

*Final Summary of Major Policy Issues (01.19.05)*

<i>Policy Issues</i>	<i>Positive (+)/Negative (-)</i>	<i>Team Recommendation/Other City Board Recommendations</i>	<i>Summary of Planning and Zoning Board Discussion/Recommendation</i>
<b>Policy 1 – Residential Issues</b>			
<p><b>R Zoning Districts.</b> Consolidate "R" districts into two districts – SF1 (Established Coral Gables described as north of North Kendal Drive, west of Old Cutler and north of Cocoplum Circle) and SF 2 (New/annexed Coral Gables described as south of the above described area).</p>	<p>(+) Simplifies residential standards. (-) None.</p>	<p>Consolidate R Districts into two categories SF 1 and SF 2.</p>	<p>10.27.04 Supported two categories.</p>
<p><b>Lot splits.</b> Modify lot split provisions to allow lot splits in neighborhoods where at least 60% of the lots fronting on the same street are smaller – purpose is to provide an alternative to so-called "monster homes."</p>	<p>(+) Provides an economically viable alternative to bigger homes. (+) Several smaller homes fit better into neighborhood with smaller lots. (-) Lot splits result in increased number of dwellings/density in City. (-) Lot splits could result in elimination of large lots in neighborhoods where lots are greater than 100' and most lots are smaller.</p>	<p>11.10.04. Recommend the existing lot split provisions remain unchanged providing for public hearing review and modify the language to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend the 1000 foot radius of influence to one block street frontage.</li> <li>• Minor clarification/amendments to the building site requirements.</li> </ul> <p>11.08.04. Historic Preservation Board. The Board recommended the lot split ordinance remain within the public hearing review format.</p>	<p>10.27.04 Board was divided on issue. Board desired to continue the current public hearing review and approval process on lot splits. Requested further research with reference to historic properties. 11.10.04 Recommended no changes to the current regulations (4 to 0 vote).</p>
<p><b>Modified FAR.</b> Modify the single family FAR to protect against homes, which are out of scale with the neighborhood.</p>	<p>(+) Protects against "monster homes." (-) May reduce the expectations of some large lot owners.</p>	<p>11.10.04. Modify the single family FAR to include sliding scale as follows:</p> <p>Single Family -1 Zoning District</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 0 – 7,500 sq. ft. - .48 FAR multiplier</li> <li>• 7,501 – 15,000 sq.ft. - .35 FAR multiplier</li> <li>• 15,001+ sq.ft. - .10 FAR multiplier</li> </ul> <p>Single Family -2 Zoning District</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 0 – 15,000 sq.ft. - .48 FAR multiplier</li> <li>• 15,001+ sq.ft. - .30 FAR multiplier</li> </ul>	<p>10.27.04 Board supported Team Recommendation.</p>
<p><b>Contextual Review.</b> Establish contextual review of single-family residences on larger lots or homes which exceed the base FAR.</p>	<p>(+) Ensures compatibility with the neighborhood.</p>	<p>Establish contextual review to ensure compatibility with the residences.</p>	<p>10.27.04 Include provisions requiring all SF residences to undergo contextual review by the Board or Architects exclusively. Recommend no contextual administrative review.</p>

*Final Summary of Major Policy Issues (01.19.05)*

<i>Policy Issues</i>	<i>Positive (+)/Negative (-)</i>	<i>Team Recommendation/Other City Board Recommendations</i>	<i>Summary of Planning and Zoning Board Discussion/Recommendation</i>
<b>Policy 2 – Transfer of Development Rights (TDR's)</b>			
<p><b>Transfer of Development Rights Receiving Areas.</b> Expansion of the current TDR program to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add the North Ponce de Leon area as receiver area.</li> <li>• Add historically designated commercially zoned properties.</li> <li>• Provide and seek input on other TDR opportunities to reduce intensity within other areas of the city.</li> <li>• All programs are voluntary.</li> </ul>	<p>(+)/(-) Makes a more viable TDR program by expanding areas in which TDR's can be used.</p> <p>(+)/(-) Promotion of North Ponce de Leon area as receiving area (described as north, S.W. 8th. east, western city boundary limit/LeJeune Road; south, Navarre Avenue; west, Douglas Avenue). Input/direction is requested on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Send sq. ft. from citywide historically designated commercially zoned properties to area.</li> <li>• Send units from within the area to other parcels within the North Ponce area for exclusive creation of open/green space.</li> <li>• Send units to the North Ponce de Leon Street corridor for mixed use projects allowing for increase in commercial depth on corridor in conjunction with lowering building heights.</li> <li>• Send both commercial square footage (C zoning district) and units (from A use districts) from other identified areas commercial and multifamily of the entire city.</li> </ul> <p>(+)/(-) The above provide for opportunities to reduce the potential development intensity of an area or areas. This does not increase the maximum intensity or building height above the current Comprehensive Land Use Plan thresholds. No additional intensity would be permitted above the current allowable buildout/envelope.</p>	<p>11.10.04. Recommend the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify the existing TDR provisions.</li> <li>• Recommend North Ponce de Leon area as receiving area for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A local historic landmark or a contributing property in a local historic district located within the boundaries of the CBD; or</li> <li>• A designated historic building in the North Ponce area; or</li> <li>• Any citywide commercially zoned property that is designated historic.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Complete a future "Special Area Plan" for the North Ponce de Leon area in association with the rewrite of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan. Special area plan will include a comprehensive planning study to examine the TDR issue, Med. Ordinance and other issues identified for the area.</li> </ul> <p>11.08.04. Historic Preservation Board. The Board recommended all (commercial, multifamily and S-Uses –not single family) designated historic properties be permitted to transfer development rights.</p>	<p>10.27.04 Board endorsed transfer of historically designated commercially zoned properties. Requested staff determines total available TDR's that could be transferred from historic properties. Recommended TDR program should be voluntary, and not a mandatory program.</p> <p>11.10.04 Recommended separate TDR study be completed (consistent with Team Recommendation). However, with 3-1 vote, no recommendation is provided.</p>

**Final Summary of Major Policy Issues (01.19.05)**

<i>Policy Issues</i>	<i>Positive (+)/Negative (-)</i>	<i>Team Recommendation/Other City Board Recommendations</i>	<i>Summary of Planning and Zoning Board Discussion/Recommendation</i>
<b>Policy 3 - Mediterranean Bonuses</b>			
<p><b>Mediterranean Bonus Provisions.</b> Merge Mediterranean Bonus Provisions with Transfer of Development Rights. (Elimination of dual bonus resulting in intensity bonus.)</p>	<p>(+) Encourages preservation of existing historic properties.                      (+) Eliminates dual bonus for Med bonus and TDR's.                      (+) Provides for smaller buildings.                      (+) Provides for med. attributes (not Med. Architecture) as required.                      (-) Some properties owners believe additional density is an entitlement.                      (-) Removes discretionary Med. Bonus.                      (-) Adds additional costs to development.</p>	<p>11.10.04 Recommend the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to the current Mediterranean Ordinance bonus provisions.</li> <li>Complete a future "Special Area Plan" for the North Ponce de Leon area in association with the rewrite of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan. Special area plan will be comprehensive planning study to examine the TDR issue, Med. Ordinance and other issues identified for the area.</li> </ul> <p>11.08.04. Historic Preservation Board. The Board recommended no changes be completed to the current Mediterranean Ordinance bonus provisions.</p>	<p>11.10.04 Recommended no changes to the current Coral Gables Mediterranean Style Design Bonus Regulations provisions.</p>
<b>Policy 4 - Non-Residential Issues</b>			
<p><b>Commercial Districts.</b> Consolidate commercial districts (CA, CB, and CC) into two districts CL (Commercial Limited) and C (General Commercial).</p> <p><b>Commercial Uses.</b> Consolidation of commercial uses from more than 200 different uses into 57 use categories.</p> <p><b>Transitional Uses.</b> Add new provision governing nighttime uses in proximity to single-family neighborhoods and add new provisions governing entertainment uses.</p>	<p>(+) CL allows for transition between residential and commercial by providing for medium intensity uses along major streets, which are adjacent to single family and duplex residential without adversely impacting the integrity of residential neighborhoods.</p> <p>(+) Number of uses in CL district has been reduced and uses have been scrutinized and placed into minor (administrative) and major (Planning and Zoning Board final authority via public hearing) conditional use reviews.</p> <p>(+) Lengthy lists of uses, some of which are now obsolete, some of which no one knew what the use was, and some of which were so broad that any attempt to exclude other non-listed uses could not be rationally justified were consolidated</p> <p>(+) Allows imposition of performance criteria on operations of "night time" uses next to residential areas. The total number of criteria increases for those uses more intense in nature. Criteria are applicable to both C and CL districts.</p>	<p>Consolidate commercial districts into two districts, CL and C.</p> <p>Allow consolidation of commercial uses for simplicity.</p> <p>11.05.04. Economic Development Board. Recommended the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to establish senior friendly zoning incentives and universal design incentives.</li> <li>Need to incentivize mid-rise commercial development.</li> </ul> <p>Require greater scrutiny of transitional uses and ability to impose conditions on approval as part of public hearing review process.</p>	<p>11.10.04</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No resolution on consolidating the existing CA, CB and CC into proposed C and CL zoning districts.</li> <li>All 24-hour uses shall be required to undergo major conditional use review/public hearing review (4-0 vote).</li> </ul>

**Final Summary of Major Policy Issues (01.19.05)**

<i>Policy Issues</i>	<i>Positive (+)/Negative (-)</i>	<i>Team Recommendation/Other City Board Recommendations</i>	<i>Summary of Planning and Zoning Board Discussion/Recommendation</i>
<b>Policy 5 – Miscellaneous Zoning District Issues</b>			
<p><b>Planned Area Development.</b> Increase PAD FAR to 3.0, 3.5 w/ bonuses. Reduce minimum parcel size.</p> <p><b>Mixed Uses.</b> Transform MXD3 into a non-overlay district to be known as "Mixed Use - MX" district. Mixed Use is also a conditional use in the C and I Districts.</p>	<p>(+) Provides additional incentives for PADs to encourage more frequent use of regulations.</p> <p>(+) Assign MX district to properties south of the Village of Merrick Park (consistent with north of the Village). Will require change in land use/zoning, which is more appropriate for entire industrial area.</p>	<p>Increase PAD FAR from 2.5 to 3.0 (3.5 with bonuses if applicable) and decrease parcel size requirement.</p> <p>MXD3 District regulations will be assigned new MX to the existing industrial area of the City (bounded by: north, Bird Road; west, LeJeune Road; east, Ponce de Leon; south US 1.</p>	<p>11.17.04 Accept Team Recommendation as provided (vote 4-1).</p> <p>11.17.04</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create new MX district text that conforms to previous MXD3 text (vote 4-2).</li> <li>• Approve to consider future assignment of MX to north and south industrial areas (vote 6-0).</li> <li>• Mixed use be permitted in C and I zoning districts (vote 6-0).</li> </ul>
<b>Policy 6 - Map</b>			
<p><b>Draft Zoning Map.</b></p> <p><b>"X" Uses.</b> Incorporated X uses into underlying zoning districts as conditional uses.</p>	<p>(+) Should zoning be changed to reflect actual use (e.g. freestanding parking lots in R zones)?</p> <p>(+) Eliminates antiquated practice.</p>	<p>Incorporate X uses into underlying zoning districts as conditional uses.</p>	<p>11.17.04 Agreed with Team Recommendation (vote 6-0).</p>
<b>Policy 7 - Administrative Issues</b>			
<p><b>City Architect.</b> Many of the compatibility issues that arise in the City turn on matters of design. Draft Code proposes the creation of the position of City Architect.</p> <p><b>Development Review Official.</b> The draft code delegates relatively routine decisions involving limited amounts of professional discretion to one or more members of the City's professional staff to serve as Development Review Officials ("DROs").</p>	<p>(+) Addition of a design professional to the City's staff would increase the City's ability to work with property owners, developers and neighbors.</p> <p>(+) Allow less important design reviews to be completed by administrative staff and thereby allow Board of Architects to focus on larger projects.</p> <p>(-) Can the City attract a design professional with enough talent and experience to play a meaningful role in the development review process</p> <p>(-) Additional professional involves an increase in the City's budget unless position is reclassified</p> <p>(+) Would streamline development process.</p> <p>(+) By designating a limited number of official "DROs" the City would promote more efficient and consistent decision making.</p>	<p>Create position of City Architect.</p>	<p>11.17.04 Approve creation of City Architect subject to minimum qualifications to be provided by staff to the Board for future consideration (6 to 0 vote).</p> <p>11.17.04 Approve Team Recommendations (6 to 0 vote).</p>

*Final Summary of Major Policy Issues (01.19.05)*

<i>Policy Issues</i>	<i>Positive (+)/Negative (-)</i>	<i>Team Recommendation/Other City Board Recommendations</i>	<i>Summary of Planning and Zoning Board Discussion/Recommendation</i>
<p><b>Minor Conditional Uses.</b> There are a number of discretionary staff reviews, which are considered under various names. Draft Code consolidates these reviews under a single procedure for minor conditional uses.</p> <p><b>Major Conditional Uses.</b> The existing Code includes a number of discretionary development reviews, which are considered under various names. Draft Code consolidates these reviews under a single procedure providing for Planning and Zoning Board final approval as a major conditional uses, except for variances, which go to the Board of Adjustment and Certificates of Appropriateness, which go to Historic Preservation Board.</p> <p><b>Board of Architects.</b> Reform the Board of Architects review procedures. Delegate minor applications/reviews to professional staff.</p>	<p>(+) Standardizes staff development review procedures                      (-) Will additional staff be required? If so, could involve an increase in the City's budget</p> <p>(+) Eliminates inconsistencies and standardizes discretionary development review</p> <p>(+) Establishes procedural safeguards which protect Board of Architect decisions.                      (+) Expand the collectiveness of individual reviews and approvals                      (+) Allows Board to focus reviews on larger projects and contextual review                      (+) Delegation of routine approvals to staff is more efficient/time saving for property owner/ applicants.                      (-) May inhibit free flowing nature of reviews.                      (-) Requires additional staff to prepare agenda and development review packages.</p>	<p>Consolidates discretionary development reviews into minor and major conditional uses.</p> <p>Various uses are identified as requiring Planning and Zoning Board review and final approval with an appeal to the City Commission for major conditional uses.</p> <p>Recommend establishing rules of procedure for major discretionary reviews by Board.</p>	<p>11.17.04 Approve minor and major use concept subject to further review of those proposed uses to be placed in minor and major use categories. Revisit who shall have final authority after completion of the above list (6 to 0 vote).</p> <p>11.17.04 See above.</p> <p>11.17.04 Adopt Team Recommendations subject to establishing rules of procedures for major reviews (6-0 vote).</p>

**Final Summary of Major Policy Issues (01.19.05)**

<i>Policy Issues</i>	<i>Positive (+)/Negative (-)</i>	<i>Team Recommendation/Other City Board Recommendations</i>	<i>Summary of Planning and Zoning Board Discussion/Recommendation</i>
<b>Policy 8 –Historic Preservation Ordinance Changes</b>			
<p><b>Changes to the Historic Preservation Ordinance.</b> Minor changes were completed to update and clarify the provisions.</p>	<p>(+) Clarification of provisions.</p>	<p>Update and clarify provisions.  11.08.04. Historic Preservation Board. The Board recommended approval of the changes.</p>	<p>01.19.05 Board approved Historic Preservation Board changes (4 to 1 vote).</p>
<b>Policy 9 -Miscellaneous</b>			
<p><b>Landscaping.</b> Created a unified landscaping division by incorporating those sections of the existing code, which referenced landscaping requirements into one division. Miami-Dade County landscaping requirements apply to the City. Staff will be referencing and incorporating the County Code into the rewrite. Staff will be suggesting changes to the County Code that are more restrictive to maintain the "landscape character" that the City exemplifies.</p> <p><b>Design Standards.</b> Consolidate design standards.</p>	<p>(+) Improved reader usability. (+) Addition of landscaping requirements for single family. (+) Clarification and strengthening of vehicular use area landscaping requirements.</p> <p>(+) Reader usability (+) Clarification of standards to be applied by decision makers.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow for a unified landscaping division.</li> <li>• After review is completed, standards will be more restrictive than County requirements.</li> <li>• Consolidate design standards.</li> </ul>	<p>01.19.05 Board tabled this item for future review to allow staff to complete this portion of the rewrite. Board requested the following information when this Article is reviewed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examples of other local government landscape provisions for single family residences.</li> <li>• Impact of installed vegetation with reference to canopy growth beyond property lines.</li> <li>• Request Landscape Advisory Board review and provide input.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Parking.</b> Increase parking requirements. Deleted shared off-street parking section. CBD exemption (under 1.25 FAR is retained).</p>	<p>(+)/ (-) Additional off-street parking will be required as a result. (+) Reduction of intrusion of parking into residential areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delete shared parking and increase requirements for some uses.</li> <li>• Retain revisions to CBD and eliminate provisions regarding content.</li> <li>• 10.28.04 Parking Advisory Board. The Board made the following observations/recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shared parking. Board unanimously did not support the use of shared parking in any form.</li> <li>• Reduced parking requirements for smaller restaurants (Citywide). Requested additional information/recommendations from staff/consultant on possible reduction in parking requirements for smaller restaurants. Asked Staff to research a sliding scale whereas smaller restaurants are relieved of parking and larger</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>11.17.04</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requested examples of parking requirements for other Miami-Dade local governments for retail, office and restaurant uses (matrix format) and Board will provide future recommendation (5 to 0 vote).</li> <li>• Delete shared parking (4 to 0 vote).</li> </ul> <p>01.19.05 Board provided additional input/discussion. Requested additional information on impacts of valet parking with reference to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Available quantity of off-street parking.</li> <li>2. Use of valet parking to satisfy off-street parking requirements.</li> </ol>

*Final Summary of Major Policy Issues (01.19.05)*

<i>Policy Issues</i>	<i>Positive (+)/Negative (-)</i>	<i>Team Recommendation/Other City Board Recommendations</i>	<i>Summary of Planning and Zoning Board Discussion/Recommendation</i>
		<p>restaurants provide "required" parking per the code requirements. Research the implementation of an "impact parking fee" as a part of the proposal whereas payment could be provided in lieu of providing parking. Parking funds from impact fees would then be earmarked for public parking garages.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No parking requirements for commercial properties of less than 1.25 FAR in the CBD.</li> <li>• Citywide parking requirements for retail commercial establishments. The Board supported the elimination of the reduced parking requirements for retail/commercial establishments in the CBD. Current Code allows for reduced parking in the CBD.</li> <li>• Commercial uses adjacent/contiguous to residential uses. The Board did not support increase in parking requirements for commercial uses adjacent to residential uses. Recommended that if a developer requests variations (i.e., variance, conditional uses, increase in height/density, etc), then the development should provide additional parking.</li> <li>• 11.05.04. Economic Development Board. Opposition to proposed parking requirements for restaurants and believed that, at a minimum, small restaurants should be exempt from the requirements like other one story retail stores in the CBD. The Board asked to be kept involved and a part of any parking re-writes for commercial districts. (It should also be noted that the City's previous Aleman Parking Study addressed parking deficits and the Wells Parking Study addressed parking operations recommendations which both are relevant for the re-write efforts.)</li> </ul>	

*Final Summary of Major Policy Issues (01.19.05)*

<i>Policy Issues</i>	<i>Positive (+)/Negative (-)</i>	<i>Team Recommendation/Other City Board Recommendations</i>	<i>Summary of Planning and Zoning Board Discussion/Recommendation</i>
<p><b>Sign Regulations.</b> Eliminated distinctions among signs based on their specific content (e.g. campaign signs, real estate signs, temporary construction signs, etc.), and created distinctions based on materials, commercial v. non commercial, and type of installation.</p>	<p>(+) Reduced legal vulnerabilities by harmonizing with developing case law on the subject.</p>	<p>Recommend changes to reduce legal vulnerabilities.</p>	
<p><b>Sign Regulations.</b> Whether pole signs should be prohibited throughout the City.</p>	<p>(+) Generally speaking, this will promote better aesthetics. (-) More restrictive</p>	<p>Prohibit pole signs and promote monument signs.</p>	
<p><i>Issues requested by public speakers or other City boards to be included:</i></p>			
<p><b>10.27.04 PZB Meeting. Allow preschools in residential areas.</b></p>		<p>11.10.04 Recommend not allowing preschools in residential areas.</p>	<p>01.19.05 Board recommended staff complete further research as to the possibility of allowing preschool within multi-family areas. Requested staff research possible future locations, and identification of existing preschools and if permitted possible performance standards to mitigate potential impacts.</p>
<p><b>10.27.04 PZB Meeting. Prohibit tennis courts on single-family residences to seek variances.</b></p>		<p>11.10.04 Recommend that variances be permitted for tennis courts if it is determined variance criteria are satisfied.</p>	<p>01.19.05 Board agreed with staff recommendation.</p>
<p><b>10.27.04 PZB Meeting. Provide Day camp provisions.</b></p>		<p>11.10.04 Changes will be included in proposed text.</p>	<p>01.19.05 Board requested further review to allow staff to research allowance of day camps in retail uses.</p>
<p><b>11.05.04 Economic Development Board. Telecommunications Tower</b></p>		<p>11.05.04. Economic Development Board. Provide facilitation of wireless telecommunication in the zoning and city codes provided aesthetic integrity is maintained.</p>	<p>01.19.05 Staff indicated provisions are being drafted and shall be subject to future review.</p>
<p><b>11.05.04 Economic Development Board. Public art, cultural art &amp; green space.</b></p>		<p>11.05.04. Economic Development Board. Provide the opportunity to build incentives to encourage public art, cultural space and green space in development projects were also suggested by the Board members.</p>	<p>01.19.05 Staff indicated provisions are being drafted and shall be subject to future review.</p>