

Zoning Code Rewrite (Part 5)

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated 05 26 06 thru 09 15 06)

Refer to City's webpage for public comments Parts 1 - 4

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
1.	09/15/06 hand delivery	Mary T. Naccarato 3500 Segovia Street Coral Gables, FL 33134 (305) 444-0791		<p>RE: Metal Roofing - Planning Comments 9/27 Meeting</p> <p>I have been a taxpayer in Coral Gables since 1987, and I expect to see you and discuss this matter at the 9/27 meeting. My roof is in a state of disrepair, however, I am dismayed and really tired of paying for reproofing which, within a relatively short period of time, needs to be redone, yet again.</p> <p>Attached is a reprint of the 2/6/06 Miami Herald Action Line column which outlines the desirability of metal roofing and please note the numerous advantages over shingles, clay and concrete products. Further, please note the report on color choices, saving energy, recycled materials, but, more importantly, warranties for lengthy periods of time. The only disadvantage which I can see, is the cost; however, not to the City of Coral Gables, but to the homeowner: ME.</p> <p>I am well aware that Coral Gables has many zoning restrictions - my residence was the first one allowed to have a "Red" entrance door. Restrictions are important, but they should be for when the objective is either unsightly or unsuitable. Metal roofing, from what I have been able to ascertain, does not meet that criteria. Please go onto the web sites, which are also listed in the above-mentioned article, for additional information and, perhaps, elucidation.</p> <p>Further, I have been informed that somewhere in the Hammocks area, metal roofing has already been allowed, on a limited basis. Well, I question that, if one has already been allowed, why not others? The exigency of this matter needs your immediate attention and assistance, and I urge you to take this giant step forward which, more than likely, will then help many other Gables' taxpayers take advantage of doing something really worthwhile for their properties.</p> <p>Perhaps yours? Thank you for your consideration, and looking forward to seeing you at the 9/27 meeting.</p> <p>(SEE ATTACHED ARTICLE PROVIDED WITH LETTER)</p>
2.	09/15/06 via email	Robert Fine	finer@gtlaw.com	<p>Eric:</p> <p>On behalf of our client(s) who either own or have an interest in acquiring land in the mixed-use and commercial districts of the City, I want to express our support of Andy Murai's comments made at the last Planning & Zoning Board meeting regarding minimum lot size requirements. We agree with Andy's comment that the 20,000 square foot minimum lot size threshold for increased height in the commercial and mixed use districts is much too large. Such a large minimum lot size requirement encourages developers to assemble relatively large parcels which result in the relatively large projects which the Zoning Code</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite (Part 5)

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated 05 26 06 thru 09 15 06)

Refer to City's webpage for public comments Parts 1 - 4

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>Rewrite is attempting to scale back. By allowing smaller sites to achieve increased height, projects will be reduced in overall scale and height will still be limited by FAR, parking, and other parameters. We agree that a 10,000 square foot minimum lot size threshold for increased height in the commercial and mixed use districts should be strongly considered.</p> <p>Best regards, Robert Fine</p>
3.	09/14/06 via email	Amado J. "Al" Acosta (305) 345-2244	amadoJulio@aol.com	<p>We look forward to being able to complete these very preliminary comments regarding the new zoning code book that became available the day before the PAZB meeting on 9-6-06. We very much regret that the "strike and lined format" book will not be available until 9-20-06 and that then the comments on that effort (which is really the way to compare and find possible discrepancies or effects of concerns) are required by 9-27-06. There seems to be an awful lot to study and digest in just 1 week, even though RNA has fully participated in the process and is somewhat familiar with the proposals; however keep in mind that the "strike and lined format" is not yet existing and the rewrite is so voluminous and comprehensive that without that format it is almost impossible to really absorb, much less comprehend.</p> <p>We understand the direction given by the Commission at its 9-12-06 meeting, and we will try as best as we can to make additional comments by 9-27-06, for which we have engaged the services of professionals to help us towards that effort. We only request that the comments we will provide by then be taken into account at the 9-27-06 deliberations of the PAZB and at subsequent deliberations. We will do all we can to have our additional comments in to the Planning Dept. before 9-27-06</p> <p>Please keep in mind that our area is probably the only residential neighborhood in Coral Gables that has provided a Neighborhood Visioning Report based on a Charrette conducted under the direction and guidance of the University of Miami School of Architecture and Urban Studies. Our area is very susceptible to deterioration in the quality of life, as covered in that report, unless serious steps are taken now by the City to set up the framework for our protection. We therefore are very concerned regarding the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Allowing townhomes under MF1 and MF2. This greatly increases the density (4 as opposed to 2) and boxes in neighbors in an area where we need the existing duplex rating. Specifically on S. Alhambra Circle and on Caballero Blvd. the existing duplex lots serve the neighborhood well with buffers to the commercial structures approaching US 1 on both streets. 2. Additionally, with duplexes the rear set back on the Mahi Waterway is 35 ft, as with SF's in the area. This is very much needed for the protection of the waterway and the manatees that regularly come to this very special area, one of only 19 in Florida

Zoning Code Rewrite (Part 5)

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated 05 26 06 thru 09 15 06)

Refer to City's webpage for public comments Parts 1 - 4

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>designated as a special area by the Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission since calves are born here. However with townhomes, the rear set backs on water do not seem to apply. If the City is so set on having townhomes, we ask that at least in this area they not be allowed. Also under the CL classification, the rear set back on water bodies is not specified, something we have repeatedly called to the attention of the PAZB and to staff and keeps being left out. We also ask that this be set at 35 ft.</p> <p>3. Under the old code there were site-specific restrictions for Lot 8, Block 208, Riviera Section Part 14, which limited the height to four stories or 45 feet. This has been deleted from the new code and runs contrary to the needs presented in the Visioning Report.</p> <p>4. Under the old code the Mediterranean Bonus, pursuant to Section 28.6, was limited to three and one-half stories or 45 feet for properties which are contiguous to R districts, or contiguous to waterways which are contiguous to R use districts. This would restrict the heights of buildings adjacent to the duplex lots in our area to three and one-half stories. This has been changed in the new code under Article 5 to limit the restrictions to properties that are adjacent to SFR districts, or what was formerly known as residential. Therefore the properties located immediately adjacent to the new MF1 designation, formerly known as duplex, would not be restricted to three and one-half stories. This too runs against our buffering needs.</p> <p>5. Old code Article 3, page 42, (o) and (p), restricted building heights to three stories or 45 feet, whichever is less, on property abutting or across from streets, waterways or alleys from single family or duplex zoned property. If an existing property is re-platted as a single lot, this would apply to an entire lot which is adjacent to a residential or duplex lot. Under the new code, Article 4, page 4-14 (a), in MF2 zoning, this is limited to that portion of the property which is within 50 feet of the property line, as opposed to the entire lot. This too is negative to the needed buffering in our area..</p> <p>We look forward to continuing to work positively with the City no matter what challenges come our way, as we have done during the entire rewrite process. Mr. Riel has committed to us in writing revising the CLUP to include our defined area under the site specific listing in 1-3.3.3, and that will help us with future projects. However if the zoning framework is not done properly now, that revision could not do all we need.</p> <p>We again ask the City to help us in this very " development-fragile" area by incorporating in the code all aspects that maintain buffering with commercial areas, keep townhomes away from the area, and keep the setbacks that now protect us and protect the Mahi Waterway.</p> <p>Thanks. We will follow with more comments by 9-27-06. Amado J. , " AI", Acosta, PE</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite (Part 5)

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated 05 26 06 thru 09 15 06)

Refer to City's webpage for public comments Parts 1 - 4

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>Vice President, Chmn. Gov't Affairs Committee Riviera Neighborhood Association, Inc. Tel 305/345-2244</p>
4.	09/14/06 via email	Andres Murai, Jr.	A.Murai@muraigroup.com	<p>Gentlemen: Article 5 page 5-47 paragraphs 1.c needs to be taken out in its entirety as it will prohibit change of use in buildings built prior to 1964. Furthermore it will affect all buildings in the Industrial CC section. Remember this section has an overlay zoning. Article 4 Page 4-43 # 8 should be transferred to the mix use provisions section. Town homes in the Duplex area should not be allowed as it will increase intensity of use as well as density. Article 5 page 5-59 B-1 should exclude private buildings "for their own use" otherwise this allowance will be impossible to meet. Private buildings do not need to have 24 hour supervision as the rack parking will not be used. Other comments will follow. Thank you. Andres Murai Jr</p>
5.	09/14/06	Fernando E. Menoyo 744 Biltmore Way Coral Gables, FL 33134	rentals@coralgables.com	<p>Comments For: Section 4-111. Multi-family Special Area (MFSA)District.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Townhouse main front doors must face the street. This is important because when townhouse main front doors face the the street they become the most pedestrian friendly. - Uses: Do not allow family day care in this area. - 11. Streetscape standards. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If the parcel of land proposed is designated multi-family low density and is adjacent to parcels of land designated multi-family low density, AND PRESENTLY HAVE ON STREET PARKING SUCH AS ON CERTAIN PORTIONS OF VALENCIA, CARDENA, HERNANDO AND BILTMORE WAY, then an URBAN streetscape shall be required. - 10. Off-street parking TWO PARKING SPACES PER UNIT AND TANDEM SPACES ARE PERMITTED are missing from most recent draft - THE SERVICE LINES FOR ALL UTILITIES FOR NEW BUILDINGS AND OR STRUCTURES ON PRIVATE PROPERTY SHALL BE PLACED UNDEGROUND is missing from most recent draft.

Zoning Code Rewrite (Part 5)

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated 05 26 06 thru 09 15 06)

Refer to City's webpage for public comments Parts 1 - 4

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
6.	09/13/06 via email	Maria Longo 2828 Segovia Street	maricrislongo@aol.com	<p>The comments I make herein are for sections MF1 and MSFA of the proposed code.</p> <p>On the last public hearing held on September 6, I spoke about my opposition against the reduction of Duplex height for Segovia Street from 34 feet to 29 feet. (MF1, page 4-10 paragraph 6)</p> <p>The maximum height that may be built on Segovia Street with the current zoning is 34 feet. The proposed code for Duplex or MF1 District reduces the height to 29 feet. However, under the new proposed zoning code, Segovia also becomes part of the Multifamily Special Area District (MSFA), which allows Town Houses of up to 45 feet high.</p> <p>There is a contradiction of goals when the proposed code allows Town Houses of up to 45 feet high on Segovia Street and it also reduces duplex height to 29 feet. According to the proposed code, Town Houses and Duplexes may be built on Segovia.</p> <p>MSFA district was originally developed as a result of the moratorium because residents in the affected area opposed the construction of tall buildings that were significantly higher than single family homes for streets like Almeria, Valencia, Anderson, Malaga, Anastasia and Santander. The development of the Town Houses code is a positive result of the moratorium for the aforementioned streets because town houses serve as buffer for single family homes from higher density areas, and they are also more pedestrian friendly and less dense than multifamily dwellings.</p> <p>On the other hand, Segovia Street like other current Duplex zoned streets, serves as a buffer for single family homes from a collector road, and Segovia has single family homes on all adjacent streets east and west of it. There is no logical reason to change Segovia from duplex zoning to MSFA because duplex zoning complements well single family home districts; and additionally, this zoning is a reasonable transition from single family homes to collector roads. Segovia Street, Ponce De Leon and Lejeune are collector roads. The zoning code for the single family homes allows for a maximum height of 29 feet, therefore the current 34 feet maximum height for Duplex should remain the same.</p> <p>In conclusion, I urge you to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • leave MF1 - Duplex zoning at 34 feet high, • remove "town house dwellings" from the MF1- Duplex section; and • Leave Segovia zoned MF1 -Duplex on the comprehensive land map.

Zoning Code Rewrite (Part 5)

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated 05 26 06 thru 09 15 06)

Refer to City's webpage for public comments Parts 1 - 4

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
7.	09/13/06 via email	Phyllis Saldarriaga (305) 446-2770	terrorose@comcast.net	<p><u><i>Building Height for Duplex zoning :</i></u></p> <p>By arbitrary decision, the Planning and Zoning Board changed the current, allowable building height of 34 ft. for duplexes on Segovia St. to 29 ft. This was an arbitrary decision because the property owners on Segovia Street were not advised that such an issue was to be presented at the time this decision was made. In effect, this is a taking of our protected property rights without notice. As taxpayers, we have been paying for the current zoning of 34 Ft. Any change is subject to litigation.</p> <p>Last year at a Commission meeting, Commissioner Kerdyk and Mayor Sleznick stated that the purpose of the zoning re-write was to organize and simplify the Zoning Code. They assured those present that their intention was not to rezone or take away any current zoning. How can we trust our City Officials if their recorded statements at Commission Meetings do not reflect their "Behind the Scenes" decisions and machinations.</p> <p>As spokesperson for my family who owns six properties on Segovia Street, I object to any change in the current zoning for duplexes. We ask the Planning and Zoning Board to reverse their decision.</p> <p><u><i>Townhouse Zoning in the Multi-family Special Area (MFSA) District:</i></u></p> <p>At the September 6, 2006, meeting of the Planning and Zoning Board, there were several objections to townhomes being allowed to be built on Segovia Street which is located in the (MFSA) district that was established through the "Moratorium" of the City of Coral Gables.</p> <p>The Planning and Zoning Board and the City Commission are bound by the Moratorium. Any arbitrary changes would be subject to litigation.</p> <p>We ask the Planning and Zoning Board and the City Commission to adhere to the decisions of the Moratorium</p> <p>Phyllis Saldarriaga (305) 446-2770</p>
8.	09/13/06 via email	Elaine Codias, Ph.D.	iceceloh@bellsouth.net	<p>On Sept. 6, 2006 I attended the Planning and Zoning Board meeting where I brought to the attention of the Board that:</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite (Part 5)

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated 05 26 06 thru 09 15 06)

Refer to City's webpage for public comments Parts 1 - 4

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>In Article 3- Development Review, p. 3-8 [section 3-205, C. Duplications of elevations and/or exterior architectural design, 1. Except as provided...] the text needs to be replaced with the new text which was passed by the City Commission on August 22, 2006.</p> <p>The new, correct language regarding this issue can be found in Article 4- Zoning Districts, on page 4-8 [section 4-101, C. Performance Standards, 13. Architectural style, e. and f.].</p> <p>Upon reviewing what transpired at the Board meeting I became convinced that my input was not correctly received. Subsequently I visited the Planning Department in person, on Sept. 7, where I spoke with Walter Carlson about this issue, and left with Jill some printed material outlining the needed change to bring the 2 areas of the code into agreement using the new language.</p> <p>Today I have received a phone call from Walter Carlson stating that Eric Riel was given the written information and that the needed change has been made.</p> <p>I thank staff for their attention to this matter, and look forward to finding the corrected text on the web site on September 20, as promised.</p> <p>Regards, Elaine Codias, Ph.D.</p>
9.	09/13/06	Santiago D. Echemendia		<p>Re: Amace Properties, Inc. objection to Proposed Zoning Code Adoption</p> <p>Dear Mr. Riel,</p> <p>As you know, this firm represents Amace Properties, Inc., with a property located at 1390 S. Dixie Highway. On behalf of Amace Properties, we assert the following objections to the proposed zoning code, to be evaluated at the September 27, 2006 Planning and Zoning Board meeting.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Property being redesignated from CA to Commercial Limited (CL) <p>The height limit in the CA district is currently 45 ft. However, the proposed redesignation of CA properties to CL reduces the height limit to 35 ft. We object to this reduction in development rights which will result from the adoption of the proposed code, changing CA properties to CL.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite (Part 5)

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated 05 26 06 thru 09 15 06)

Refer to City's webpage for public comments Parts 1 - 4

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>2. Vesting of rights, Section 1-108</p> <p>Section 1-108 provides that the current Coral Gables zoning code will apply to projects where preliminary approval of the Board of Architects is pending on the date of the adoption of the new code. However, projects involving Planned Area Developments, plan amendments or rezonings are lengthy processes which will require starting over under this vesting provision. We request that this section be revised to vest projects which have applications pending for Planned Area Development, plan amendments, or rezonings, so that the application process will not be disturbed.</p> <p>3. Folio # 03-4130-006-0290</p> <p>A portion of this property does not have a zoning designation on the proposed revisions to the zoning map. We request, on behalf of the property owner Amace Properties, Inc., that this scrivener's error is corrected before the adoption of the revised map so that the parcel is designated that same as the rest of the parcel.</p> <p>Please fee free to contact me with any questions or comments on these issues.</p> <p>Sincerely, Santiago D. Echemendia</p>
10.	09/13/06	Alfred Neuman	Saber_1985@hotmail.com	<p>Subject: New Zoning Code Comment for Inclusion into the New Zoning Code</p> <p>My recommendation below is that the Planning and Zoning Boards recommendation below option A be included in the new Zoning code for approval by the city commission.</p> <p>Thank You, Larry Horton 6604 Leonardo St. Coral Gables,Fl. 33146 7786-268-1429</p> <p>City of Coral Gables Planning Department Staff Report To: Honorable Planning and Zoning Board Members From: Planning Department Date:</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite (Part 5)

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated 05 26 06 thru 09 15 06)

Refer to City's webpage for public comments Parts 1 - 4

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>September 14, 2005 Subject: Review of Zoning Code 2005 – Articles 4 and 5 Staff Recommendation The Planning Department recommends approval of the following Articles: • Article 4. Zoning Districts, Division 4., Prohibited Uses, Section 4-412., Trucks, trailers, commercial vehicles, and recreational vehicles (see Attachment A). • Article 5. Development Standards, Division 19., Section 5-1914., Political signs. (Draft will be distributed via email on Monday 09.12.05 or at the meeting.) Request Planning and Zoning Board review and recommendation and public input on the following proposed Articles: • Article 4. Zoning Districts, Division 4., Prohibited Uses, Section 4-412., Trucks, trailers, commercial vehicles, and recreational vehicles Section 4-412 is provided as two separate versions (Version A and B): <i>Version A is the more liberal of the two proposals in that it allows pickup trucks on driveways and other permitted areas of residential property as long as the pickup truck's cargo box is covered. Based on the current applicable law, this proposed version will likely be able to withstand constitutional challenges.</i> Version B is more restrictive in that a pickup truck may be parked at a residence only if it is entirely garaged or concealed from view on three sides by a carport or other permitted structure or hedge. The determination of the constitutionality of this proposal is more questionable given that in some areas of the City, particularly where multi-dwelling structures are common, it is not feasible to erect a carport or other structure to shield the vehicle from view. It is conceivable that a court would therefore not view this proposed ordinance as materially different than the current version of the ordinance. • Article 5. Development Standards, Division 19., Section 5-1914., Political signs</p> <p>Review of Zoning Code 2005 September 14, 2005 Page 2 Background Building and Zoning Department Staff and the City Attorney will present the major changes to each of the aforementioned articles and seek direction from the Board. Changes are noted in underline and strikeout format.</p>

(Note: Most recent comments/letters received are at the beginning of chart.)

Zoning Code Rewrite (Part 5)

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated 05 26 06 thru 09 15 06)

Refer to City's webpage for public comments Parts 1 - 4

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>Supplemental Information Staff has also included the following background information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Comment Charts - Part 3 (updated 06 20 05 thru 08 18 05) and Part 4 (updated 08 18 05 thru 08 21 05). • Planning and Zoning Board's Recommendation Tracking Chart. <p>Public Notification/Comments The following has been completed to solicit input and provide notice of the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publish agenda in the Daily Business Review on 09 01 05. • E-News (email) distribution of above schedule and notification of the September 14th meeting. • Post agenda in City Hall. • Post final draft articles on the City's web site. • Request Building and Zoning Department notify interested parties.
11.	09/08/06	Larry Horton 6604 Leonardo St Coral Gables, FL 33146 786-268-1429	Larryh@baptisthealth.net	<p>My recommendation below is that the Planning and Zoning Boards recommendation below option A be included in the new Zoning code for approval by the city commission.</p> <p>Thank You, Larry Horton 6604 Leonardo St. Coral Gables, FL. 33146 7786-268-1429</p>
12.	09/07/06	Maria Elena Cowley P.O. Box 141445, Coral Gables, FL 33134		<p>RE: Lots 19, 20, Block 3, DOUGLAS SECTION</p> <p>Dear Members of the Planning and Zoning Board</p> <p>I am writing to request that you resend to the City Commission your earlier recommendation that privately owned properties whose zoning designations are inconsistent with their land use be changed and made consistent as part of the Zoning Code rewrite process.</p> <p>I am the owner of the referenced property. The Planning Department identified this property as one of the privately owned properties whose zoning designation was inconsistent with its land use.</p> <p>Sincerely, Maria Elena Cowley</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite (Part 5)

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated 05 26 06 thru 09 15 06)

Refer to City's webpage for public comments Parts 1 - 4

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
13.	09/07/06	Kirk R. Menendez 325 Malaga Avenue Coral Gables, FL 33134		<p>Re: Proposed Article 4, entitled "Zoning Districts and Maps", in particular, the Single-Family classification title change</p> <p>Dear Members of the Planning & Zoning Board:</p> <p>As a property owner residing along the 300 Block of Malaga Avenue, Coral Gables, Florida, I would like to place on the record that I have no objections to the proposed zoning classification title as "single family" as long as it does not adversely effect the consideration of a future application in the area consistent with the existing Land Use.</p> <p>Very truly yours, Kirk R. Menendez</p>
14.	09/06/06	Lydia Menendez 346 Malaga Avenue Coral Gables, FL 33134		<p>Re: Proposed Article 4, entitled "Zoning Districts and Maps", in particular, the Single-Family classification title change</p> <p>Dear Members of the Planning & Zoning Board:</p> <p>As a property owner residing along the 300 Block of Malaga Avenue, Coral Gables, Florida, I would like to place on the record that I have no objections to the proposed zoning classification title as "single family" as long as it does not adversely effect the consideration of a future application in the area consistent with the existing Land Use.</p> <p>Very truly yours, Lydia Menendez</p>
15.	09/06/06	Ada Michele Wade 300 Malaga Ave Coral Gables, FL 33134		<p>Re: Proposed Article 4, entitled "Zoning Districts and Maps", in particular, the Single-Family classification title change</p> <p>Dear Members of the Planning & Zoning Board:</p> <p>As a property owner residing along the 300 Block of Malaga Avenue, Coral Gables, Florida, I would like to place on the record that I have no objections to the proposed zoning classification title as "single family" as long as it does not adversely effect the consideration of a future application in the area consistent with the existing Land Use.</p> <p>Very truly yours, Ada Michele Wade</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite (Part 5)

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated 05 26 06 thru 09 15 06)

Refer to City's webpage for public comments Parts 1 - 4

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
16.	09/05/06	Santiago D. Echemendia, Amanda Quirke	sde@tewlaw.com , AQ@tewlaw.com	<p>Re: Proposed Zoning Code Re-write, Scrivener's Correction</p> <p>Dear Mr. Riel:</p> <p>This law firm represents Amace Properties, Inc., owner of the property located at 6100 Caballero Boulevard, Folio No. 03-4130-006-0290. This property is a unitary parcel bordering on either side of the waterway, located at the intersection of Caballero Boulevard and South Dixie Highway. There is a small section of property that is between the end of the waterway and South Dixie Highway, showed on the attached property information from the Miami-Dade County Property Appraiser. However, on the Coral Gables Zoning Map, this section is not included on the map. Therefore, according to the Coral Gables zoning map, this small piece of Folio No. 03-4130-006-0290 does not have a zoning designation. We request that the City of Coral Gables correct this scrivener's error in conjunction with the proposed zoning code rewrite that will go before the City Commission on first reading Wednesday night. Thank you for your assistance in correcting this scrivener's error before the new zoning map takes effect. Please contact me if you have any questions related to this request.</p> <p>Sincerely, Santiago D. Echemendia Amanda Quirke</p>
17.	09/05/06	Juan P. Lluria	jplluria@bellsouth.net	<p>To All of You People in City Hall,</p> <p>The City should apply the same rule for Duplex height that is used for townhouse height. Duplex zoning should STAY at 34 feet and should require the first 50 feet that abuts or are contiguous to single family homes to be 29 feet. The proposed solution will allow to large massing to face the collector roads and the lower massing to face the single family homes. Please listen to the voice of reason!</p> <p>Thanks for your attention to this vital matter! Juan P Lluria</p>
18.	09/05/06	Amado J. "Al" Acosta	AmadoJulio@aol.com	<p>Subject: Final Zoning Code Honorable Mayor Slesnick, Vice Mayor Anderson, Commissioner Cabrera, Commissioner Kerdyk, Commissioner Withers, and members of the Planning and Zoning Board (via city staff):</p> <p>The Riviera Neighborhood Association(RNA) has been a very active participant in most of the zoning rewrite process. We recognize the value of the process, and trust the process to work for the best interests of the residents, provided that the public's input is indeed taken into account.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite (Part 5)

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated 05 26 06 thru 09 15 06)

Refer to City's webpage for public comments Parts 1 - 4

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>We also place a very high value on the extremely valuable contributions of talented individuals like Mrs. and Mr. Fryer. Their hundreds, or even thousands of hours of study and involvement in the rewrite process (as others have done as well), with their educational and experienced professional knowledge, needs to be given continued attention. Without attention to their well documented observations and previously agreed-upon positions, the City cannot say that the process of Citizen involvement has worked.</p> <p>RNA has also been very concerned about some of the errors that have appeared in the past, such as leaving out setback requirements in the rear for MF zoning when the rear is a water body such as a waterway or a lake. Or having no front setback requirement for townhouses (when these were being considered as substitutes to duplex zoning) when the existing neighbors are living in a single residence or a duplex.</p> <p>RNA fully supports Mamta and Daniel Fryer in their requests to you.</p> <p>Amado J. , " Al", Acosta, PE Vice President, Chmn. Gov't Affairs Committee Riviera Neighborhood Association, Inc. Tel 305/345-2244</p>
19.	09/04/06	Daniel Fryer 640 Majorca Ave Coral Gables, FL 33134	danielfryer@hotmail.com	<p>Dear Mayor Slesnick, Vice Mayor Anderson, Commissioner Cabrera, Commissioner Kerdyk, Commissioner Withers, and members of the Planning and Zoning Board (via city staff):</p> <p>At the Planning and Zoning Board meeting on June 21, residents expressed concern that several of the single family provisions approved by the Board and by the commission were not in the Zoning Code rewrite. The Board asked Mamta to send a written list of those to city staff and the consultant, and we were assured that in the Final Zoning Code all these omissions and discrepancies would be addressed. That list was sent on June 27. However, over two months later, many of these issues have not been corrected in the final draft of the Zoning Code.</p> <p>Two questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What will it take? 2. If after two years, close scrutiny, and diligent feedback, this one area of the code is still problematic, how can we have any confidence in the rest of the code? <p>After reviewing the final draft of the zoning code, we <u>repeat</u> the following comments, concerns and questions.</p> <p>The specific standards for flat roofs in the single family regulations ordinance approved on second reading August 22, 2006, including height and pitch, do not appear to have been</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite (Part 5)

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated 05 26 06 thru 09 15 06)

Refer to City's webpage for public comments Parts 1 - 4

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>included in the final zoning code draft.</p> <p>The standards for projections in the final zoning code include baywindows. These were not part of the approved single family regulations.</p> <p>The definition of carports approved in the single family ordinance has not been incorporated into the final zoning code draft. In fact, the definition in the final draft is still contradictory to what was approved in the single family ordinance.</p> <p>What counts for floor area in the ordinance has not been incorporated correctly into the final zoning code draft. The definition for floor area in the final zoning code draft appears to refer to commercial and not single-family, but no distinction is made between the two, and for purposes of clarity and accuracy, they need to be separately listed. For example, in the ordinance, garages and balconies count, as do roofed terraces, breezeways and porches located on the second floor; in the zoning code definitions, they do not count.</p> <p>We had previously asked about removing residential carport canopies from the code for reasons of neighborhood character, architectural context and hurricane safety; this was not addressed.</p> <p>We were unable to view the zoning maps on-line. We would like to know the zoning of Le Jeune Road where it intersects with residential streets in North Gables, such as Majorca, Navarre, Minorca, etc. Is this zoned MF1?</p> <p>Under MF1, the draft final zoning code specifies building sites for all buildings and structures "other than townhouses." However, we could not find how a building site is defined in MF1 for townhouses. Where is this specified? <u>If townhouses are allowed to have smaller building sites, this increases density in our residential neighborhoods.</u></p> <p>Are townhouses in MF1 supposed to have the appearance of single family residences, as do duplexes? Where is this specified?</p> <p>We had previously asked that neighbor notification for demolition and substantive changes to a residence be improved. Was this done? If so, where?</p> <p>We are requesting that the commission send a directive to city staff to address these concerns and properly update the final zoning code draft.</p> <p>Thank you. Daniel Fryer</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite (Part 5)

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated 05 26 06 thru 09 15 06)

Refer to City's webpage for public comments Parts 1 - 4

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				Mamta Chaudhry-Fryer 640 Majorca Avenue Coral Gables, FL 33134
20.	09/03/06	Richard Namon	rn@miamimiami.com	<p>Dear Code Rewrite:</p> <p>As an owner of duplex property, I will benefit along with other duplex owners by the increase in ground coverage and reduced set backs associated with the proposed MF1 zoning designation. However, this change represents an aesthetic degradation for single family property owners who face duplex zoned properties. It does not accomplish any of the reasons given for the Code Rewrite, and as an arbitrary and unnecessary change should be removed. Even though it will benefit me, for the good of Coral Gables, I am against this change.</p> <p>With the effective removal of the Industrial Section of Coral Gables and its replacement with high density commercial and residential development, the lack of night club zoning in that area is short sighted. If that area is to attract younger individuals, night life entertainment is needed. South Beach has been very successful doing this, and I believe Coral Gables could do the same by providing night club zoning in the Industrial District. It is not too late to consider zoning changes that will serve the needs of younger Gables residents and workers. I recommend inclusion of night club zoning in the Code Rewrite.</p> <p>Richard Namon Coral Gables 305-661-1166</p>
21.	09/02/06	Guillermo Pino	gpino@bellsouth.net	<p>I do not agree with the 29 ft maximum height. If within certain distance from the side set backs, say 30 ft, only one story is allowed for single family residences, the center portion of the houses could be at 34 ft in height without being overwhelming to the adjacent houses</p> <p>Visit 529 luenga ave for a good example. Thank you</p> <p>Guillermo pino Gp builders inc</p>
22.	08/31/06	Jaime M. Giammattei C.B.I. International Hialeah, FL 33014 Tel (305) 270-0033 xt 106	J.Giammattei@cbicorporate.com	<p>Please note that this change in the zoning code will only diminish the value of the properties zoned for such. Additionally, the height should not matter if there is already properties of the height, notwithstanding, the fact that you are on a collectors road, which only enhances the view of the area.</p> <p>As a homeowner, I will oppose this matter, and believe this change in zoning it is not</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite (Part 5)

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated 05 26 06 thru 09 15 06)

Refer to City's webpage for public comments Parts 1 - 4

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
		Fax (305) 418-7472		<p>reasonable and should not pass. I thank you for your prompt attention to this matter and if you should have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>Yours truly, Jaime M. Giammattei</p>
23.	8/31/06	Jennifer McNamara	Jennifer_McNamara@not es.ntrs.com	Please see the edit to the first line of the second paragraph below (added the word 'Not') - I apologize for not catching prior to sending the initial posting on 8-30-06.
24.	08/30/06	Jennifer McNamara	Jennifer_McNamara@not es.ntrs.com	<p>Re: Proposed Zoning Code</p> <p>The Northern Trust has been operating from a one-storey building for the past 19 years at 595 Biltmore Way (NW corner of Biltmore Way and Segovia). We are currently in the planning and design stages to build a larger, 2-storey structure on the east side of our existing site. The new, larger building will allow the Bank to continue our successful growth in the Coral Gables market and to better serve our clients. The Bank has negotiated with the owner, the Edward J. McBride Marital Estate, and signed a long-term ground lease that allows us to exclusively develop the property for our needs.</p> <p>The proposed zoning at 595 Biltmore Way is CL (Commercial Limited). We do <i>NOT</i> think that this is the correct designation since it is inconsistent with our location; the property is bordered on the northside by a church and school, on the east and south sides by office buildings and, across the intersection to the west by hi-rise condominium towers.</p> <p>It has come to my attention that the proposed new Coral Gables zoning code reduces the base allowable height on the property from 45 feet in the existing code to 35 feet in the new, proposed code; these base building heights do not include the current potential of significant height increases dues to bonuses and other zoning criteria. It is my understanding that the existing code could potentially allow a structure of 16 floors in height, in keeping with the scale of adjacent office and apartment towers on Biltmore Way while the potential height increases by means of bonuses, under the proposed new zoning code are currently unresolved and may in the end be greatly decreased from what is possible today.</p> <p>This potential decrease in allowable building height, under the proposed new code, will adversely affect our ability to develop the property. I would ask that you reconsider this aspect of the proposed new zoning code and retain the height allowances currently contained in the Coral Gables zoning code.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite (Part 5)

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated 05 26 06 thru 09 15 06)

Refer to City's webpage for public comments Parts 1 - 4

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
25.	08/20/06	Maria Longo	maricrislongo@aol.com	<p>Subject: The city should apply the same rule for Duplex height as it did with TownHouses that abut SFH</p> <p>Dear Mayor and Commissioners,</p> <p>The height issue in Duplex zoning will be resolved if the city uses the same criteria it used with Town House (MF2) zoning to lower massing of buildings that abut or are contiguous to single family homes .</p> <p>According to the zoning code, the maximum height for townhouses is 45 feet or three stories; ?except that no portion of any building within (50) feet of any property line which abuts or is contiguous to land designated as SF- Use shall have a height in excess of (35) feet.? (Page 13 of 21 from Article 4, Division 1- Residential Districts).</p> <p>The city is proposing to lower Duplex height to 29 feet from 34 feet to match the height of single family homes; however, the city should apply the same rule for Duplex height as it did with Town Houses. Duplex zoning should stay at 34 feet and should require the first 50 feet that abuts or are contiguous to single family homes to be 29 feet.</p> <p>The proposed solution will allow Segovia and other collector roads to have the larger massing face the collector street and the lower massing face the single family homes. We should resolve this matter as we have done with zoning districts that serve as buffers. Duplexes are buffers for single family homes: Segovia, Ponce De Leon and Le Jeune have high traffic flow and are two-way streets.</p> <p>I continue to encourage the city to involve great urban planners in our zoning rewrite, which we have available in our city.</p> <p>Sincerely, Maria C. Longo</p>
26.	08/18/06	Rolando Iglesias Tech Developers 4444 SW 71 Ave., Suite #107, Miami, Florida 33155		<p>Dear Mr. Smith:</p> <p>I am the owner of a duplex located at 3001 Segovia Street, Coral Gables, Florida, 33134. Please let the record reflect that I am against any change of height on Segovia Street from it's existing height of 34 feet down to 29 feet. I am sorry I cannot be at the meeting held today at 11:30AM at your office, but I am giving this letter to my friend, Sonia M. Blair, to deliver for me. I am of the opinion that Segovia Street was originally designed to be a buffer from the residential areas. The existing duplexes are beautiful two story Mediterranean style with pitched roofs and should remain the same.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite (Part 5)

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated 05 26 06 thru 09 15 06)

Refer to City's webpage for public comments Parts 1 - 4

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>You may call me any time at my office 305-662-6290 or my cell 305-310-6037 to advise the date and time of any Commission Hearing, as I would like to attend.</p> <p>Tech Developers Rolando Iglesias President</p>
27.	08/18/06	<p>Sonia M. Blair 2920 Segovia Street Coral Gables, FL 33134 305-446-8695</p>		<p>RE: ZONING CHANGE ON SEGOVIA STREET CORAL GABLES, FLORIDA 333134 Dear Mr. Smith:</p> <p>I presently reside on 2920 Segovia Street, Coral Gables, Florida. My duplex is zoned duplex/multi-family.</p> <p>The purpose of this letter is to inform you and the City Commissioners that I am in favor of the development of a median on Segovia Street. Secondly, I am also in favor of the new landscape plan that is in the works for my street. Further, I am against the height reduction for the proposed zoning for duplexes along Segovia. I believe this change would encourage the development of structures of flat rooms versus Mediterranean pitched barrel roofs. More importantly, Segovia Street is wider than most single family residential streets in the Gables, with a wider City owned space from the edge of the street to the beginning of the property line.</p> <p>I respectfully request a notification when this matter will be brought up in front of the City Commission, as I would like to attend. I believe the median that you are presently installing on Ponce is very beautiful, and I am very pleased with the work the City has done to bring about more beautiful architecture and to maintain the integrity that our founding fathers implemented.</p> <p>Thank you for all your courtesies to this matter.</p> <p>Sincerely yours,</p>
28.	08/18/06	<p>Tom Reardon & Ernie Coscia</p>		<p>RE: ZONING CHANGE ON SEGOVIA STREET CORAL GABLES, FLORIDA 333134 Dear Mayor Slesnick:</p> <p>I presently reside on 2909 & 2915 Segovia Street, Coral Gables, Florida. The purpose of this letter is to inform you and the City Commissioners that I am in favor of the development of a median on Segovia Street. Secondly, I am also in favor of the new landscape plan that is in the works for my street. Further, I am against the height reduction for the proposed zoning for duplexes along Segovia. I believe this change would encourage the development of structures of flat rooms versus Mediterranean pitched barrel roofs. More importantly, Segovia Street is wider than most single family residential streets in the Gables, with a wider City owned space from the edge of the street to the beginning of the property line.</p> <p>I respectfully request a notification when this matter will be brought up in front of the City</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite (Part 5)

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated 05 26 06 thru 09 15 06)

Refer to City's webpage for public comments Parts 1 - 4

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>Commission, as I would like to attend. I believe the median that you are presently installing on Ponce is very beautiful, and I am very pleased with the work the City has done to bring about more beautiful architecture and to maintain the integrity that our founding fathers implemented.</p> <p>Thank you for all your courtesies to this matter.</p> <p>Sincerely yours, Tom Reardon & Ernie Coscia.</p>
29.	08/10/06	Maria C. Longo	maricrislongo@aol.com	<p>Dear Mayor and Commissioners,</p> <p>Mr. Riel responded in his e-mail dated 08/02 that the height reduction in the proposed Duplex code is the result of recommendations by citizens to parallel the anti-McMansions efforts in Duplex neighborhoods as well.</p> <p>The effort to prevent McMansions is valid and important for our city; however, the arguments that apply to residential single family homes are not the same for Duplex zoning, because the intention of the zoning code for single family homes and Duplex are different. The proposed and current code for Duplex reads: “Duplex use Districts are intended to accommodate low-density, multi-family dwelling units and buffer single-family residential uses from collector roads”.</p> <p>Presently, we have three different residential typologies: single family homes, Duplex and Townhouses. Each distinct from each other. However, the proposed height reduction to 29 feet in Duplex zoning to match single family home height will create a similar version of a single family home, not a duplex. The Duplex zoning should remain 34 feet.</p> <p>It is the responsibility of the Planning Department to analyze the existing code, and to understand all implications of the changes as it relates to the vision for our city, with varied building typologies. I have expressed in the past that the city should hire urban planners to work this enormous and important task. We have great urban planners in our city, and the rewrite should be reviewed by one of them. Our city deserves the best urban planners to maintain and enhance the character of our city.</p> <p>Respectfully, Maria C. Longo</p>
30.	08/03/06	Maria C. Longo	maricrislongo@aol.com	<p>Subject: Re: Segovia zoning</p> <p>Dear Mr. Riel,</p> <p>Thank you for your response. As you mention in your e-mail, the original intention in the zoning rewrite for MF1 "Duplex" was to increase the height to 45 feet and to allow for</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite (Part 5)

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated 05 26 06 thru 09 15 06)

Refer to City's webpage for public comments Parts 1 - 4

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>Town Houses; however, now the new proposed zoning is actually reducing the existing height to 29 feet from 34 feet (16 feet less than the original proposal of 45 feet). Please note that streets with Duplex zoning have different characteristics than streets with single family homes; Segovia, Ponce De Leon, and LeJeune are wider than single family streets. Precisely that is why they have Duplex zoning. Residents, including myself, opposed the proposed height of 45 feet, not the existing 34 feet. It is critical that we maintain the "Duplex" zoning as it is. It is not reasonable to lower it just for the sake of changing it.</p> <p>Sincerely, Maria C. Longo</p>
31.	08/02/06	Sonia M. Blair	soniamblair@yahoo.com	<p>Dear Commissioner Anderson:</p> <p>I presently reside on 2909 & 2915 Segovia Street, Coral Gables, Florida.</p> <p>The purpose of this letter is to inform you and the City Commissioners that I am in favor of the development of a median on Segovia Street. Secondly, I am also in favor of the new landscape plan that is in the works for my street. Further, I am against the height reduction for the proposed zoning for duplexes along Segovia. I believe this change would encourage the development of structures of flat roofs versus Mediterranean pitched barrel roofs. More importantly, Segovia Street is wider than most single family residential streets in the Gables, with a wider City owned space from the edge of the street to the beginning of the property line.</p> <p>I respectfully request a notification when this matter will be brought up in front of the City Commission, as I would like to attend. I believe the median that you are presently installing on Ponce is very beautiful, and I am very pleased with the work the City has done to bring about more beautiful architecture and to maintain the integrity that our founding fathers implemented.</p> <p>Thank you for all your courtesies to this matter.</p> <p>Sincerely yours, SONIA M. BLAIR OWNER</p>
32.	07/27/06	Maria C. Longo	maricrislongo@aol.com	<p>The new duplex zoning is proposing lowering the height to 29 feet.</p> <p>I am against the height reduction for duplex along Segovia Street because the proposed height will encourage the development of structures with flat roofs versus Mediterranean pitched barrel roofs; and it will encourage architecture that is boxier. Architecture with</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite (Part 5)

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated 05 26 06 thru 09 15 06)

Refer to City's webpage for public comments Parts 1 - 4

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>classical proportions, long and elegant (e.g., windows with 1:2 ratio) requires more vertical space.</p> <p>Most important is that Segovia Street is wider than most single family residential streets; its scale and composition is unique, making it more appropriate for taller buildings than single family residential homes.</p> <p>Coral Gables was founded to mirror a classic Mediterranean city. Classic architectural proportions create beautiful buildings like our City Hall. Urban planners do not control massing and volume by reducing height but by reducing floors. The present duplex zoning allows for 2 stories. Please don't let the proposed duplex zoning lower height in Segovia Street from what it presently is.</p> <p>Sincerely, Maria C. Longo</p>
33.	07/18/06	Richard Namon	rn@miamimiami.com	<p>After review of your proposed Code Rewrite, I have the following comments: The Code Rewrite Again Coral Gables residents sleep well at night trusting their Police and Fire Departments. They have placed their trust in the hands of fine people. I don't feel the same about our Planning Department. It says Building and Zoning Codes need updating. They keep repeating: "Most of the proposed changes are organizational." The new code is needed, because "It also reorganizes the code to make it more user friendly." Yet, the current Code has not stood in the way of explosive construction growth over the past five years. If the Code Rewrite changes are organizational, why does every property have a new zoning designation? Why will all normal single-family lots have reductions in maximum home size? Why will many new commercial buildings be allowed more ground coverage with less open space around them? How does rezoning all duplex properties to townhouse fit into reorganization? The Code Rewrite has come at great expense with large consultant's fees and countless hours of city workers time. Will the Code Rewrite save the City money, or cost taxpayers more? I think more; it creates at least one full time architect position and is a veritable Pandora's Box. I don't think we need the substantial changes in the Code Rewrite and its future costs. It is not too late to tell our city leaders we don't want it. This is one case where older is better! Richard Namon Coral Gables</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite (Part 5)

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated 05 26 06 thru 09 15 06)

Refer to City's webpage for public comments Parts 1 - 4

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
34.	07/12/06	Jeffrey S. Bass, Esq. 46 SW. 1 st ST, 3 rd floor Miami, FL 33130	jbass@shubinbass.com	<p>Dear Eric:</p> <p>This correspondence is transmitted on behalf of the University of Miami ("University") in connection with the presentation of the zoning code rewrite scheduled for tomorrow before the City of Coral Gables City Commission ("Commission"). It is our understanding that the matter is noticed as a presentation and, as such, neither the public in general – nor the University in particular- shall be required to present comments, concerns, and/or objections during the course of tomorrow's presentation. It is my additional understanding that the draft ordinance will be returned by the Commission to the Planning and Zoning Board for further comments, modifications, revisions, and recommendations. If your understanding differs from mine on these points, kindly advise at your first convenience. As both you and the City's outside consultants are undoubtedly aware, we have separately and repeatedly shared our comments, concerns and objections with regard to the proposed zoning code draft with the City's staff. Through this correspondence, we reassert those comments, concerns, and objections. We respectfully request that this correspondence be included as part of the record of tomorrow's presentation. If you have any questions concerning this correspondence, please do not hesitate to contact me. We look forward to continuing to work with the City's professional staff on this matter.</p> <p>Thanks as always – Best Regards- JSB</p>
35.	07/12/06	Richard Hunt The Keyes Company 2121 SW 3 rd Ave Miami, FL 33129		<p>July 10, 2006 Via email to DBrown@CityBeautiful.net David L. Brown City Manager City of Coral Gables 405 Biltmore Way Coral Gables FL 33134</p> <p>Re: Erroneous Omission of Reference to "Appendix A" of the Proposed Zoning Code in the current draft of Thursday's Commission Meeting Agenda</p> <p>Dear Manager Brown,</p> <p>I enclose a copy of the City Commission Agenda for the meeting of the City Commission scheduled for Thursday, July 13, at 8:00am. I took the attached copy direct from the City's web page, and I presume it is currently intended to be handed out on Thursday in that form.</p> <p>In reviewing this agenda, I noticed that the proposed Zoning Code Provisions outlined in the agenda make no reference to "Appendix A" of the June 2006 draft revision, which consists of the Code's "Site Specific Regulations" which appear in the current Zoning Code as Article 04., but which have been moved to "Appendix A" in the Proposed Revision by the zoning consultants, and are referred to in Proposed Section 1-108 D</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite (Part 5)

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated 05 26 06 thru 09 15 06)

Refer to City's webpage for public comments Parts 1 - 4

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>(Transitional Rules) as "existing Site Specific Standards." The Appendix is given substantive effect by the proposed transitional rules, and correctly overrides conflicting language in the general regulations. Appendix A is included in the draft provision currently on the City's web page, and should be a part of the Proposed Code introduced on Thursday.</p> <p>I assume the elimination of any mention of "Appendix A" in the Commission's agenda is an oversight, and I am hopeful this email reaches you and the City Attorney in time to correct the omission.</p> <p>Very truly yours, Broker Associate/Commercial Specialist The Keyes Company Commercial Division Enclosure: July 13 Commission Meeting Agenda cc: Elizabeth M. Hernandez City Attorney</p>
36.	07/07/06	Santiago Echemendia Tew Cardenas LLP Four Seasons Tower 15 th Floor 1441 Brickell Avenue Miami, Florida 33131-3407 305-536-1112	sde@tewlaw.com	<p>Re: Amace Properties, Inc. Property at approximately 1390 S. Dixie Highway: Objection to Proposed Rezoning</p> <p>Dear Eric:</p> <p>As you know, this firm represents Amace Properties, Inc., ("Amace") regarding its property located at approximately 1390 S. Dixie Highway (the "property"). We understand that on July 11, 2006, the Planning & Zoning Board will consider a proposal to downzone a portion of the Property from the current zoning of Commercial to Commercial Limited District, as depicted in the attached map. As we previously expressed to you in correspondence dated August 10, 2005, we object to the proposed downzoning because it is unnecessary and would inordinately burden the Property. For your reference, I include a copy of the August 10, 2005 letter.</p> <p>In addition to the reasons set forth in that letter, the proposed down-zoning is unnecessary because, as part of the redevelopment of the Property, our client filed a Plan Amendment application on February 1, 2006 and has already gone through the design review process regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Property. I have enclosed copies of the Plan Amendment Application. Moreover, as part of Amace's continuing efforts to redevelop the Property, for the past year, Amace has been involved in extensive meetings with the neighborhood (specifically, the Riviera Neighborhood Association) as well as the City in efforts to design the most appropriate project for the Property, including consideration of all</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite (Part 5)

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated 05 26 06 thru 09 15 06)

Refer to City's webpage for public comments Parts 1 - 4

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>zoning related matters. The proposed downzoning to Commercial Limited District for the Property directly conflicts with the plans for redevelopment that have been coordinated with the neighborhood and the City. Indeed, the proposed down-zoning is more inconsistent with the neighborhood's visioning report than Amace's plans for the property.</p> <p>Therefore, we object to a downzoning of the Property and request that the Property retain its current Commercial zoning designation. Please feel free to call me at 305.536.8420 to discuss the foregoing. Thank you.</p> <p>Sincerely, Santiago D. Echemendia, P.A.</p>
37.	06/28/06	Mamta Chaudhry-Fryer	mcfgables@hotmail.com	<p>Eric, Charlie, Dennis:</p> <p>As the Planning and Zoning Board requested at the June 21st meeting, I am sending you written comments on the proposed zoning code, especially regarding the single family regulations <u>as they were approved by the commission, and passed by the Planning and Zoning Board at the June 14th meeting.</u> You mentioned that the proposed zoning code presented to the Board last Wednesday was not updated to reflect all the approved language. Will it be updated before the zoning code presentation to the commission on July 11th?</p> <p>I trust the following will help to clarify certain issues, and to resolve some inaccuracies and internal contradictions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For starters, the single-family section needs to be easier to locate. If you go to ARTICLE 4. ZONING DISTRICTS in the Table of Contents, (p. 8 of 17), Division 1 says Residential districts, then Section 4-101. says SF R District. I believe it would be more helpful if you spelled it out as Single Family Residential district, especially since the Multi-family districts immediately following are spelled out. 2. In splitting off sections and putting them elsewhere in the code, the rewrite did not transfer many of the changes that were approved by the City Commission and Planning and Zoning Board. I am indicating some of the changes below. You also need to look at conflicts where an issue is listed twice (e.g. the cookie-cutter provision), and update that to match the language in the single-family section. In general, the definition section needs to be updated to match the regulations in Article 4. <p>a) Floor Area Ratio:</p> <p>In the SF regs [4-1, pg 4 of 21] what is counted and how it is counted is at odds with the definition of FAR [Section 8, p. 11 of 39]. For example, screened porches that count at ½ of FAR only require a covenant if enclosing them would cause the residence to exceed the maximum FAR. The definition section does not mention that condition.</p> <p>In non-flood districts, roofed terraces, breezeways and porches located on the second floor <u>do</u> count in FAR; in the definitions, they do not count.</p> <p>b) Roofs:</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite (Part 5)

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated 05 26 06 thru 09 15 06)

Refer to City's webpage for public comments Parts 1 - 4

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>Flat roofs and roof projections were moved out of the single-family regulations into a different section, but the language and requirements were not updated. Some of the new requirements include a pitch that conforms to the Building Code, and a height of 24' for the roof deck, with a maximum 30" parapet; in the section where it is now [5-1603, p. 1-2 of 4], there is no mention of these changes. The definitions need to be updated as well. Similarly, in the section on roof projections [5-1609, p. 3 of 4], the language allows bay windows in a 5 to 10 foot setback area, whereas the approved regulations do not permit bay windows in the 5 to 10 foot setback; on setbacks greater than 10.1 feet, the word "balconies" needs to be inserted between "roofs" and "bay windows" in order to reflect the approved regulations.</p> <p>c) Carports: The single-family regulations (4-1 p. 4 of 21) define carports as a one-story roofed structure that is attached to the main building and open on 3 sides, with the structural supports, pillars, arches and decorative features characteristic of carports in the Gables. But the definition section says a carport is <u>not more than 75% enclosed</u>. This means only 25% has to be open. That is a conflict, and runs contrary to the intent of reducing the visual mass of buildings. Again, the definition needs to be updated to match the regulations in Article 4.</p> <p>d) Garages: The approved regulations require one parking space, consisting of a roofed structure, i.e. a garage, carport, breezeway, etc., clear of all obstruction from floor to ceiling. That definition is no longer included in the single-family section (nor in the definition section), although the related point about the 1/3-2/3 garage-to-facade ratio remains in Article 4. Instead, Article 5 about parking, loading and driveways simply says for detached dwellings you need one space per unit. If you look at the definition of parking space in the definition sections, it is merely a "surfaced area." It would seem that a carport canopy over a surfaced area would suffice. This is not the intent. The language regarding one parking space and what it consists of needs to be spelled out as it was in the approved single-family regulations before they were split up into various sections. And since carport canopies were not discussed during the public hearings on single-family regulations, I believe you need to reconsider their use in single family residential areas [Section 5-302, p. 1 of 2] where carport canopies are allowed to be 440 square feet. There has been no discussion of whether this counts in ground area coverage, nor of the fact that it disrupts the character of the historic neighborhoods. Also, they pose a hazard during hurricanes; who will enforce the "quick removal such as is necessary in cases of impending storms or hurricanes"?</p> <p>e) Cookie-cutter provision: In the section on Development Review, [3-205 C, p. 4 of 10], the text regarding duplications of elevations and/or exterior architectural design needs to be updated to</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite (Part 5)

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated 05 26 06 thru 09 15 06)

Refer to City's webpage for public comments Parts 1 - 4

Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
			<p>match the new, approved language in the single-family regulations [4-101, 18, p. 7 of 21].</p> <p>4. Duplex regulations which affect single-family residential areas:</p> <p>a) In Section [4-102 B 1, p. 8 of 21], duplexes are referred to as "duplex townhouse dwellings." The definitions section refers separately to duplexes and townhomes. Is there a difference?</p> <p>b) Are the duplexes along LeJeune at the intersection of residential streets such as Zamora, Majorca, Navarre, etc. zoned MF-1?</p> <p>c) In the definitions section, a duplex is defined as "having the exterior appearance of a single-family dwelling house," but the regulations themselves do not specify appearance, nor do they talk about consideration of architectural and neighborhood context before plans are approved by the Board of Architects. There is a building going up at Zamora that clearly disrupts the residential character of the street and does not harmonize with its architectural context. This needs to be addressed for future duplex construction.</p> <p>d) Also, the landscape provision for duplexes need to specify that the 20% required in the front is 20% <u>of the required 40%</u>.</p> <p>e) As with single-family regulations, the parking space requirements, namely the roofed structure detailed under the garage section above, need to be spelled out.</p> <p>5. Lot aggregation:</p> <p>The commission had asked about stipulations to limit the FAR on lots that are aggregated into a larger building site. I do not see any reference to such limits in the section dealing with lot splits and lot aggregation.</p> <p>6. Effective date of single-family ordinance:</p> <p>As a follow-up to the last commission meeting, I had already e-mailed you a recommendation for the cut-off date for new developments:</p> <p><i>On page 2 of the ordinance itself, Section 3 states: The provisions of this ordinance shall not apply to a development which has filed an application with the Board of Architects on or before _____, 2006.</i></p> <p><i>I believe that should be changed to: The provisions of this ordinance shall not apply to a development which has received preliminary approval by the Board of Architects on or before the effective date of this ordinance.</i></p> <p><i>If it's simply a question of filing, there will be a flood of applications in order to get in before the new regulations go into effect, and we may see many more of the oversized homes go up that this ordinance was written to prevent. I'm sure you agree that would be counterproductive.</i></p> <p>7. Notification of neighbors and affected property owners:</p> <p>Again, I had e-mailed you the following after the commission meeting:</p> <p><i>Regarding notification of neighbors, the ideal would be to follow the same procedure as for variances: a notice posted on the site, and letters mailed to neighbors. However, if that is too onerous in terms of personnel and mailing costs, an acceptable alternative would be to</i></p>

Zoning Code Rewrite (Part 5)

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated 05 26 06 thru 09 15 06)

Refer to City's webpage for public comments Parts 1 - 4

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p><i>post a notice on the site, and send a weekly e-mail to concerned residents about demolition permits and new construction/major alteration permits in single family residential areas. Pertinent information could easily be extracted from the online agenda for the Board of Architects meetings.</i></p> <p><i>The City newsletter can inform residents of this option, and tell them how to sign up to receive the weekly bulletin. Then they can see at a glance if there is a property that directly impacts them. I have heard a lot of residents say they were blind-sided by demolitions right next door to them; no doubt commissioners and city staff have heard similar complaints. This would be a meaningful way to address residents' concerns.</i></p> <p>I would appreciate it if you would forward this e-mail to members of the Planning and Zoning Board, since it was written at their behest.</p> <p>As you know, many of the residents and architects have focused exclusively on the single-family regulations in the residential section of the code. I hope you are getting similarly attentive scrutiny and feedback on the rest of the code from concerned citizens.</p> <p>Sincerely, Mamta</p>
38.	06/26/06	Ignacio Zabaleta, AIA Eastshore Int'l Corp 2727 Salzedo Street Coral Gables, FL 33134 (305) 648-2006	ignacio@eastshore.net	<p>Dear Mr. Riel,</p> <p>As requested by the Assistant City Attorney, I am forwarding various concerns. The first four are very basic housekeeping issues. I respectfully request that the Planning Board reconsider the process by which the established grade, on elevated building sites, is determined.</p> <p>Please find below the issues raised at last Wednesday's meeting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Article 5, Division 16 - Roofs - June 12, 2006 - Page 1 of 4 - Section 5-1602. Flat roofs without a parapet. The text does not include the revised language previously revised and agreed upon. 2. Article 5, Division 16 - Roofs - June 12, 2006 - Page 1 of 4 - Section 5-1603. Flat roofs with an eighteen (18) inch parapet. The text does not include the revised language previously revised and agreed upon. 3. Article 3, Division 2 - General Development Review - June 12, 2006 - Page 9 of 10. Line 33 D. Incomplete buildings. It is virtually impossible to comply with the one (1) year time frame for the completion of construction projects. The text should be revised to at least eighteen (18) months. 4. Article 8, Definitions - June 12, 2006 - Page 10 of 39 - Beginning on line 50 - Floor area. The text regarding a covenant stating that "screened porches will never be enclosed"

Zoning Code Rewrite (Part 5)

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated 05 26 06 thru 09 15 06)

Refer to City's webpage for public comments Parts 1 - 4

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>conflicts with the language previously agreed upon in Article 4, Division 1 - Residential Districts - June 12, 2006 - Page 4 of 21 and beginning on line 8.</p> <p>5. Article 8, Definitions - June 12, 2006 - Page 10 of 39. Line 13 Established grade and page 11 of 39 line 43 Grade. The text ignores the fact some some building sites, due to natural geologic features, are elevated above the adjacent sidewalks and/or streets. I understand that the Planning Board would like the Board of Adjustment to examine these building sites on a case-by-case basis. However, I maintain that the process is quite unfair to the property owner. In the case of a building site in Snapper Creek the process goes something like this: Architect must design the residence and prepare drawings (15 - 45 days + architectural fees), submit to Snapper Creek Review Board (30 days min. turn-around + fees), submit to Coral Gables Board of Architects (14 days min. plus hefty upfront fees), submit to Board of Adjustment (30 - 60 days + substantial fees + preparation of supporting documentation). All of this without any guarantee that the request will be approved...</p> <p>I look forward to your response.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ignacio Zabaleta, AIA Eastshore Int'l Corp 2727 Salzedo Street Coral Gables, FL 33134 (305) 648-2006</p>
39.	6/20/06	Amy B. Hernandez 305-662-9781	Amyh925@aol.com	<p>We live in the Riveria section of Coral Gables, 1450 Certosa Ave. Our home needs a new roof. Three estimates 50-60 thousand for tile roof. Due to the cost & poor durability during hurricanes, we are interested in a metal roof. Where does the city stand on this? Come on guys, a full copper roof is out of the question, I'm talking about a durable metal roof. I went to your planning website. & looked at the discovery worksheet, but can't seem to find what was the outcome of this discussion at the hearing. Personally I feel a durable metal roof would look better than a bunch of houses with no tile after a hurricane. It could take 6 months to 1 year for me to get tile for a new roof, now that's beautiful. I noticed the affordable housing issue on the discovery sheet, how about affordable roofs? I know metal roofs are expensive, but more durable too. Where do we stand?</p> <p>Thank you, Amy B. Hernandez 305-662-9781</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite (Part 5)

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated 05 26 06 thru 09 15 06)

Refer to City's webpage for public comments Parts 1 - 4

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
40.	05/26/06	Elaine K. Codias, Ph.D. 1604 Casilla St. Coral Gables, FL 33134 305-798-0585	jceceloh@bellsouth.net	<p>Dear Mr. Riel:</p> <p>Just a quick note to thank you for bringing the issue of duplicated houses into the discussion by the Building and Zoning Board at the end of the meeting of May 24. This issue has concerned my husband and I for some time. Although I have brought it up at every meeting, as I did on the 24th, and have sent numerous emails to City Commissioners and others, this is the first time we have seen action taken.</p> <p>I have copied you on an email sent today to Dennis Smith. Please note that there is an attachment to that email of a sheet with pictures of the offending "substantially similar" houses in our neighborhood. This is a PDF document, so hopefully you will be able to view it. As I said to Dennis, if the revised code would prohibit the building of these 4 houses, you will have come a long way towards preserving Coral Gables.</p> <p>Best Regards, Elaine K. Codias, Ph.D. 1604 Casilla St. Coral Gables, FL 33134 305-798-0585</p> <p>P.S. I would like to send copies of these emails to Cristina Moreno. Do you have an email address for her? Alternatively I could mail them to her if you have her snail mail address.</p>