --

4 MS. KEON: Right.

5 MR. SMITH: -- because it's across the
6 street.

7 MS. KEON: No, no, no, just stay with
8 Journey's End.

9 MR. SMITH: It becomes a problem with that.

10 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Okay, next witness?

11 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: The last speaker is
12 Paul Posnak.

13 MR. POSNAK: I'm at 829 Catalonia.

14 MR. AIZENSTAT: Name, please?

15 MR. POSNAK: Paul Posnak is my name.

16 MR. AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

17 MR. POSNAK: When I started reading the
18 statement of purpose, all I could think of was,
19 "Bravo," because this is really, I think, more than a
20 step or two in the right direction, this is really
21 we're getting to, you know, the real McCoy, and I'm
22 very happy to see what's going on, personally, and as
23 I know a lot of people who are friends and neighbors
24 would feel the same way, so congratulations from my
25 point of view.

1 I think that as far as the area of 15-1, A,
2 on Page 9, it's just a matter, I think, of -- just to
3 support what other people are saying, have been
4 saying -- more a descriptive and clearly written
5 proposal or statement there, so that we do not
6 prohibit architectural personality and creativity.

7 I fully understand Ms. Moreno's objections
8 to the language, because it tends to imply a kind of
9 a conformity or rigidity, and I think it's easy to
10 address that, to tweak it. Otherwise, you know, if
11 we don't have these constraints, we get to Cole
12 Porter's "Anything Goes," and that's Coconut Grove,
13 and it will be a very different, ultimately, change
14 of character of our City. It reminds me of a great
15 statement by Igor Stravinsky, that out of the
16 greatest constraint comes the greatest freedom, and I
17 think we have some wonderful architects, people like
18 Jorge Hernandez, in our community, who deal with
19 these things very creatively.

20 Now, there's another issue that has not been
21 specifically dealt with, that I think is
22 interrelated, which is that of house demolition.
23 This may be difficult to consider, but we have had --
24 one of the problems with the situation that has
25 caused this to be an urgent issue, this whole series

1 of urgent issues, is that people buy homes and are
2 increasingly doing this demolition derby, where
3 beautiful older homes, not homes that are in bad
4 shape, not homes that are not aesthetically
5 appropriate to the neighborhood or beautiful,
6 irregardless, are being torn down.

7 The house just opposite me, 830 Catalonia,
8 is a poster child example. We have a block that is,
9 I think, of historic value there. The homes are all
10 1948 to 1950, and they're, by the way, very different
11 from each other, wonderfully different from each
12 other, but they're wonderfully architecturally
13 compatible in style and scale. And the house across
14 the way, which was absolutely beautiful, and could
15 have been expanded, renovated, was torn down for a
16 McMansion that's going to have seven bedrooms and
17 seven and a half baths, and that was supposed to be
18 5900 square feet; now it's going to be 6200 plus
19 square feet and have a virtual carport, and I don't
20 even know if that's actually something that -- I'd
21 like to just deal with the enforcement issue here.

22 But if you want to or feel so moved to
23 consider some language about demolition, to the
24 extent that there should be some reasonable cause for
25 demolition, or some language that gives some

1 protection to the neighborhood this way, that's just
2 a thought that I had in mind.

3 I support, also, the limitation of garage.
4 If you have a 50-foot lot, I don't see the need to
5 have more than a one-car garage. In fact, one of the
6 nice models of the City, especially the northern
7 part, with the smaller houses, is the recessed
8 garage, where you can park two or three cars very
9 nicely in any event, where one car is garaged and the
10 other one or two are not, and even maybe with a
11 75-foot lot, but that's been very well gone over, and
12 I agree with the 29-foot height over established
13 grade. If people want to erect towers and parapets
14 and castle turrets and church steeples, they can do
15 that in Pinecrest on an acre or larger home, or I
16 agree with the person from Journey's End, you know,
17 if we could have a mansion variance for a community
18 where the lots and the house sizes are compatibly
19 larger, that way, it makes sense.

20 My concern, I suppose, because of my own
21 traumatic experience, I wish that this was being done
22 a couple of years ago. Hats off, I wish it were --
23 too late for me and for my block and for my neighbors
24 and for my family -- is enforcement of these building
25 codes. I don't -- I have a feeling that -- well, I

1 have seen homes where, inevitably, variances have
2 been given, very frequently, and we need to be very
3 strict when we enact these things, and maybe have
4 some kind of help to the Board of Architects so that
5 things don't slip through.

6 The building across the street from us is a
7 case in point. All the houses I mentioned are
8 approximately 2800 to 3,000 square feet. This is
9 apparently now going to -- now -- it was supposed to
10 be 5900 square feet. Now, apparently -- I just saw
11 the specs -- it's advertised at 6200 square feet, and
12 with seven, as I said, bedrooms and seven and a half
13 baths. So you get the idea. So I hope that we can
14 maybe take a look at that, in the present, as well.
15 But this hopefully will not happen again if this is
16 put into place. Thank you very much for all your
17 good work.

18 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Thank you.

19 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: No more speakers.

20 CHAIRMAN KORGE: No more?

21 Okay. I'll open it for discussion. Anybody
22 have any comments?

23 MS. MORENO: I could start, if you want.

24 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Please.

25 MS. MORENO: First I want to say that I have

1 been troubled by this issue from the beginning,
2 because to me, it was a classic pitting of interests,
3 where people who have a need for more living space
4 and needed to increase their house, especially on the
5 small lots, were at odds with their neighbors who
6 wanted to keep the houses small, and what I like
7 about what you did, Dennis, is that you've taken away
8 some massing, but you've taken it away not from
9 living space but from extra space, I guess, is what I
10 would call it. You know, it's -- sure, it's not as
11 nice to live with a lower ceiling, but this still
12 will be a very acceptable height ceiling. And sure,
13 it's nice to have a two-car garage, but, you know,
14 you deal with one car, and my problem was taking away
15 bedrooms and bathrooms from people, and I think this
16 balances it pretty well.

17 I was also concerned about taking dollars
18 out of people's pockets, because frankly, if you
19 downsize what can be built, you know, that person
20 that was, one day before, saying, "Yes, please limit
21 these big houses," is then going to be before us,
22 saying, "Oh, but you took away my dollars, because
23 now I can't sell my lot for the \$700,000 that I
24 wanted to get for it."

25 (Thereupon, Ms. Alfonsin left the Commission

1 Chambers.)

2 MS. MORENO: So, to me, as a Board member,
3 you had those issues, and I think that this is, as
4 some of the speakers have said, a compromise that
5 works for me.

6 That being said, I think, of the issues that
7 were raised by the various people, the ones that I
8 thought need more consideration were the question of
9 allowing unequal distribution for setbacks. I'm not
10 sure that you need to tweak it very much. I think
11 that what I would do is say that -- create a
12 presumption that they should be equal, but have a
13 little more leeway about when they can be allowed to
14 be unequal, not just when it's a hardship or
15 something unusual, but, you know, give someone leeway
16 to decide, in this particular context, as I think
17 someone said, if it means that you put the two
18 garages five feet apart, well, that's a situation
19 where you should allow unequal spaces, and maybe
20 contextual takes care of that. I don't know the
21 answer.

22 I am a hundred percent in agreement with Pat
23 that the garage has to be proportionate to the
24 frontage. I like the one third/two thirds, and I'm
25 not offended by saying a 75-foot frontage should have

1 only one garage. And to me, the answer is what
2 happens in a lot of the traditional Spanish. If you
3 really want to protect two cars, as opposed to one,
4 well, you have one garage and then you have a
5 carport. But to have -- there's several houses on
6 Alhambra, built in the '50s, that all you see is the
7 garage.

8 MR. SALMAN: Right.

9 MS. MORENO: You know, the garage is the
10 entire facade, and that, to me, is offensive.

11 MS. KEON: There's one on Riviera.

12 MS. MORENO: I think we need to clarify
13 that the enclosing of the porch is prohibited only
14 if, as a result of the enclosure, you exceed FAR.

15 I am very concerned about that language
16 about compatibility, harmonious, et cetera. I, as a
17 lawyer, would read that to mean that I cannot put a
18 two-story home in a one-story neighborhood, and maybe
19 that's what we want. I just don't want to have
20 unintended consequences. And, you know, I tried to
21 follow Jorge's distinction between style and type,
22 and maybe two-story and one-story is a type and you
23 can have it in different styles, but I think you --
24 at least for me, reading it, without being an
25 architect, it says to me, you've got to be

1 consistent.

2 On the other hand, I agree with the last
3 gentleman that spoke, that a 6,000-square-foot house
4 has no business in area where all the houses are 2400
5 square feet, even if you're able to amass all the
6 lots. So how we address that issue -- you know,
7 maybe it should have been addressed as not being
8 consistent with the character. I leave that.

9 And the building heights, I think with the
10 modification for Journey's End, that satisfied me.

11 So those were my notes and my comments. And
12 thank you very much for your efforts.

13 MR. SMITH: Thank you.

14 MR. SALMAN: Dennis, congratulations.
15 Besides everything that we've talked about, I want to
16 congratulate you on having corrected a whole series
17 of other issues that have been dragging in the old
18 Code, where things were just not able to be found
19 easily. The 35-foot setback on lakefront or canal
20 properties is one of the primary ones, as well as,
21 some other more difficult-to-find issues in the Code
22 have now been cleaned up in a way that is logical and
23 easy to understand, and as a user of the Code, I
24 thank you.

25 My comments, and I don't want to echo too

1 much what Cristina's were, because she covered a
2 whole lot of ground --

3 MS. MORENO: Yeah, I stole the thunder.

4 MR. SALMAN: Yeah, you did, but that's okay.
5 That's what you're here for.

6 CHAIRMAN KORGE: It shortened the meeting.

7 MR. SALMAN: The issue really is one of
8 typology. I think that Jorge hit it right on the
9 head, and it has nothing -- and it has to do with
10 proportion and size. I don't see a problem with
11 somebody amassing two or three lots and building up a
12 five or six thousand square foot house, even in a
13 neighborhood of two thousand, because it's fine. I
14 don't see that as necessarily being a problem. But
15 likewise, somebody who has a project or a house of
16 over an acre, they still have a whole lot of house
17 they can build under the current -- under this
18 iteration of the Code, and we're not imposing a
19 hardship.

20 And quite honestly, a lot of the variance
21 requests of the Board of Adjustment were often just
22 really late-caught errors that were justified under a
23 hardship, that were then brought to this Board -- to
24 that Board, and this addresses a lot of it. So this
25 is going to relieve a lot of the unwarranted and

1 unnecessary variance requests that we used to see,
2 where we just sort of had to squint and say, "Okay,
3 well, I can see where we're stretching the point of a
4 hardship." This answers that question in many, many
5 ways, and I thank you for that.

6 And finally --

7 CHAIRMAN KORGE: And the Board of Adjustment
8 thanks you for that.

9 MR. SALMAN: Very specific -- and the Board
10 of Adjustment is going to thank you for that.

11 And finally, a very specific issue with
12 regards to the openings for the garages. I agree
13 that there should be no more than one garage per
14 lot. If you've got one lot, you get one garage. If
15 you've got two, you get two, two garages. It looks
16 right. It's just very simple. 65 or less could be
17 the cutoff, because we do have odd lots.

18 MR. SMITH: We'll look at the one third/two
19 thirds. I think that's what's going to work.

20 MR. SALMAN: It will work out that way. It
21 will just work out that way.

22 And finally, the openings of the garage, I
23 want to make sure we keep them down -- I see them
24 growing up to get your Hummers in and whatnot -- and
25 limit it to like an eight-foot height, no more than

1 that.

2 MS. KEON: Well, you've got to allow those
3 pickups to get in there --

4 MR. SALMAN: No.

5 MS. KEON: -- if you want them off the
6 street.

7 MR. SALMAN: I don't want them -- they can
8 park a pickup. I mean, an eight-foot clearance is
9 fine.

10 MS. KEON: Okay, I mean, as long as they
11 can. I don't know what that clearance --

12 MR. SALMAN: I just don't want them to go
13 crazy.

14 MS. KEON: Yeah.

15 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Pat?

16 MS. KEON: I'd like, in your going through
17 and working on this, for this proportion to allow
18 garages -- I think that for people that have 50-foot
19 lots, if you want to encourage them to have that --
20 to develop in that style where you have the carport
21 and then you have the garage recessed, if there is
22 something in here that would prohibit you from doing
23 that, the way it's written now, that maybe you would
24 carve out a provision that would make it permissible
25 under that, to encourage that type of building, so it

1 may be that, you know, when you start adding up all
2 those numbers, you may need to make -- you may need
3 to give somewhere. You know, you may need to give
4 with the setback in the back. You may need to give
5 something. I don't know what it is, but I'm sure,
6 you know, you do, and Mr. Hernandez and the Board of
7 Architects that have -- you know, will gladly work
8 with you, I'm sure, can help you. But I really think
9 that that is the style that we would like to see
10 here, you know, to continue, because I think part of
11 that is what provides some of the character for that
12 area.

13 MS. MORENO: Maybe, in those cases, you can
14 count the garage half.

15 MS. KEON: You know, and maybe that. You
16 know, maybe it's that. It may be that it's half, but
17 I -- you know, I trust that you certainly know how to
18 get there, and you will. Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Eibi?

20 MR. AIZENSTAT: I echo the same sentiments
21 as my fellow Board Members. I do agree that terraces
22 and so forth should be allowed to be closed as long
23 as they meet -- they don't exceed the FAR.

24 Where I might differ a little bit is that I
25 feel that, in a 75-foot-wide lot, you should be able

1 to accommodate two vehicles, and not necessarily in
2 tandem. Whether it is one garage and one carport,
3 whatever means it might be, I do feel that a lot of
4 that size, building a 60-foot house wide -- a person
5 shouldn't have to move one vehicle that's parked in
6 the back to get the spouse's vehicle or somebody
7 else's vehicle out of there. So I would like to --
8 or I do encourage you to look at other ways on how to
9 be able to put two vehicles that are not necessarily
10 tandem. That doesn't mean that you have to do a wide
11 garage. I mean, there's other ways. You might
12 narrow the specs, like the other gentleman said, to
13 11 feet and so forth. But I do feel that a property
14 starting at 75 foot does merit two vehicles.

15 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Well, I don't have much
16 more to add to what has already been said.
17 Congratulations, I suppose, that, you know, we've
18 really made some progress.

19 The only other comment I'll add, that I've
20 already given, was in relation to -- you know, the
21 towers and the other things that might go above the
22 29-foot level. I still believe that it would be
23 helpful for the designers to allow them to do that.
24 Someone had -- one of the speakers suggested that
25 that include a limit on the percentage of the area

1 that could go above that 29-foot height for purposes
2 of a cupola or a tower or something like that.

3 You know, maybe that's not going to be
4 acceptable to everybody else, but I think that if we
5 don't accommodate those design features, it's likely
6 that they're going to just disappear, because it's
7 not going to make business sense for the builder or
8 the home owner to reduce the entire structure in
9 order to accommodate a design feature that is
10 primarily for aesthetic purposes. So just think
11 about that some more. I don't know.

12 Anyway, that was my only comment. I think
13 it's really good we've made a lot of progress. I
14 don't know if anybody here wants to --

15 MR. RIEL: Mr. Chairman --

16 CHAIRMAN KORGE: I guess you're going to
17 have some more drafting?

18 MR. RIEL: If I could -- if I could -- yeah,
19 and just a couple -- going through my notes, I just
20 want to make sure we're clear on some other issues,
21 very briefly.

22 Add the language on covenants regarding
23 carports and porches? Okay, that's a yes?

24 MS. MORENO: Yes.

25 MR. SALMAN: Yes.

1 MR. RIEL: The discussion of the two-story
2 continuous walls, that was not supported?

3 MR. SMITH: We're going to -- we'll look at
4 that.

5 MR. AIZENSTAT: I think that has to be
6 looked at further or studied further --

7 MR. RIEL: Okay.

8 MR. AIZENSTAT: -- as to how to do that.

9 MS. KEON: I think they wanted to give some
10 direction to the Board of Architects in dealing with
11 that issue.

12 MR. RIEL: Okay, and then --

13 MS. MORENO: That list of elements.

14 MS. KEON: Yeah, with elements that would
15 be --

16 MR. SALMAN: Adding a list of elements.

17 MS. KEON: That they would look at it,
18 because it may be appropriate and it may be
19 inappropriate, but we want it looked at.

20 MR. RIEL: And then the clarification on the
21 20 percent of the 40 percent landscaping? That's --

22 MR. AIZENSTAT: In other words, just to
23 clarify that it's 20 percent of the 40 percent.

24 MR. RIEL: Of the 40, okay.

25 MR. AIZENSTAT: And there is one thing which

1 I'd like to say. From the way I read it, on the 29
2 feet, the way I read it in here is that it's a
3 29-foot maximum.

4 MS. MORENO: Uh-huh.

5 MR. AIZENSTAT: I know we started talking
6 about an average, but if I understood you correctly,
7 you were talking about an average on the interior
8 space --

9 MS. MORENO: Right.

10 MR. AIZENSTAT: -- based on that 13 --

11 MS. MORENO: No, actually, I'm the one that
12 asked -- I'm the one that asked about the average,
13 and it was answered by the people who came up that
14 they really wanted it to be a maximum, so I agree
15 with that.

16 MR. AIZENSTAT: Right, and that's the way I
17 interpret this, is that it really states as a
18 maximum --

19 MR. SMITH: Right.

20 MR. AIZENSTAT: -- and that the average, we
21 were just talking interior space.

22 MR. SALMAN: That would only underline Tom's
23 argument that perhaps you get some leeway, to a very
24 small percentage of the lot -- buildable lot
25 coverage, to be able to exceed that --

1 CHAIRMAN KORGE: For design features.

2 MR. SALMAN: And then the problem becomes,
3 to what limit? That's the problem.

4 CHAIRMAN KORGE: That, I don't know, and I'm
5 glad I could even spot the issue, to be honest with
6 you.

7 MR. RIEL: I've got two other ones.
8 Allowing courtyards on larger lots?

9 MS. KEON: Pardon me?

10 MR. RIEL: Allowing courtyards on larger
11 lots. We talked about allowing the ability --

12 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Well, I think that's been
13 addressed.

14 MR. SMITH: Yeah.

15 MS. KEON: That was addressed.

16 MR. SMITH: That was addressed. I explained
17 that.

18 CHAIRMAN KORGE: I think it's clear that it
19 really is -- it doesn't do what we thought it did.

20 MR. SMITH: No.

21 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Right.

22 MR. RIEL: Okay, and then the other, the
23 last one, was the identical architecture, to make
24 sure that's strengthened.

25 MS. MORENO: I agree a hundred percent with

1 that. I don't know where you put it, but --

2 MS. KEON: We'd like it in the Code.

3 MR. SMITH: What's that?

4 MR. RIEL: The identical architecture, the
5 use of identical architecture on streets, basically.

6 MR. SMITH: We'll include that in this draft
7 and do something.

8 MS. MORENO: Yes.

9 MR. SMITH: That needs to be strengthened.

10 MS. MORENO: Yeah, and one of my suggestions
11 is, don't use the word "identical," because they'll
12 say it's not identical if you flip it or if you
13 change a window. If it's substantially similar, you
14 know.

15 MR. SALMAN: "Substantially similar" works
16 for me.

17 CHAIRMAN KORGE: There was one thing --

18 MR. AIZENSTAT: Who determines that?

19 MS. MORENO: The Board of Architects.

20 MR. SALMAN: The Board of Architects.

21 MR. AIZENSTAT: Okay.

22 CHAIRMAN KORGE: There was one question I
23 meant to ask earlier and forgot to. On the open
24 landscaping, if you have stepping stones or something
25 like that, that would not count against the open

1 landscaping?

2 MR. SMITH: Yes, it would.

3 CHAIRMAN KORGE: It would?

4 MR. SMITH: Yes.

5 CHAIRMAN KORGE: So if you have a stepping
6 stone --

7 MS. MORENO: It's not open.

8 MR. SMITH: Those count. Those are
9 impervious. That's not landscaping.

10 MS. MORENO: It's got to be open, like
11 grass.

12 MS. KEON: What if you have like the stones
13 with the grass between them? They're sort of laid
14 out --

15 CHAIRMAN KORGE: That's what I'm talking
16 about.

17 MS. KEON: -- like that. Would --

18 MR. SMITH: Those would count.

19 MS. KEON: That would count?

20 MR. SMITH: Yes, they would.

21 MS. KEON: Okay. That's fine.

22 MR. AIZENSTAT: They would count -- wait --

23 MR. SMITH: They would count --

24 MR. SALMAN: Uh-uh.

25 MR. AIZENSTAT: Against.

1 MR. SMITH: They would count against. It
2 wouldn't count as landscaping.

3 MR. AIZENSTAT: Right.

4 CHAIRMAN KORGE: So you're not going to be
5 able to have a stepping stone --

6 MS. MORENO: It doesn't count -- guys, it's
7 eight percent.

8 MR. AIZENSTAT: You can't have any pavers,
9 stepping stones or anything except grass?

10 MS. MORENO: Or ground cover or flowers or
11 trees.

12 MR. SMITH: Exactly.

13 MR. SALMAN: Exactly.

14 MS. KEON: But that's not very big --

15 MR. SALMAN: Or just dirt.

16 MS. KEON: That's not a lot.

17 MS. MORENO: It's eight percent.

18 MS. KEON: It's eight percent. That's
19 really not much.

20 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Yeah.

21 MR. AIZENSTAT: But we just want to be
22 clear.

23 MS. KEON: Right, but it's not much.

24 MS. MORENO: Let me make a suggestion in
25 that "substantially similar" issue. Why don't you

1 include that the architect has to also indicate what
2 other projects he's built in the Gables? And that
3 way, you catch him. I mean, if he's copying somebody
4 else's project, you don't catch it, but --

5 MR. SMITH: Let me work on it.

6 MS. MORENO: Okay.

7 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yeah, that's going to be a
8 fat -- a whole book.

9 MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

10 MR. SALMAN: Uh-huh.

11 CHAIRMAN KORGE: So you're going to come
12 back with whatever revisions you think that we've
13 discussed?

14 MR. RIEL: We're going to need -- I'm going
15 to need a motion from the Board, though. I'm going
16 to need a motion from the Board, because --

17 MR. AIZENSTAT: How? How do we -- what type
18 of motion?

19 MR. RIEL: Well, to instruct Mr. Smith to
20 come back with the changes, because the City
21 Commission asked that this come to them in June, and
22 it's obviously not going to happen, because they only
23 have one meeting in June, June 6th.

24 MS. MORENO: Okay, I make a motion that the
25 draft of this ordinance, that is pretty close to

1 being finished, be revised in accordance with the --

2 MR. AIZENSTAT: Comments.

3 MS. MORENO: -- concerns expressed at this
4 meeting.

5 MR. AIZENSTAT: As noted by Eric.

6 MS. MORENO: Do we need to see it again?

7 Yes.

8 MR. SALMAN: As noted in the record.

9 MR. RIEL: It's included in the record.

10 MS. KEON: As noted in the record.

11 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Pardon me?

12 MR. SALMAN: It's on the record.

13 MR. RIEL: Which you summarized in the end.

14 It was basically 10 or 12 issues.

15 MS. MORENO: Yeah.

16 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN KORGE: I'm sorry, say that again.

18 I didn't hear you.

19 MR. RIEL: You summarized those in the end.

20 There's approximately 10 or 12 issues.

21 MS. MORENO: Yes.

22 MS. KEON: So it's in the record.

23 MS. MORENO: So it's in the record, but do
24 we need to see them before the Commission sees them,
25 or do we give Dennis our instructions and let him

1 draft it for the Commission? That's the question I
2 have.

3 MS. KEON: I'd like to see them.

4 MR. SALMAN: We'd like to see them.

5 CHAIRMAN KORGE: It's a consensus. Does
6 everybody want to see them again?

7 MS. KEON: I'd like to see them all.

8 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Okay.

9 MS. KEON: So we know what they're --

10 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Then I guess that's the
11 consensus, that we'll --

12 MS. MORENO: Okay.

13 CHAIRMAN KORGE: We'll see them again.

14 MS. MORENO: And then that it come back to
15 us for further -- for approval, I guess. That's my
16 motion.

17 MR. SMITH: That's fine.

18 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Is there a second?

19 MS. KEON: I'll second it.

20 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Any discussion on the
21 motion?

22 MR. SALMAN: It blows the Commission's
23 request right out of the water, unless we get a
24 special meeting of this Board between now and the --

25 MR. RIEL: Well, I don't think Mr. Smith is

1 going to be able to make the changes by next
2 Wednesday, because that's the time line.

3 MR. SALMAN: That would be the cutoff,
4 right?

5 MR. RIEL: Yeah, but we will go report to
6 the Commission. Obviously, they'll get the minutes,
7 and we'll report to them and summarize what the 10 or
8 12 issues --

9 MR. SALMAN: Tell them we're real close.
10 We're real close.

11 MR. RIEL: We will certainly report to them
12 on the June 6th meeting.

13 MR. SALMAN: And we're substantially better.
14 Do you want any of us to go report to the --

15 MR. RIEL: That's really not necessary, but
16 if the Board would like to appoint someone, that's
17 within your purview. We will certainly convey --

18 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Any more discussion? Let's
19 call the roll on this one.

20 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Eibi Aizenstat?

21 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yes.

22 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Robert Behar?
23 Pat Keon?

24 MS. KEON: Yes.

25 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Cristina Moreno?

1 MS. MORENO: Yes.

2 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Javier Salman?

3 MR. SALMAN: Yes.

4 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Tom Korge?

5 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Yes.

6 That concludes our meeting.

7 MR. RIEL: Yes. The --

8 CHAIRMAN KORGE: We still need -- excuse me
9 for interrupting, but we're going to need,
10 eventually, to go over the nonconformity regs.

11 MR. RIEL: Yes. Well, there's two --

12 CHAIRMAN KORGE: We've never reviewed this.

13 MR. RIEL: There's two -- there's two
14 articles in the Code or two divisions we haven't gone
15 over, landscaping and nonconformities. My intention
16 was to bring back the entire document of the Zoning
17 Code on June 7th. I don't think we're going to be
18 ready for that, so therefore, I don't think we're
19 going to have a meeting on June 7th.

20 So the next meeting will be June 14th, which
21 is the regular meeting, which we have projects, but
22 what we're going towards is June 21st, as having that
23 initial, first Zoning Code meeting. Based upon the
24 attendance, we will have six people at that evening's
25 meeting, so --

1 MR. AIZENSTAT: So there is no meeting June
2 7th?

3 MR. RIEL: June 7th, there will not be a
4 meeting.

5 MR. AIZENSTAT: So the next meeting is June
6 14th?

7 MR. RIEL: June 14th, and that's a regular
8 agenda item.

9 MS. MORENO: I thought you were going to get
10 stuff done while I was away.

11 MR. RIEL: We were trying.

12 MS. MORENO: Skip the meeting?

13 MR. RIEL: We tried.

14 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Were you expecting to do
15 the whole -- finish the whole rewrite, when we
16 haven't reviewed these articles yet?

17 MR. RIEL: What we're going to do is, we're
18 going to go through and present to you what you all
19 have recommended, but on those sections that we
20 haven't presented, we're obviously going to go into
21 them with some more detail, so -- the intent is to
22 roll the Code, because you've made a lot of different
23 recommendations. Staff has gone through it, line by
24 line. We're finalizing that final draft, and then
25 we're going to get it to you in the next week or two.

1 We want you to have enough time to look at it.

2 If I give it to you next Wednesday and then
3 have the meeting the Wednesday thereafter, I don't
4 think you're going to have enough time to look at it,
5 but the intent of the 21st meeting is to tell you
6 what you've done and how they all connect to one
7 another, and to go over the nonconformity in much
8 more detail and then obviously give you the
9 landscaping.

10 The landscaping wasn't completed, because we
11 hadn't completed the single-family. Now it's
12 finished, and we're actually concluding the landscape
13 code with other departments right now, so --

14 MR. AIZENSTAT: And who's taking a look at
15 doing all that? Is it still through Charles Siemon's
16 office?

17 MR. RIEL: Who is doing it? It's Charlie
18 Siemon's office, and I can tell you, it's City Staff,
19 the Building & Zoning Department, Historic
20 Preservation, City Manager's Office, Planning
21 Department. We've sat down and gone through the
22 entire Code again. We've looked at all your
23 recommendations. We will tell you where we disagree
24 with you, and we will tell you where we agree, and
25 we're producing a final document.

1 MS. MORENO: Okay.

2 MR. RIEL: So June 14th is the next meeting.

3 MR. AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

4 MS. KEON: I'm not going to be -- I won't be
5 here on the 21st. When is the next one to follow
6 that?

7 MR. RIEL: The next regular meeting is, I
8 believe, July 12th.

9 MS. KEON: So there won't be another
10 meeting, then, before July 12th?

11 MR. RIEL: No.

12 MS. KEON: Okay.

13 MR. RIEL: I think two in June is enough.

14 MS. KEON: So the 14th and the 12th.

15 CHAIRMAN KORGE: Will you e-mail it tomorrow
16 on that?

17 MR. RIEL: We will. We'll e-mail you.

18 MR. AIZENSTAT: Eric, thank you for
19 everything.

20 MR. RIEL: Thank you.

21 MS. MORENO: Thank you very much.

22 MR. AIZENSTAT: Dennis, thank you.

23 MR. SALMAN: And thanks to all who came out.

24 (Thereupon, the meeting was adjourned at
25 9:57 p.m.)

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

CERTIFICATE

STATE OF FLORIDA:

SS.

COUNTY OF MIAMI-DADE:

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

I, JOAN L. BAILEY, a Notary Public in and for the State of Florida at large, do hereby that all witnesses were duly sworn by me.

DATED this 30th day of May, 2006.

JOAN L. BAILEY, RDR

Notary Commission Number DD 190412.
My current notary commission expires 6/14/07.

