

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
1.	04 01 05	Sarah Anderson	jands@netrus.net	<p>Dear Ralph,</p> <p>I'm writing to ask you to support interim measures to halt the building of oversized houses until the completion of the Zoning Code re-write.</p> <p>The Historic Fabric of our neighborhoods, in addition to the scale and character of same is being destroyed at an alarming rate and John and I hope we can count on your support.</p> <p>Thanks, Sarah Anderson 305-445-5059</p>
2.	04 01 05	Jeffrey Kerr 917 Majorca Avenue Coral Gables, FL 33134	jekerr@comcast.net	<p>Dear Vice-Mayor Cabrera:</p> <p>I am writing to ask you, as our primary elected official, to take note of the deleterious effects of the trend of new-home builders in Coral Gables to construct homes that are clearly out of proportion to the lots and settings on which they are being built. The effects of this trend, already evident in several parts of the Gables, are not merely aesthetic. They include decreased sunlight and airflow for neighboring homes, decreased privacy, less green space and landscaping, and a violation of the character and feel of the neighborhoods in which they are located. Left unchecked, this trend will inevitably lower the quality of life in the Gables and will eventually be reflected in the desirability and value of Coral Gables residences (especially those located next-door).</p> <p>The Gables has always gone to great lengths to preserve its unique and historical character though rigorous enforcement of well thought-out building and zoning codes. As you and other city officials work on rewriting these codes, I respectfully request that you consider and protect Coral Gables by modifying the codes such that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -new or remodeled homes are required to conform to the size and character norms of the immediate neighborhoods in which they are being built; -minimum allowable setbacks are increased; -maximum allowable building heights are decreased; -the allowable size of homes (both square footage and volume) is decreased; -strict and objective guidelines are specified for the Board of Architects (to avoid the potential conflict-of-interest problems that currently characterize the process of interpreting zoning rules); -variances on home size limits are rarely (if ever) granted; -the demolition of existing homes is more tightly regulated and justified (including the required notification of neighbors).

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>Thank you for considering my request. I hope you agree that those who live, raise their families, and pay taxes here in the Gables should be the ones who determine the character and proportions of their own neighborhoods. Of course, I understand that the city must grow and move forward and that development must be a positive part of that process. But this does not mean that every development is in the best interests of the city. <u>This one is not</u>. The massiveness of these oversized homes runs counter to the elegant aesthetics and harmony that have characterized the Gables for decades. Please help us stop this trend while we still have the opportunity. We soon will not.</p> <p>Jeffrey Kerr 917 Majorca Ave. Coral Gables, FL 33134</p>
3.	04 01 05	Peter & Nancy Muller 725 Cremona Avenue Coral Gables, FL 33146	pmuller@miami.edu	<p>Dear Mayor Slesnick, Vice-Mayor Cabrera, and Commissioners Anderson, Kerdyk, and Withers</p> <p>We are asking you, as our elected representatives, to preserve the character, charm, and scale of Coral Gables. These features are what make our city unique and they are under assault by the oversized homes being built without concern for the proportion of the lots or the character of specific neighborhoods. Until the deliberate and well-thought-out zoning code re-write is completed, it would be counterproductive if there was a rush to build the very houses that are a problem and would be affected by the new code.</p> <p>Specifically, we are asking you to approve the following in your interim and long-term solutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> C require new and remodeled homes to be no larger or more massive than the existing norm for the immediate neighborhood and surrounding streets; C increase the minimum allowable setbacks; C decrease the maximum allowable height; C decrease the maximum allowable size, <u>both</u> square footage and cubic footage (volume); C provide the Board of Architects with strict objective guidelines, rather than flexibility in interpreting the code; this addresses the problem of architects who serve on the board and who also design or build homes in Coral Gables, or have business interests with those who do; C restrict the variance process so that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to obtain a variance to the code; C make it harder to demolish existing homes, and require notification to neighbors; <p>We feel that residents -- not speculators and developers -- should determine the direction of our</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>city. Property values have <u>always</u> gone up in the Gables. It's not because of the recent trend toward large houses stacked close together, but precisely because our city offers architecture of harmonious proportions, street trees, and backyards to provide breathing space, sunlight, and privacy. Once you overbuild a neighborhood, it is changed forever. If the problem of oversized homes is not corrected, it will also change for the worse the residential quality of life that defines Coral Gables.</p> <p>Thank you. Peter and Nancy Muller 725 Cremona Avenue Coral Gables, FL 33146</p>
4.	04 01 05	Edmund Parnes	eporal@aol.com	<p>Mr. Mayor and Commissioners: Please add my name to those concerned citizens that plead with you to "do the right thing" relative to the OVERSIZED HOME issue before the city commission. You do not need me to explain the problem, but you must realize the people of Coral Gables are united in wanting the size of these homes reduced and controlled. There may be a small, vocal contingent of developers and property owners wanting to maintain the status-quo, but the overwhelming sentiment favors control.</p> <p>Thanks for your attention. Edmund Parnes</p>
5.	04 01 05	Gina Dombosch Stefan Dombosch 804 Majorca Avenue Coral Gables, Florida 33134 Ph: (305) 794 7588	dombosch@com cast.net	<p>Mayor Slesnick and Members of the Coral Gables Commission:</p> <p>My name is Gina Dombosch and my husband, Stefan and I have lived in the Gables for almost 10 years. As a young married couple, we worked very hard to save for our first home which we purchased at 804 Majorca Avenue in the spring of last year. Imagine our excitement at our first home and in the community we have lived while we pursued our law and business degrees at the University of Miami.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the excitement of owning our first home was quickly diminished when we realized that a two-story oversized home was being built directly behind our property on the 800 block of Navarre Avenue. For the last 10 months, we have scarcely had a day of peace and quiet without feeling as if we are living directly on a construction site. The scores of workers necessary to build this oversized home and the attendant noise of their daily construction has truly dampened the quality of our living in our own home. Not only did the developer remove our chain link fence (without any notice to us) and replaced it with an unfinished concrete wall, they also ripped out all the beautiful palm trees that once lined the property and somewhat blocked out this huge construction site. They have installed a large pool which runs right up against our lot line and only</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>a few feet from our bedroom window. While we have frequently called the police because the contractor commences work well before the lawful hour in the morning, several days later, they return to working at 6:00 am. or 6:30 and certainly wake most of the neighborhood with their tools and loud voices. We cannot even enjoy our backyard as hordes of construction workers are often several feet from us!</p> <p>We cannot emphasize enough that this massive construction project of this enormous 2-story home has disrupted our lives for the entirety of our living in our new home. On many occasions, we have regretted working for 5 years to save the money necessary to buy this home because we have lost our privacy and our peace and quiet which attracted us to this community in the first place.</p> <p>Therefore, we are asking you, as our elected representatives, to preserve the character, charm, and scale of Coral Gables. These features are what make our city unique and they are under assault by the oversized homes being built without concern for the proportion of the lots or the character of specific neighborhoods. Until the deliberate and well-thought-out zoning code re-write is completed, it would be counterproductive if there was a rush to build the very houses that are a problem and would be affected by the new code.</p> <p>Specifically, we are asking you to approve the following in your interim and long-term solutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> C require new and remodeled homes to be no larger or more massive than the existing norm for the immediate neighborhood and surrounding streets; C increase the minimum allowable setbacks; C decrease the maximum allowable height; C decrease the maximum allowable size, <u>both</u> square footage and cubic footage (volume); C provide the Board of Architects with strict objective guidelines, rather than flexibility in interpreting the code; this addresses the problem of architects who serve on the board and who also design or build homes in Coral Gables, or have business interests with those who do; C restrict the variance process so that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to obtain a variance to the code; C make it harder to demolish existing homes, and require notification to neighbors; <p>We feel that residents -- not speculators and developers -- should determine the direction of our city. Property values have <u>always</u> gone up in the Gables. It's not because of the recent trend toward large houses stacked close together, but precisely because our city offers architecture of</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>harmonious proportions, street trees, and backyards to provide breathing space, sunlight, and privacy. Once you overbuild a neighborhood, it is changed forever. If the problem of oversized homes is not corrected, it will also change for the worse the residential quality of life that defines Coral Gables.</p> <p>Thank you. Gina Dombosch Stefan Dombosch 804 Majorca Avenue Coral Gables, Florida 33134 Ph: (305) 794 7588</p>
6.	04 01 05	Barbara Collingwood 616 Alcazar Avenue Coral Gables FL 33134	bcollingwood@bellsouth.net	<p>I have just passed the 25-year mark as a resident of Coral Gables, and this is my first letter to elected officials. We certainly do have a wonderful, livable community. Although evolutionary change is inevitable -- and often welcome -- some change is like a discordant note in an otherwise beautiful symphony. And like that discordant note, some change can't be undone. I am speaking of the number of homes that have been designed, approved and built in Coral Gables recently that just do not fit the scale and character of the existing neighborhood. You know where they are as well as I do. I can understand the conflict and tension between an owner's right to build and the community's right to preserve its values. I do however believe that you as our elected officials have no greater mission in this "bigger-is-better-era" than to find a way to ensure that our neighborhoods are not forever destroyed by overbuilding. How this is done I will leave to the experts in this field. I know it can be done. Please do not miss this opportunity to sustain the vision of George Merrick during your watch.</p> <p>Barbara Collingwood 616 Alcazar Avenue Coral Gables FL 33134</p>
7.	04 01 05	Flor Suarez Tilden 732 Majorca Avenue Coral Gables, FL 33143	Flor732@aol.com	<p>I am writing you as the elected representatives of the City of Coral Gables, to request your consideration of the developing of our neighborhood.</p> <p>I have lived in this city since the early 1960's. My parent's home was on Alhambra Circle, where I lived until 1970. As an adult and a parent I purchased my home on Majorca Avenue, and have loved where I've been and where I am within our city.</p> <p>My neighbors, the residents of Coral Gables, have strived, with the backing of our elected Mayor and Commissioners to preserve and keep the vision and reality of what Coral Gables has become today- but as of a recent time, an unwelcome change within North Gables has become apparent. The construction of oversized homes have come to stand out, not only because of their size, but</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>because harmony of structure is glaringly amiss! These oversized structures are casting a great shadow on the green of our streets, and infringe on the personal spaces of backyards, where our families have derived energy of the out-of-doors.</p> <p>I ask of you, our elected government officials to reconsider and deliberate on your decisions with a sense of concern for the citizens of Coral Gables. Developers and potential homesteaders have come scouting for opportunities to build, for that is what they do. We the citizens of Coral Gables have worked for generations to keep a sense of gentility and grace, where homage can be seen toward nature and clean living.</p> <p>Dade County has offered all us countless examples of what development can be.. If we look toward Hialeah and Kendall, can we ask, " where have their parks and trees and green gone?" Elegance is not necessarily "large." Specifically when situated in seemingly, unplanned and random spaces.</p> <p>To the Zoning, Code Enforcement and Historic Society, I ask you consider each one of the citizens who have strived to comply to rules and guidelines to keep a City beautiful, where each and every resident is assured their personal spaces, including the privacy surrounding their dwelling and streets.</p> <p>Specifically, I ask you to approve the following in your interim and long-term solutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • require new and remodeled homes to be no larger or more massive than the existing norm for the immediate neighborhood and surrounding streets; • increase the minimum allowable setbacks; • decrease the maximum allowable height; <p>decrease the maximum allowable size, <u>both</u> square footage and cubic footage (volume); In all, I ask that you as the officials of Coral Gables preserve the character, charm and scale of our residential neighborhood.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted, Flor Suarez Tilden 732 Majorca Avenue Coral Gables, FL 33143</p>
8.	04 01 05	Harriett Galvin 829 Catalonia Avenue	Harriett.Galvin@usdoj.gov	<p>Dear Commissioner Cabrera:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">We are about to experience an "oversized" home being built across the street from us, on</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>830 Catalonia Avenue. The buyers will be demolishing the existing house, built in the 1940's, and building a 2-story, 6800 square foot home, whereas all the houses on the street are one story and comparable in size to our home, at 829 Catalonia, which is 2,800 square feet. We know that Coral Gables is working on rewriting the current building code and that you will be discussing this at your meeting on April 5. I am unable to attend because I work downtown, but I would like my statement to be considered at the meeting.</p> <p>I hope that you will consider, in formulating either interim or long-term solutions, the following requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) require that new and remodeled homes be no larger or more massive than the existing norm for the immediate neighborhood and surrounding streets; 2) increase the minimum allowable setbacks; 3) decrease the maximum allowable height; 4) decrease the maximum allowable size, both square footage and cubic footage (volume); 5) provide the Board of Architects with strict objective guidelines, rather than flexibility in interpreting the code; this addresses the problem of architects who design or build homes in Coral Gables, or have business interests with those who do; 6) restrict the variance process so that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to obtain a variance to the code; 7) make it harder to demolish existing homes, and require notification to neighbors. <p>My family moved to this community 20 years ago because of its property values and its aesthetic charm which includes homes that are in proportion to the surrounding properties. We feel we are in danger of losing the character of Coral Gables that makes it unique amongst communities in Dade County and, indeed, the nation. Thank you for your consideration. Harriett Galvin, 829 Catalonia Avenue</p>
9.	04 01 05	Luiza Vladescu 617 Majorca Ave Coral Gables, FL 33134	Luizav2@yahoo.com	<p>Mr Vice-Mayor, We are asking you, as our elected representatives, to preserve the character, charm, and scale of Coral Gables. These features are what make our city unique and they are under assault by the oversized homes being built without concern for the proportion of the lots or the character of specific neighborhoods. Until the deliberate and well-thought-out zoning code re-write is completed, it would be counterproductive if there was a rush to build the very houses that are a problem and would be affected by the new code.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>Specifically, we are asking you to approve the following in your interim and long-term solutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % require new and remodeled homes to be no larger or more massive than the existing norm for the immediate neighborhood and surrounding streets; % increase the minimum allowable setbacks; % decrease the maximum allowable height; % decrease the maximum allowable size, <u>both</u> square footage and cubic footage (volume); % provide the Board of Architects with strict objective guidelines, rather than flexibility in interpreting the code; this addresses the problem of architects who serve on the board and who also design or build homes in Coral Gables, or have business interests with those who do; % restrict the variance process so that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to obtain a variance to the code; % make it harder to demolish existing homes, and require notification to neighbors; <p>We feel that residents -- not speculators and developers -- should determine the direction of our city. Property values have <u>always</u> gone up in the Gables. It's not because of the recent trend toward large houses stacked close together, but precisely because our city offers architecture of harmonious proportions, street trees, and backyards to provide breathing space, sunlight, and privacy. Once you overbuild a neighborhood, it is changed forever. If the problem of oversized homes is not corrected, it will also change for the worse the residential quality of life that defines Coral Gables.</p> <p>Thank you. Luiza Vladescu 617 Majorca Ave Coral Gables, FL 33134</p>
10.	04 01 05	Richard Grant and Adriana Cala 800 Majorca Avenue Coral Gables, 33134	rgrant@miami.edu	<p>Dear representatives,</p> <p>We are asking you, as our elected representatives, to preserve the character, charm, and scale of Coral Gables. These features are what make our city unique and they are under assault by the oversized homes being built without concern for the proportion of the lots or the character of specific neighborhoods. Until the deliberate and well-thought-out zoning code re-write is completed, it would be counterproductive if there was a rush to build the very houses that are a problem and would be affected by the new code.</p> <p>Specifically, we are asking you to approve the following in your interim and long-term solutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> C require new and remodeled homes to be no larger or more massive than the existing norm for the immediate neighborhood and surrounding streets; C increase the minimum allowable setbacks;

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>C decrease the maximum allowable height;</p> <p>C decrease the maximum allowable size, both square footage and cubic footage (volume);</p> <p>C provide the Board of Architects with strict objective guidelines, rather than flexibility in interpreting the code; this addresses the problem of architects who serve on the board and who also design or build homes in Coral Gables, or have business interests with those who do;</p> <p>C restrict the variance process so that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to obtain a variance to the code;</p> <p>C make it harder to demolish existing homes, and require notification to neighbors;</p> <p>We feel that residents -- not speculators and developers -- should determine the direction of our city. Property values have <u>always</u> gone up in the Gables. It's not because of the recent trend toward large houses stacked close together, but precisely because our city offers architecture of harmonious proportions, street trees, and backyards to provide breathing space, sunlight, and privacy. Once you overbuild a neighborhood, it is changed forever. If the problem of oversized homes is not corrected, it will also change for the worse the residential quality of life that defines Coral Gables.</p> <p>Thank you. Richard Grant and Adriana Cala 800 Majorca Ave Coral Gables, 33134</p>
11.	04 01 05	Daniel Fryer Mamta Chaudhry-Fryer 640 Majorca Avenue	danielfryer@hotmail.com	<p>We are asking you, as our elected representatives, to preserve the character, charm, and scale of Coral Gables. These features are what make our city unique and they are under assault by the oversized homes being built without concern for the proportion of the lots or the character of specific neighborhoods. Until the deliberate and well-thought-out zoning code re-write is completed, it would be counterproductive if there was a rush to build the very houses that are a problem and would be affected by the new code.</p> <p>Specifically, we are asking you to approve the following in your interim and long-term solutions:</p> <p>></p> <p>> C require new and remodeled homes to be no larger or more massive than the existing norm for the immediate neighborhood and surrounding streets;</p> <p>> C increase the minimum allowable setbacks;</p> <p>> C decrease the maximum allowable height;</p> <p>> C decrease the maximum allowable size, both square footage and cubic footage (volume);</p> <p>> C provide the Board of Architects with strict objective guidelines, rather than flexibility in interpreting the code; this addresses the problem of architects who serve on the board and who also design or build homes in Coral Gables, or have business interests with those who do;</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > C restrict the variance process so that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to obtain a variance to the code; > C make it harder to demolish existing homes, and require notification to neighbors; > We feel that residents -- not speculators and developers -- should determine the direction of our city. Property values have always gone up in the Gables. It's not because of the recent trend toward large houses stacked close together, but precisely because our city offers architecture of harmonious proportions, street trees, and backyards to provide breathing space, sunlight, and privacy. Once you overbuild a neighborhood, it is changed forever. If the problem of oversized homes is not corrected, it will also change for the worse the residential quality of life that defines Coral Gables. > Thank you. > Daniel Fryer > Mamta Chaudhry-Fryer > 640 Majorca Avenue
12.	04 01 05	Laurie Berry 608 Navarre Avenue Coral Gables, FL 33134	LBerry@1957@aol.com	<p>Dear Vice-Mayor Cabrera:</p> <p>We are asking you, as our elected representatives, to preserve the character, charm, and scale of Coral Gables. These features are what make our city unique and they are under assault by the oversized homes being built without concern for the proportion of the lots or the character of specific neighborhoods. Until the deliberate and well-thought-out zoning code re-write is completed, it would be counterproductive if there was a rush to build the very houses that are a problem and would be affected by the new code.</p> <p>Specifically, we are asking you to approve the following in your interim and long-term solutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> C require new and remodeled homes to be no larger or more massive than the existing norm for the immediate neighborhood and surrounding streets; C increase the minimum allowable setbacks; C decrease the maximum allowable height; C decrease the maximum allowable size, <u>both</u> square footage and cubic footage (volume); C provide the Board of Architects with strict objective guidelines, rather than flexibility in interpreting the code; this addresses the problem of architects who serve on the board and who also design or build homes in Coral Gables, or have business interests with those who do; C restrict the variance process so that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to obtain a variance to the code; C make it harder to demolish existing homes, and require notification to neighbors;

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>We feel that residents -- not speculators and developers -- should determine the direction of our city. Property values have <u>always</u> gone up in the Gables. It's not because of the recent trend toward large houses stacked close together, but precisely because our city offers architecture of harmonious proportions, street trees, and backyards to provide breathing space, sunlight, and privacy. Once you overbuild a neighborhood, it is changed forever. If the problem of oversized homes is not corrected, it will also change for the worse the residential quality of life that defines Coral Gables.</p> <p>Thank you. Laurie Berry 608 Navarre Ave. Coral Gables, FL 33134</p>
13.	03 30 05	Eloisa Vladescu 617 Majorca Avenue Coral Gables, FL 33134	eliosavladescu@ hotmail.com	<p>To the Coral Gables Commission: We are asking you, as our elected representatives, to preserve the character, charm, and scale of Coral Gables. These features are what make our city unique and they are under assault by the oversized homes being built without concern for the proportion of the lots or the character of specific neighborhoods. Until the deliberate and well-thought-out zoning code re-write is completed, it would be counterproductive if there was a rush to build the very houses that are a problem and would be affected by the new code.</p> <p>Specifically, we are asking you to approve the following in your interim and long-term solutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> C require new and remodeled homes to be no larger or more massive than the existing norm for the immediate neighborhood and surrounding streets; C increase the minimum allowable setbacks; C de decrease the maximum allowable height; C de decrease the maximum allowable size, <u>both</u> square footage and cubic footage (volume); C provide the Board of Architects with strict objective guidelines, rather than flexibility in interpreting the code; this addresses the problem of architects who serve on the board and who also design or build homes in Coral Gables, or have business interests with those who do; C restrict the variance process so that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to obtain a variance to the code; C make it harder to demolish existing homes, and require notification to neighbors; <p>We feel that residents -- not speculators and developers -- should determine the direction of our</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>city. Property values have <i>always</i> gone up in the Gables. It's not because of the recent trend toward large houses stacked close together, but precisely because our city offers architecture of harmonious proportions, street trees, and backyards to provide breathing space, sunlight, and privacy. Once you overbuild a neighborhood, it is changed forever. If the problem of oversized homes is not corrected, it will also change for the worse the residential quality of life that defines Coral Gables.</p> <p>Thank you. Eloisa Vladescu 617 Majorca Ave Coral Gables, FL. 33134 (305) 441-0053</p>
14.	03 30 05	Howard Landau 839 Catalonia Avenue Coral Gables, Florida 33134 305-898-9832	hlandau@comcast.net	<p>Dear Mayor Slesnick,</p> <p>My name is Howard Landau. My wife, Sarah Lea Tobocman, and I have been a homeowner at 839 Cataloia Avenue for 21 years. We recently spoke at the CABA dinner where my wife's Gunster Yoakley law partner Mikki Canton introduced us. You told me about you and your wife living on Sevilla for many years.</p> <p>I am writing to you about my concerns with the overdevelopment of homesites in my neighborhood. The issue is ripening across the street from me. The original owners of the home at 830 Catalonia sold their home over the summer. The parties that purchased the property intend to build a 6800 square foot home on the land. As of this date I have not received any notices of Board of Architect meetings to discuss the approval of this design. Yet, my neighbor Paul Posnack said they have been approved.</p> <p>I realize that the Commision is in the process of restructuring our zonning codes. I suggest that it is imperative that a moratorium be placed on the approval and commencement of construction on private residences that are considered oversized in proportion to the existing homes on their streets and neighborhood..</p> <p>We live in a beautiful community that has always strived to fit within the visions of our original settlers. This simple idea of construction conformity has made the Gables appealing and in demand for home buyers. The oversized home does not belong in our part of the Gables.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>From my reading the local papers I know you share my feelings on this issue. I am offering my support as both a resident and an attorney to assist you and the commission to save our community from this potential problem.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and I look forward to seeing you at the April 5th meeting.</p> <p>Respectfully, Howard Landau 839 Catalonia Avenue Coral Gables, Florida 33134 305-898-9832</p>
15.	03 24 05	Isabel Roces McCormick	imcc@mindspring.com	<p>Dear Mayor Slesnick: It just came to my attention that the present co-chair of the Board of Architects is the same architect - Alberto Bernal- that designed the MacMansion that was built next to my house about 5 years ago (two and a half stories high of uninterrupted concrete wall running from the 20ft setback on the front of the house all the way back to the back of the property line. There are 5 ft separating the house from my property). If my memory serves me right the other present co-chair was one of the members of the board that approved the house. At that time-before you came into office- I went to the Board of Architects to protest the house. Although Mr. Bernal left the podium to go and sit in the audience and later came up at the request of the Board to explain his project, human nature being what is it, the project was approved. No variances were needed. It was all allowed within the code. I doubt it very seriously if our MacMansion problem is going to get any better when the ones building the MacMansions are the ones deciding whether they should be built. What a terrific conflict of interest. It is the fox guarding the hen house.</p>
16.	03 24 05	Ben Neji	ben_neji@yahoo.com	<p>The Honorable Mayor of the City of Coral Gables: As you may recall, my partner Mr. Carlos Yanes and I met with you and Ms Cathy Swanson in January of this year. We presented you with our plans to open "Le Bouchon Wine Cellar", a business venture with a new twist in selling fine wines and educating our city beautiful residents on wine, food and art. Based on your recommendation, we had meetings with various zoning and planning Departments of the city. Mr. Wally was very helpful, he indeed recommended that we open two business, with two separate entrances one next to each other in order to comply with the city code. One business would be a "wine store", and the other a "restaurant". Although this would double our expenses and our investment, Mr. Yanes and I would be glad to do it this way. However, in our meeting with Ms. Ruth of the Zoning Department she insisted that beside the separate entrances, we must have a solid wall to separate "Le Bouchon Wine Cellar" and "Bistro Le Bouchon". This will definitely defeat the purpose of our project and would not allow us to</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>conduct wine, food and art education sessions as the wall will prevent the interaction. This wall will be a barrier between the art exhibit and the wine presentations as they will have to be in separate sides of the premises. Here again, as residents of the city of Coral Gables, we will continue respecting the city code. we are willing to erect a separation between the two business, however, we need to have at least one access between the two. We therefore, request your support to create a nicely decorated French door between the two business to facilitate access during the events of wine, food and art presentations. Also, we must be accountable to the land Lord who has been very patient with us as he believes in our venture as much as we do.</p> <p>Mr. Mayor, we know that you believe in our idea and our project, we would highly appreciate your support and assistance in making this project a reality for the city. This would be our modest participation in making our city one of the most internationally oriented cities in the United States.</p> <p>Sincerely Ben Neji Le Bouchon Wine Cellar</p>
17.	03 23 05	Richard A. Crisonino	CRISONINO@aol.com	<p>Dear Mr. Mayor:</p> <p>It was a pleasure running into you the other afternoon. Please note that I fully agree with your position regarding the building of monstrous residential structures in the Gables. I believe it is important for the City to enforce its green area requirements so as to maintain the integrity of the city beautiful.</p> <p>I believe that the intention of the percentage equations relating to building, versus green area, should be applied in such a way to benefit adjoining property owners, and not only the individual or individuals attempting compliance. By this I mean that a property owner should not be able to build up to his property line to the detriment of his neighbors, and then leave a large green area enclosed for himself. I believe this violates the spirit of the law.</p> <p>We appreciate the good job you are doing.</p> <p>Sincerely yours, Richard A. Crisonino, Esquire</p>
18.	03 16 05	Laura L. Russo	laurarusso@msn.com	<p>I represent Gables Estates Club. I have been requested to ask you to review the impact of the proposed legislation on the site specific development regulations for Gables Estates. Several years ago, Gables Estates Club hired the planning/architectural firm of Correa, Valle, Valle to review the existing City zoning codes and the Gables Estates building restrictions and study the character of the area. Their recommendations were presented to the Planning & Zoning Board and then to the City Commission where they were passed. Jaime Correa and Eric Valle studied the building trend in Gables Estates and the difference in development from the rest of the City due</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>to additional setback restrictions and especially large building sites. Some of the site specific regulations addressed issues such as fence/wall height, gate and column heights, location of garages and auxiliary structures and height. \</p> <p>We have been provided with a breakdown of the proposed regulations and its effect on larger lots. I will fax to you for your review. Gables Estates lots range in size from approximately one acre to over 4.5 acres – the loss of square footage if this chart is correct would range from 4,425 square feet to 36,425 square feet. Jaime Correa is currently out of the country. Upon his return we would like him to review the proposed legislation and discuss with you its impact on Gables Estates.</p> <p>Thank you, Laura L. Russo</p>
19.	03 15 05	Rachel B Lauzurique 123 Salamanca Avenue Apt. 3 Coral Gables Fl 33134 305 788 8577 cell 305 444 3434 home	rblauzurique@aol.com	<p>Gentlemen:</p> <p>I was so happy to hear at the last commission meeting your cautious approach to the mcmassions that are ruining this lovely city.</p> <p>But please, don't forget that also Mcbuildings that are sprouting all over the landscape. The intrusion will be immeasurable. A double lot on Salamanca Ave and Galiano was just sold. I am sure that it is for a condominium building. Please keep this in mind because when it comes up for permitting, I will be there to oppose it. This is a small street and it cannot absorb any more traffic.</p> <p>Regards, Rachel B Lauzurique 123 Salamanca Avenue Apt 3 Coral Gables Fl 33134 305 788 8577 cell 305 444 3434 home rblauzurique@aol.com</p>
20.	03 15 05	Nelson Bean	Nelsonbean@aol.com	<p>Allowing some property owners to separate lots united by unity of title, may arrest the McMansion trend.</p> <p>From a business point of view, it is bad to have the largest home/parcel on the block. Allowing those blessed/cursed with too much land, obtain a separate buildable lot, would benefit both the property owner [burdened w/ a high tax bill] & the community in dire need of centrally-located, single-family housing.</p> <p>Having two homes in scale w/ the surrounding homes, is better than a parcel destined for a Monster Home.</p> <p>How about letting landowners separate lots, so they can sell a portion to the city as parkland? This would be a blessing for all. I remember when the kids on my block used to play ball in the many vacant corner lots. Sadly, there are hardly any left. Corner parks in the more densely populated</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				North Gables are needed.
21.	03 14 05	Richard Namon	rn@mailmiami.com	<p style="text-align: center;">MAC MONSTER HOMES (Super Size It, Please!)</p> <p>I commend Mayor Slesnick on his stand to immediately stop the spread of "Monster Homes" (The Herald Neighbors, 3/13/05). This is an important Coral Gables issue. Our building codes permit over sized homes. When land costs were lower, bigger homes were built on bigger lots. That is no longer true.</p> <p>Hopefully, changes in the code will be the same for all residential sites. Perhaps those changes could apply to all non-commercial property as well. We have a model for code changes from the past. The Biltmore Hotel is outstanding and almost as old as the city. It is an acceptable "monster" in the midst of homes. For years it was tallest structure in Coral Gables. Also, it always has had lots of daily traffic. Yet, it is not just acceptable, it is considered one of the jewels of our city!</p> <p>Why is this overly large, tall, and busy building so desirable? The most obvious reason is that it has very, very large setbacks and plenty of parking. The angle from the center of the road to the tallest spire is not steep – much less than seen with monster homes. The same holds for the side property lines. Add to this the Biltmore details in design, the many changes in elevation, and you can see a formula for its success. Here the hotel is very large and still in keeping with its residential surroundings. The same considerations could be applied to town homes and apartment buildings. Of course, when you have higher density, you need road design that handles the traffic. Road design has kept Biltmore traffic from being intrusive to its neighborhood.</p> <p>Home size is important whether the land is small or large. Any changes that affect small lots should apply to large lots. We do not need two sets of rules: one for North Gables and one for South Gables. Whatever changes are made, they should be equally fair and applicable. For me, the addition of structure setback angles from the lot front and sides would work fine. They would push a second story further into the lot than a first story. Then existing ground cover setback minimums could be left as they are. Not only would this prevent building new "monsters", but also prevent their replacement when they are eventually torn down.</p> <p>Richard Namon Coral Gables</p>
22.	03 14 05	Georgina C. Serio, CIC Frank Crystal & Co. of Florida, Inc. 2 Alhambra Plaza, #102 Coral Gables, FL 33134	seriog@fcystal.com	<p>I am in agreement with the oversized homes. The oversized homes that are being built are done with great taste and add to the beauty of the City.</p> <p>Thank you, Georgina C. Serio, CIC 305.421.0900 office 305.421.0999 fax 305.608.3335 cell</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
23.	03 10 05 email	Melissa Bassette, P Realtor® Avatar Real Estate Services, LLC 1500 San Remo Ave. Suite 350 Coral Gables, FL 33146	www.MelissaBassett.com	Dear Mr. Riel: Given that this is a public hearing. It would seem reasonable to expect that the proposals to be reviewed in this public hearing be made available to the public PRIOR to the hearing. The only way the citizens of this fine city can participate is by having an informed citizenry. I urge the council to reconsider the timeframes for this hearing. Respectfully, Melissa Bassett, P.A. office: 305-666-1800 x 336 cell: 305-778-8389 fax: 305-669-8441
24.	01 25 05	Juan B. Diaz	m.diaz1@comcast.net	Dear sirs, concerning your zoning rewrite article in the city beautiful news I would like to make a suggestion about the University Drive and Campo Sano intersection. The traffic through university street is very fast due to so many students using it and a circle in that intersection would take care of that problem. There are three streets converging there. Pls. Let us know if that could be possible and what we have to do to see that accomplished. Thank you, Juan Diaz, owner of 4995 and 4991 University Dr. property.
25.	02 24 05	Marilyn Caplin	mcaplin@bellsouth.net	Greetings; I was delighted to read of your work and to have a place to send some comments. My husband and I live in the Gables (7 years now) and it has been an interesting and sometimes frustrating experience. We appreciate all the effort that goes into making the Gables a very special place, but we do have some suggestions. The first is that if you are going to have a rule on the books, make awareness of the rule accessible and enforce it. I appreciate that after three or four years here, we received a written letter advising us of the pick-up of trash and recycle material and the rules governing this. It is disappointing however to travel through residential sections and see trash put out right after a pick-up. I understand that with garden clippings there is often no other choice - the gardeners come when they come - but boxes and other household trash? The second suggestion is please when you rewrite the code, consider updating the process. We have recently repainted our home. That involved a lengthy wait for my husband to get the application and then a return to have it approved. That wasn't as bad as the next step. We wanted to remove three trees which had been planted inappropriately close to the house/and power lines. That involved a trip to get the permit, another long line, then a trip back to submit it. The comedy of errors that followed would have been funny if we were younger and stronger - which we are not. The application was approved with a qualification, we needed to speak to a supervisor. Daily phone calls were not productive, the supervisor was in seminars. When we did

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>reach her a week later, we were told that she was not the person we needed to speak to. She gave us the name of another person, this resulted in repeated phone calls also....followed by several trips to city hall for the permit which was not ready when expected...and at one point was actually lost.</p> <p>We cannot be the only persons who are dismayed by the outmoded procedures. What happened to sending an application by mail, or downloading it on the computer?</p> <p>There has to be a more efficient way to contact city hall with questions as well. Phone calls are often not returned because the person is on other official business. (When they are returned, the personnel are pleasant and helpful - but often just reaching them is an ordeal.) Contractors are often reluctant to deal with Coral Gables - their mantra is you get the permit, we'll do the work! Please consider revamping how your offices are run- time to join the 21st century!</p> <p>Marilyn & Leonard Caplin 305-663-1521</p>
26.	01 18 05 (email)	Richard Namon	rn@miamimiami.com	<p style="text-align: center;">CODE REWRITE POLICY ISSUES</p> <p>There are several Code Rewrite issues that need to be resolved. Each of the following three policy issues needs to be carefully considered and publicly answered. It appears the Code Rewrite has gone far beyond the original reasons for starting it.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should the Code Rewrite be limited to the original purposes of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Rearranging the various code sections for easier use. ii. Eliminating discrepancies between and within sections. iii. Making changes to meet current legal standards for enforcement. 2. Should the new Land Development Regulations (LDRs) try to reconcile differences between existing zoning and the current Master Plan? Can this be done without public hearings on each affected area? 3. There are many changes in the code that are not noted in the "Working Draft" where they are introduced. Some examples are as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Section 4-103 Multi-family – 1 District ("MF-1") states it's derived from Article 3. It changes D-Use Districts to the same standards as the R-TH-Use districts. The change of R-TH-Use to MF-1 has no negative effects on already zoned R-TH-Use properties. The changes proposed on D-Use zoned properties are significant! Primary building site coverage goes from 35% to 50%, and front setback from 25 ft. or 15 ft. to 5 ft. or zero ft. ii. Current duplex zoning has no units per acre density per acre restriction; the new classification will limit the rezoned duplex land to 9 units per acre. iii. Both D & R-TH Districts will no longer be limited to the number of stories in the 35 ft. height limitation. iv. The current Section 3-4 (r) 1. specifies Maximum % of ground coverage diminishing with increased height. The equivalent MF-2 District does not have this restriction.

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>My recommendations for the above policy issues as numbered above are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Keep the Code Rewrite limited to purposes 1. i, ii, and iii. 2. If the LDRs and the Master Plan are to be reconciled at this time, the Master Plan should be publicly reviewed in light of changes in traffic, population density, annexations, and living styles since its last review. Any reconciliation between the two would not be in the public interest without such public reevaluation. 3. Any proposed changes in building codes and/or zoning uses should be clearly indicated in the "Working Draft." As shown in 3. i-iv there are many proposed changes not noted as changes in the draft. Before further public input and review, a new "Working Draft" must be presented for public scrutiny that notes each and every change in code or use. Otherwise the Code Rewrite cannot be considered transparent. <p>Richard Namon Coral Gables</p>
27.	01 13 05	Cynthia Drew	cynthia_drew@hotmail.com	<p>Hi Maria, coincidentally, I walked through one of these side-by-side (mirror image) structures in n. 700 block Madeira (directly behind a teardown just started by young couple) in s. 700 block Zamora). Those are located immediately west of poor original one-story nice 50's home, now sandwiched b/t them & original such 2-story teardown/add-on immediately east of original one. I have heard second or thirdhand that this original one was done by owner-developer (nice guy), who decided he'd rather live in the one directly behind (on Z), which is now being completed -- & also that he then decided to develop the two side by side on Madeira (the mirror images but one west of his original Madeira add-on, the one of which still for sale I walked through yesterday) on spec. Apparently that was successful, as one appears to have sold, & I was told the one still for sale was \$875 K when I walked through it. So this one individual has in a short half-block w/ 3 fronting on M & 1 on Z been responsible for 4 of the 5 such constructions. These are all "snout" houses on 50-foot front lots.</p> <p>He lived first in one on M, but will apparently now reside in one on Z that are directly behind each other. The two mirror images on M were built just for sale: & at that price, you can see why: & the wave of the future if permits continue to be granted for such. Two houses west of the person's intended permanent residence on Z another teardown has occurred, by the young couple who will build themselves a bigger house. Since construction has not started, we do not yet know what ultimate appearance of that house will be.</p>
28.	01 11 05 (email)	Richard Namon	rn@miamimiami.com	<p>Our Code Rewrite - Our Trojan Horse!</p> <p style="color: red;">The code rewrite consultant and City officials have proposed major changes in the code. They have used site specific building and zoning solutions with limited public input to justify citywide code changes. These changes are included without any reference in the Code</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>Rewrite change tracking book! That document is supposed to track the actual code changes. Those changes are not shown on the grounds they have had "public" input. Such changes will come as a surprise to affected Coral Gables residents if implimented. Current documentation does not disclose adequate information. The Code Rewrite authors should correct this before continuing public hearings.</p> <p>The rush to pass this historic Coral Gables Code Rewrite has created a controversy over its intent and effects. Its passage has been delayed to allow a more thorough review. Proper review is not possible unless the tracking book clearly identifies all changes.</p> <p>The rewrite consultant and the City Planning Director say 80% of the code is unchanged. Yet, 90% of the zoning map will be different!</p> <p>There is little vacant land left in Coral Gables, so what's the need for a new building code as opposed to a simple reorganization and code clarification revision? The new code is not intended to keep Coral Gables the same.</p> <p>Continued development will degrade our single-family neighborhoods. Coral Gables' way of life has not changed in decades. Now, land prices are going up, older structures are being cleared for more offices and housing in their place.</p> <p>At some point, and I think we are near it, this type of growth will lower the quality of life in "The City Beautiful." Then who will want to live here, and what will happen to property values?</p> <p>Our current growth problems started with the Coral Gables Master Plan of 1978. In 1978 there was vacant land and little major redevelopment. That plan was reaffirmed in 1993 without much thought. It projected and sanctioned growth without projecting its toll on infrastructure and life quality. Using their political influence: investors, builders and developers, have pushed City Hall to carry forward that outdated plan.</p> <p>Our time to stop over development of Coral Gables is running out. The new code keeps "Mediterranean Code" bonuses that allow excessive building. That bonus gives developers the right to build more on the same land at little cost.</p> <p>The Mediterranean Code should be eliminated, because it is so overtly pro-development! We need codes that set standards without bonuses! The new code also allows a tall building to cover more of the lot. It allows more floors for the same maximum height. It does away with duplex zoning; eventually townhouses will replace them citywide.</p> <p>The new zoning districts and uses will expose single-family homes to more commerce and its unwanted side effects. Traffic congestion and parking problems will worsen citywide. It is not too late to stop this from happening.</p> <p>As written the current rewrite will aid investors, builders and developers in their quest to build more on existing land!</p> <p>With the additional builder bonus provisions in the code rewrite, we will have more over crowded</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				schools, and more people living in every neighborhood than with the current code! It will take Coral Gables from a single family city and turn it into an apartment dominated community. Richard Namon Coral Gables
29.	12 10 04	Santiago Echemendia Tew Cardenas LLP	sde@tewlaw.com	<p>Re: City of Coral Gables' Amendments to the Zoning Code</p> <p>Dear Eric:</p> <p>As part of the City's current review and amendment of its Zoning Code, we request, on behalf of this firm's client, Alfred Pellas, Jr., a resident of Coral Gables, that the City specifically review the provisions that allow for a variance from Section 5-18 of the City Code, which governs the placement of private tennis courts between the primary residence and the street. We believe that the granting of such variances is deleterious to abutting neighbors and should be removed as an allowable variance under the Code. We understand that the City generally is heading in the direction of softening the standard for variances from hardship to compatibility. At the very least, we respectfully submit that, regarding Section 5-18, the hardship standard should continue to apply.</p> <p>In addition, the amendments to the Zoning Code contemplate permitting owners of residences to place permanent outdoor lighting prior to submitting a lumens study on the lighting to ensure the light does not spill over to a neighboring property. The current code requires that a lumens study be submitted prior to permitting permanent placement of outdoor lighting, which we believe is a better way to prevent disputes regarding overspill of outdoor lighting onto neighboring property. We urge you please to re-visit this issue.</p> <p>Please feel free to call me at 305.536.8420 to discuss the foregoing. Thank you.</p> <p>Yours truly, Santiago D. Echemendia, P.A. For the Firm</p>
30.	12 10 04	Christopher G. Tyson 1498 Sevilla Avenue Coral Gables, FL 33134		<p>Section 16 Trussed Rafter</p> <p>Dear Rotarian Maria:</p> <p>This section should be deleted from the Zoning Code for at least six reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This section of the Code conflicts with the Florida Building Code, Section 2301.4.10 Metal Plate connected wood trusses. 2. This section of the Code is not a proper subject for the code because, almost without exception, trusses are hidden from view and do not in any way affect the appearance of a building. Back in 1957 this section was added to the Code so as not to conflict with the South Florida Building Code, in my view a subtrafuge. 3. Application of this section does not always result in stronger trusses. There are dozens of instances were 2 x 6 trusses can be weaker than 2 x 4 trusses. Chord size is only one of

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>several parameters that affect design. How the trusses are subdivided is another. It is ironic that the solution for increasing the strength of a 2 x 6 truss is not to add more 2 x 6, but adding 2 x 4 web members. The design of the metal plate connectors, not addressed by this section, is also critical. Most of not all truss manufacturers employ structural engineers to detail truss layouts for construction, and design is mostly done using computers. Structural tests of trusses used to be routine, but so much work has been done that new tests are rarely required.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Because truss construction contains much less wood than "standard" construction, the fear of the then new method was not entirely unreasonable. But the more than forty years of success since 1957, shows that 2 x 4 construction can be more than sufficient. This was predicted by the use of the Method of Joints and the Method of Sections developed late in the 19th century. These methods are taught in Statics, the first technical course that engineering students must pass. It is Hurricane Andrew were 2 x 6. 5. The recent annexation of areas (2 square miles) means that residents living in the old areas (12 square miles) have a more expensive criteria than those in the annexed areas where trusses were approved by another jurisdiction. 6. The cost of 2 x 6 for Coral Gables residents was, and will continue to be, real. My most unhappy experiences were requiring 2 x 6 after Hurricane Andrew, every rejecting 2 x 4 delivered in good faith by manufacturers who just didn't know Coral Gables 2 x 6 requirements, delaying construction when it was greatly needed. <p>Background information: As a structural engineer I have worked several times for the City, but most of my experience has been elsewhere. I do have 2 x 4 trusses in an addition to my house completed in 1968 authorized by a variance from the Code, (not my goal) by the City Commission. To my knowledge, these trusses have never been inspected by the City. I would be glad, by appointment only, to show them to anyone. They behaved very well during Andrew.</p> <p>Respectfully, Christopher G. Tyson</p>
31.	12 07 04	Richard Namon	rnmiamiami.com	<p>As to the zoning code parking requirements - stricter parking provisions are needed. One of the major problems related to the parking issue is the relationship of traffic, public transportation, and parking to one another. These three elements cannot be treated separately, or there will be continuous problems with each one. Unfortunately, the needed studies of traffic, the number of cars per family, the availability of public transportation and parking have not been accomplished prior to the Code Rewrite. It is clear at this time parking availability at the MetroRail stations serving Coral Gables residents is inadequate with no parking spots available at these stations during peak MetroRail use. Parking in downtown Coral Gables is an experience to say the least. New homes are being built with three car garages on a regular basis. How can the existing parking requirements for new structures in the business district provide the needed capacity to</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>park those additional family use vehicles? Studies from other cities cannot be used to solve the unique mix of Coral Gables residential and business needs? Final parking provisions should be put on hold until studies on these issues are accomplished.</p> <p>From my viewpoint, I present the following as an introduction to our parking, public transportation, and traffic problems. Richard Namon Coral Gables</p> <p style="text-align: center;">CORAL GABLES ROADS, TRAFFIC AND PARKING By Richard Namon</p> <p>GENERAL: Traffic and parking go together. Too often the City deals with them separately. Coral Gables has no Master Plan for parking and traffic. That information is needed before allowing new commercial and multi family dwelling projects. Coral Gables is said to provide 40,000 jobs. The U.S. Census Bureau estimated a Coral Gables population of 43,000 in 2002. This means we have about one job per resident in Coral Gables. Many residents work outside Coral Gables, and many residents are not employed because of age or by choice. A significant part of Coral Gables traffic is nonresidents filling those jobs. If the current ratio of jobs to residents continues, any commercial or residential growth will result in more traffic congestion.</p> <p>UNIQUE SITUATION: Excepting for the Roads section of downtown Miami, Miami-Dade County is laid out on a north-south and east-west grid system. As the county has evolved main roads are on the section lines (one mile apart), and where there is higher density use, there are main roads on the half-section lines. This provides major road service within a quarter mile of any structure. This is not true for most of Coral Gables. Coral Gables is effectively two miles wide east to west and eight miles long north to south. For city residents the north to south corridors are most important. They are the main roads to the business districts. Traffic flow within Coral Gables is not typical of the rest of the County and other municipalities. The following discussion considers what makes our traffic flow different.</p> <p>NORTH SOUTH CORRIDORS:</p> <p>George Merrick did not intend Coral Gables to merge into Miami or the rest of the County. He envisioned a self-contained city. Otherwise, he would not have made avenues run east to west whereas in the rest of the County they run north to south. The same holds for streets: in Coral</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
			<p>Gables streets run north to south - in the County they run east to west. This explains why visitors get lost in Coral Gables. They expect streets and avenues to run in the usual direction, and become confused when they don't.</p> <p>If you compare the Miami-Dade road grid with Coral Gables roads, you come to the heart of our traffic and parking problems. On the east we have Douglas Road (SW 37 Ave.) providing a major north to south highway. About 0.2 miles west and parallel to Douglas you have another highway: Ponce De Leon Blvd., but it essentially stops at US 1. Le Jeune Road is the third major north south artery located about 0.3miles further west. These three north south corridors are located on the east side of Coral Gables and provide road availability for high-density development. They provide traffic access from north and south. Residences and businesses between them are in walking distance to the Ponce De Leon Trolley. Unfortunately, the rest of the Coral Gables arteries are not as close together. And there are no other trolleys.</p> <p>The last north-south road within the Gables is Granada Boulevard (extension of SW 51 Ave.), and it is 0.9 miles west of Le Jeune. It is a two lane road, and cannot be a major traffic corridor. The west Coral Gables boundary highway is Red Road (SW 57 Ave.), and it is 0.6 mile from Granada Blvd. Red Road could be widened as far south as Kendal Drive (SW 88 St.), and can support moderate development on the western edges of Coral Gables.</p> <p>Excepting near US 1, the areas between Le Jeune and Red Roads are limited by design. Existing residential construction, the University of Miami, and three golf courses limit development of an additional north to south corridor. Also, that area does not have road configurations for public transportation, and further development would create traffic problems. Unfortunately, Douglas and Le Jeune Roads and Granada Boulevard effectively end at Sunset (SW 72 St). This leaves the majority of southern Coral Gables north to south traffic to be carried by Red Road for the next four miles south. Coral Gables has and will continue to have little control over this very important road.</p> <p>EAST WEST CORRIDORS:</p> <p>The northern east to west corridor is SW 8th Street. The next east to west corridor is one mile south (Coral Way, AKA SW 24 St.), though Alhambra Circle does provide an east west secondary corridor for mainly Gables residents. Parallel and one mile south of Coral Way is Bird Road (SW 40th St). Coral Way and Bird Road are the two major corridors running east to west inside Coral Gables. Two miles south, Sunset Boulevard (SW 72 Ave.) has limited potential for more traffic in the future. The southern boundary of Coral Gables runs to SW 136 St (3 miles south of Sunset).</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
			<p>This circumstance of no east to west corridors in the southern area results in part from the bay shoreline. This leaves southern development to the traffic capacities of Red Road. Old Cutler Road is a part of Red Road for some distance in south Coral Gables.</p> <p>US 1 (Dixie Highway) is a major traffic corridor running northeast to southwest through mid Coral Gables. It runs between Bird and Sunset Roads, and unfortunately carries mainly nonresident traffic going through the city. Due to its heavy rush hour loads, it has limited potential for further commercial development. This would change if US 1 were two tiered or relieved by an extension of I-95 running further south. Old Cutler Road does more or less parallel US 1 through most of Coral Gables east to west. Old Cutler cannot be widened and acts as a pass through for a large percentage of its traffic. Many Coral Gables residents use old Cutler Road, and a reduction of non-resident traffic would be welcome.</p> <p>CONCLUSIONS REGARDING CORAL GABLES TRAFFIC CORRIDORS:</p> <p>Clearly, Coral Gables was not built on a grid system to handle traffic or provide public transportation. Road design limits public transportation availability for the bulk of our residents. Utilizing existing roads, the Coral Gables areas most amenable to more intense development are bounded by SW 8 St on the north, US 1 on the south, Douglas Road on the west and Le Jeune Road on the east. The major draw back to further development of these areas is: during rush hours the traffic has become saturated (especially for east west travel), and parking is already saturated for most business and residential uses. Unfortunately, the greater part of east west traffic in Coral Gables is not city related. Coral Gables sits between western Miami-Dade County residential development and the City of Miami. While that traffic brings restaurant and merchant business as a secondary consequence, it creates rush hour traffic in Coral Gables. Where there is excessive traffic, further development should be limited.</p> <p>PARKING: A parking utilization study covering all of Coral Gables is needed. Personal experience indicates parking saturation occurs in the center of the City as well as peripheral areas. The Metro Rail Parking at University and Douglas Stations are both full on some occasions! Any increase in the use of these stations by local residents (i.e. more apartments) will create severe parking problems. While the Coral Gables Trolley helps this problem in concept, in reality with monthly Metro Rail parking passes costing \$5.00, who will wait for a trolley if they can park at a Metro Rail Station easily and cheaply? This is especially true during the rainy season.</p> <p>Most city residents will continue parking in the central business district instead of using public</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>transportation. Most have to drive from home to reach public transportation. This is the result of limited public transportation routes. Also, the rainy season makes driving more desirable than using public transportation. Another factor increasing parking demands is the increase of vehicles per family. Until the 1940's a typical home had one car. With the advent of husband and wife holding jobs, the number of cars slowly rose to two per household. Today the trend is towards one car for every family member over the age of sixteen! The old parking requirements for developments will not meet future demands. A couple may arrive in separate cars after work for dinner in the business district, and this is not unusual. This trend increases the parking requirements for the business district. The need for future parking should include anticipated higher traffic, or parking saturation will become too common.</p> <p>Some suggest "Valet" parking is a solution to downtown Gables parking problems. While the drop-off may be quick, the pick-up is infinitely slower. Valet parking takes away public parking spaces besides using private parking spaces. This doesn't help places without valet parking. Coral Gables is selling bulk public parking at reduced rates for valet parking and lowering its parking revenue. This seems an arbitrary way of taking from the City and giving to private businesses. Where valet parking uses City parking, they should take any car until all their spaces are full. Let the valets deal with the same parking problems the rest of the residents have.</p> <p>Coral Gables needs a complete parking utilization survey. This study should be completed before decisions about future parking are made. It should include the average number of vehicles per single-family residence as well as for apartment households. Also, we should determine the proportion of existing parking utilized by non-resident visitors and workers. The commercial developments that mainly attract outside visitors and workers should have realistic parking requirements. More workers go to work in their own car than ever before. This trend is likely to continue, and already contributes to saturated parking in older strip shopping centers. To avoid parking problems in the future, we need to provide more parking spaces than are currently needed. Otherwise, this will not feel like "The City Beautiful" when we try to find a place to park.</p>
32.	11 19 04	Wirt T. Maxey Catamal Realty, Inc. 3001 Ponce De Leon Blvd. Suite 200 Coral Gables, FL 33134		<p>Re: Zoning Code Rewrite</p> <p>Dear Mr. Riel:</p> <p>This is to follow-up on my letter of October 21, 2004.</p> <p>As you know, we are the owners of the property located at 3001 Ponce de Leon Boulevard in Coral Gables, legally described as Lots 1, 2, 3, 16, 17, 18 and 19, and Catamal Corner, Tracts A, B, and</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>C, Block 30, Coral Gables Craft Section. As you also know, we are greatly concerned about the Planning Department's proposal to place our property in the new CL Zoning Classification, as this results in a significant down-zoning and reduction in both the uses to which the property may be put, the maximum height restrictions and the FAR.</p> <p>We respectfully suggest that, in the planning process, it is important to distinguish the property along Ponce de Leon Boulevard that is north of the intersection of Ponce de Leon and University Drive from the property which is south of the intersection of Ponce de Leon and University Drive. There are numerous distinguishing factors. There is a courthouse at the intersection of Ponce de Leon and University Drive. US Century Bank is in our building, the 3001 Ponce building. There is a bank planned for the site directly across the street from our building known as the Turnberry Bank project. There is an existing high-rise building located at 250 Catalonia, approximately one block to the west of our building. There is a high-rise located at 2801 Ponce de Leon, one block north of our building. The Union Planters Bank high-rise building is approximately one block north and west of our building. The configuration of our property in Block 30 is substantially different from the configuration of the properties along Ponce which are located to the south of University Drive. Specifically, our site has considerably more depth than the properties along Ponce, south of University Drive. The northern portion of our property where the parking lot is now located also abuts Ponce Circle Park, which is another distinguishing factor. Additionally, our property is the <u>only</u> property which abuts Ponce Circle Park which is not proposed to be placed in the new "C" Zoning Classification, as opposed to the new "CL" Zoning Classification. We do not understand why we have been singled out for down-zoning and are being treated differently from the other properties on the east side of Ponce which abut Ponce Circle Park and have residential areas immediately to the east. For instance, there is residential zoning immediately to the east of the property at 2801 Ponce, yet 2801 Ponce is proposed for the "C" zoning classification. Why is it not acceptable to have the "C" Zoning Classification on our property as well? This seems discriminatory.</p> <p>The intersection of Ponce de Leon Boulevard and University Drive is very much the natural boundary and natural entrance to the downtown business district. The property north of Ponce de Leon and University is widely perceived as being in the downtown business district. The property south of University is not. The property south of University is currently all low-rise.</p> <p>Additionally, it is important to note that, with one exception, all of the residential properties which are located to the east of our building on Block 30 are rental properties. Thus, these properties are being held for the production of income which is certainly a type of commercial use. We have</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>contacted the majority of the owners of the residential properties east of our building in Block 30 and are able to state that the majority of these owners have no complaints or objections to our property being placed in the new "C" Zoning Classification.</p> <p>We have made plans and have changed our position in very significant ways over a long period of years in reliance on the use classifications granted to our property under the Comprehensive Land Use Plan. As you will recall from my letter of October 21st, the classifications under this Plan for our property are "Commercial Use Mid-Rise Intensities (6 stories; FAR 3.0)" for Catamal Corner Tracts B, C and portion of our property where the building is currently located. For the City to change the long-standing status of our property at this time would result in frustrating the plans and position changes that we have made in reliance upon the designations in the Comprehensive Land Use Plan. As an example, reducing the FAR from the current 3.0 to the proposed 1.0 drastically reduces that which can be built upon the property. Likewise, placing our property in the "CL" Zoning Classification, as opposed to the "C" Zoning Classification, significantly reduces the height of a building which can be constructed on our property from that which is currently available and also reduces the current allowable uses.</p> <p>In summary, we respectfully request that the Planning Department amend the new "Conceptual Zoning Map" to conform to the existing Comprehensive Land Use Plan by placing Catamal Corner, Tract B and C, and a portion of Tract A together with Lots 1 through 3 and 16 through 19 in the "C" Zoning classification.</p> <p>We look forward to your response.</p> <p>Yours very truly, Catamal Realty, Inc. Wirt T. Maxey, Its President</p>
33.	11 17 04	Informal Study Session		Do parking levels count as stories in bldgs - should be stated in revised code.
34.	11 17 04	Ruth E. Harris Law Offices of Silva & Silva 236 Valencia Avenue Coral Gables, FL 33134	silvasilva@aol.com	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>Re: Revised Codes</p> <p>Please make it easier for us to install hurricane protection for our windows. It has taken me a month-and-a-half to get someone to respond to my request for a quote. I found out that nobody wants to deal with the zoning board of Coral Gables. The contractors say it takes too much time to provide drawings only to find out that certain types of protection are not allowed. (I was also</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>informed that the federal government can do as they please....example the post office has roll down shutters which are visible from the streets of Valencia and Salzado.) I called eleven contractors, only three responded, one to say forget it when I gave them our address, and the other two giving me quotes with "maybe it will be acceptable to the City".</p> <p>I understand that the City wants to maintain a certain appearance, however, lets not compromise our common sense and safety.</p> <p>Thank you, Ruth E. Harris, Office Manager (and homeowners in Coral Gables)</p>
35.	Via email 11 16 04	Nelson Bean	nelsonbean@aol.com	<p>Dear Mr Riel & Mr Carlson,</p> <p>I just read a congratulatory note on your rewrite comments page from Hialeah City Atty Bill Grodnick, one of the brightest gov't officials in Dade. I too would like to congratulate the two of you as stewards of Merick's vision.</p> <p>As you probably know, Hialeah has an excellent <i>New Urbanist</i> code for its Central Business District. The Hialeah Code allows a maximum of 8 stories. I'm troubled to know that one can build 13 stories in parts of the Gables. Mr Cannone, from your dept, further pointed out that w/ Med incentives, 16 stories is permissable.</p> <p>I'm gravely concerned about the effects of more tall bldgs in the Gables. With such tall bldgs, arcades & colonnades loose ther significance.</p> <p>Don't let greedy developers build more than 13 stories. Repeal the Med Bonuses.</p> <p>I doubt any of our "sister" cities have 16 story behemoths.</p> <p>Best wishes, Nelson Bean</p>
36.	11 10 04	P.J. Martin P.O. Box 142102 Coral Gables, FL 33114-2102		<p>RE: Proposed land development regulations/preliminary comments This is in reference to the updating of the code Article IV-Division 3 Paragraph 7.</p> <p>Congratulations to all of you who participated in this process.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>The residents are being silenced again. It has taken staff over a year to stall us after we have shown them the facts which under the "original code" that has kept "The City Beautiful" in tact, that "Sleep Centers were not included!! You continue in every way to toy with our lives!! We have given you petitions, attended meetings, etc. For some reason you are not on the same page. 3200 Ponce De Leon should not be a 24 hour operation. Sleep Centers belong in hospitals. Furthermore I would no even want a heart catheterization done there. I would want a hospital setting with much more equipment to help me if something went wrong.</p> <p>We live here—You are not protecting us when you write something in the code that will adversely affect our way of life!</p> <p>Why are sleep centers included now, after you bounced this around and stalled us for over a year. Guess we better star work on changing the U.S. Constitution to fit out current needs.</p> <p>In closing, I remember the saying--- When you move to Texas and complain about the weather, the people say "wait five minutes". In comparison...If you don't like the Code of Coral Gables and you bring your business here, we'll accommodate you, "Just wait five minutes".</p> <p>Again "Sleep Centers" belong in hospitals, which belong in "S-zones" Please rectify!</p> <p>I look forward to a written reply. P.J. Martin P.O. Box 142102 Coral Gables, FL 33114-2102</p>
37.	Via email 11 09 04	Lisset Gonzalez-Ocon	Llisset Gonzalez-Ocon@discovery.com	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>I am a working mother in Coral Gables and I have come to the conclusion that there are very few child care / pre-school options to choose from in the city. Since I live in Kendall and work near the airport I figured that the best options for my child would be in Coral Gables, however aside from a few schools located on church grounds or near other commercial areas where it may not be as safe or child friendly as I would like to see.</p> <p>I am writing to you to find out if the city has any plans of development for new child care or pre-school facilities in this area? I thank you in advance for your attention to this matter.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				Sincerely, Lisset Gonzalez-Ocon Concerned Mom
38.	Via email 11 05 04	Alex Obeso 844 Malaga Avenue	aobeso@adxtech.com	The proposal of mitigating "monster homes" in Coral Gables through lot splitting is dangerous and should be abandoned. Allowing for lot splitting will completely change the character of Coral Gables. We will increase population density, traffic, and infrastructure requirements by having more homes and more families in the City. Please tell the special interests who are trying to push this through to go away and please stop this nonsense. Alex Obeso 844 Malaga Avenue 305-442-4776
39.	11 05 04	R. Estorino-Hills 3131 Anderson Rd	restorino-hills@amadeus.net	The proposal of mitigating "monster homes" in Coral Gables through lot splitting is useless. They will just build up as Mr. Pardo accurately predicted and then they really look like monster homes as the home takes up all the space. There is one just like that one block away from my house. If you want to keep the character of our "City Beautiful", the home size should be limited depending on the lot(s) size. If someone has two lots they can build a bigger home and it will look fine, since the yard space around the house is proportionate to the size of the house. Allowing for lot splitting will completely change the character of Coral Gables. The population density will increase, bringing traffic problems, and increase in other infrastructure requirements by having more homes and more families in the City. How do you plan to pay for the additional police officers, firemen, garbage pickup personnel, etc.....? With the Condo proposals it is the same issue. What do you want to do to the "City Beautiful"? Convert it into a Doral? R. Estorino-Hills 3131 Anderson Rd
40.	Via email 11 05 04	Nelson Bean	Nelsonbean@aol.com	Dear Planners & Commisioners, I'm gravely concerned about the effects of overdevelopment.Though X Aragon & the Colonnade are handsome, the 0 & 100 blocks of Aragon AV are dreadfully gloomy because of the shadows cast by these 16 & 18 story behemonths.Those blocks never see the sun. In the downtown business district, there are, for the most part, either older 2 story, or newer 16 story buildings. Valuable land is grossly <i>underdeveloped</i> or <i>overdeveloped</i> , destroying the urban fabric.

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>An appropriate height for Downtown Coral Gables is a number somewhere in between; 8 or 10 stories, as illustrated by Dayco's beautiful, 8-story, Andalusia project. Since I'm pro development, [my family owns 3 properties in the area] 10 stories should be the Maximum height, not 8.</p> <p>Don't let greedy developers, who may not even live in the Gables, build more than 10 stories along the Ponce corridor.</p> <p>Really tall speculative bldgs don't work, look @ Downtown Miami. Would you stroll Downtown Miami late @ night? I don't think so. Land now is so valuable, there's a shortage, so why give the overly ambitious the right to turn the City Beautiful into Brickell. Projects under 10 stories (e.g. Villa Florini, Andalusia, Villa Calabria, Mendoza Village, Villa Isabella, Torre del Valle, Bermuda Village) are economically feasible. Don't be duped by the avaricious!</p> <p>Coral Gables, because of the architecture & quality of life she affords, is often compared to Europe. I believe we even have "sister" cities across the Atlantic. However, I doubt there are ugly 16 story buildings in any of our sister cities. Why? Is it because the city officials & the citizenry over there care more?</p> <p>I commend you all for your efforts to conserve the beautiful city Merrick envisioned.</p> <p>Best wishes, Nelson Bean</p>
41.	11 05 04	Bill Kerdyk 2631 Ponce De Leon Blvd. Coral Gables, FL 33134		<p>Members of the Coral Gables Planning Board Mr. Eric Riel City Hall City of Coral Gables 405 Biltmore Way Coral Gables, FL 33134</p> <p>Re: Lot Splitting Ordinance</p> <p>Dear Board Members:</p> <p>In my opinion, this was one of the strongest ordinances we ever passed in my twenty-eight years as a City Commissioner. North Gables was divided into fifty foot lots when the town was founded.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>In the late sixty's, fifty foot lots became quite valuable to build houses. When I first became a commissioner, one day I was driving down the street and I saw a porch being taken off a house to get at the fifty foot lot beside the house. I brought this to the commission asking how we could prevent this from happening and that's when the commission initiated the lot splitting ordinance (meaning that a home built over two lots could not be separated and build tow houses where there was one before) therefore guaranteeing less proliferation of extra housing. This ordinance has been defended in court several times and we have always been successful.</p> <p>Thank you, let's keep the "City Beautiful"</p> <p>Bill Kerdyk City Commission 1967-1995</p>
42.	Via email 11 03 04	Lucia A. Dougherty Greenberg Traurig 1221 Brickell Avenue Miami, FL 33131	Doughertyl@gtlaw.com	<p>Dear Mr. Riel:</p> <p>Re: Zoning Code Rewrite/Proposed Expansion of Mixed Use District to the Southern Industrial District</p> <p>We represent de Guardiola Properties, Inc., ("de Guardiola Properties") with regards to the above referenced matter. As I mentioned at the October 27th Planning and Zoning Board meeting, de Guardiola Properties enthusiastically supports your proposal to expand the boundaries of the Mixed Use District so as to include the area commonly known as the "Southern Industrial District". De Guardiola Properties believes that the proposed mixed use regulations will greatly enhance the quality of the development in the area.</p> <p>The Southern Industrial District is presently characterized by small office buildings and former automotive body shops which are currently being utilized for other industrial type uses. The general pattern of development in the area has not been consistent with development throughout the rest of Coral Gables. The presence of Mediterranean style architecture in the neighborhood is extremely limited and the sort of industrial and semi-industrial uses prevalent in the area can not be found anywhere else in Coral Gables. The expansion of the Mixed Use District to this area would be a significant step towards fostering development which is consistent with the rest of the City and would also help to address the residential and commercial need of the City in a responsible manner which limits the height of buildings and utilizes the mixed use concept in order to address traffic issues.</p> <p>Additionally, the expansion of the Mixed Use District would benefit the Village of Merrick Park by</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>facilitating the development of compatible “higher end” residential and commercial uses. At present, residential development is not permitted in the Southern Industrial District. Expansion of the Mixed Use District would permit the development of luxury residential units within walking distance of Merrick Park as well as expand the high end shopping venues in the area.</p> <p>Lastly, Policy 11.7.5 of the Coral Gables Comprehensive Land Use Plan (the “CLUP”) provides as follows:</p> <p>Redevelopment of the Industrial Design Center. By January 2000, the City shall adopt land development regulations which encourage the development of the Industrial Design Center as a mixed use village.</p> <p>Thus far, the City has adopted mixed use regulations for the “Northern Industrial District” but not for the Southern Industrial District. The proposed expansion of the Mixed Use District would fulfill the intent of the above referenced policy by effectively permitting and encouraging the development of the Southern Industrial District as a mixed use village.</p> <p>In short, the proposed expansion of the Mixed Use District will greatly benefit the Southern Industrial District and the City at large by fostering development which is compatible with the rest of the City, and the Village of Merrick Park in particular, and by fulfilling the, as of yet, only partially realized policy of the CLUP to create a mixed use village in an area which is presently unaesthetic and disconnected, stylistically and functionally, from the rest of the City Beautiful.</p> <p>Sincerely, Mario Garcia-Serra for Lucia A. Dougherty</p>
43.	Via email 11 01 04	Ralph Sanchez	RSanchezFL@aol.com	<p>Eric:</p> <p>Just to let you know that we accept being included on the new zoning map with the MXD zoning. I was there last Wednesday for almost three hours and had to leave.</p> <p>Ralph A. Sanchez</p>
44.	Via email 10 27 04	Richard Namon	rn@miamimiami.com	<p>REWRITE THE CODE REWRITE</p> <p>The Coral Gables Code Rewrite consultant, Charles Siemon, Esq., states that there will be continued pressure for redevelopment of built on areas. On that point I agree. But I disagree on</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>the necessity to provide developers an easy rout for economic profits. There is nothing in the law that gives someone who has bought something the right to a profit on its sale. Nor does it give them a guarantee they should be paid what another person was paid for a similar item. I say these obvious statements, because Charles Siemon, Esq. says owners deserve the profit they will receive if they are allowed to split lots. But then, he is a developer himself.</p> <p>Still incomplete, the Code Rewrite is scheduled for final approval in early January 2005. More time is needed for public input after the rewrite is complete. Its passage should be postponed until after the next City election.</p> <p>Code Rewrite consultants Siemon & Larsen propose splitting large lots. They say this will reduce the number of 'Monster' homes and help neighborhoods. Two 'Monster' homes will have more of an effect on a neighborhood than one! Two smaller building footprints and heights add up to the same as one 'Monster' and by 'new' code exceed it. The only difference: the new 'Monster' pair would have a 10-foot wide space between them that comes off the original side setbacks. On the negative, side setbacks to two neighbors would be reduced. Two families would bring more cars than one family and increase parking problems. There would be more local traffic. Two families would utilize more school facilities.</p> <p>Another fact is: with an increase in the value of the two split lots over that of a larger lot, the cost of each square foot of land would be more expensive. That will naturally require more expensive homes for the land that was one lot. With todays building concepts, this can only mean more being built on the two lots than there would have been built on the original one.</p> <p>The real solution to 'Monster' homes is to place a volume restriction on structures. It should be based on lot size and include a maximum height angle from the center of the road. Using those restrictions, municipalities have controlled structure size and height without limiting innovative design. Builders charge three times land cost for a new structure. With the cost of land rising faster than the cost of construction, the natural result has been larger homes being built on the same size lot. Without volume limits, the next generation of standard homes will be 34-foot high 'Monsters'. Lot splitting will only increase overbuilding, and further burden our existing infrastructure. It will give developers extra profits since two new lots will be worth more than the original one. Because the two new lots will cost more per foot, each new owner will be encouraged to be built bigger!</p> <p>This code change is not a surprise. Charles I. Siemon is a lawyer and developer. He has favored</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>excessive development in the past (Martin County versus Section 28 Partnership, LTD. CASE NO. 4D98-2813). He tried to force Martin County to allow residential and commercial development on agricultural land! Because the Code Rewrite consultant is a property development advocate, the effect of each code change must be studied. Coral Gables is fully developed. Its population, employment, and retail business can only grow by removing and replacing existing structures. Hopefully not by building concrete canyons and lowering the quality of Coral Gables life.</p> <p>As written, the proposed Land Development Regulations and Zoning Code Rewrite is a blueprint for over development. It includes incentives to tear down and build more on existing properties. Do we want a more crowded city, and do we want to pay for it? We need a referendum on this issue before changing the City Building and Zoning Codes.</p> <p>Richard Namon Coral Gables</p>
45.	10 27 04	Santiago D. Echemendia, P.A. Miami Center, 26 th Flr. 201 S. Biscayne Blvd. Miami, FL 33131	sde@tevlaw.com	<p>Re: City of Coral Gables' Amendments to the Zoning Code</p> <p>Dear Eric:</p> <p>As part of the City's current review and amendment of it Zoning Code, we request, on behalf of this firm's client, Alfred Pellas, Jr., a resident of Coral Gables, that the City specifically review the provisions that allow for a variance from Section 5-18 of the City Code, which governs the placement of private tennis courts as auxiliary uses. We believe that the granting of variances from the provisions of this Section could only lead to incompatible uses and would be adverse to the public interest. As you know, the placement of private tennis courts in residential areas has given rise to much adversity and litigation in the City and, therefore, merits revisiting.</p> <p>Please feel free to call me at 305.536.8420 to discuss the foregoing. Thank you.</p> <p>Yours truly, Santiago D. Echemendia, P.A. For the Firm</p>
46.	10 27 04	Jaime Saldarriaga Valencia property owner		<p>Mrs. Christina Moreno Chair Coral Gables Planning & Zoning Board</p> <p>Ref. Comments to Valencia Neighborhood Association Draft Proposal for TDR's</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>Dear Mrs. Moreno and Members of the Planning and Zoning Board</p> <p>Since September of 2003, the David-Williams Condo owners have been trying to lower the heights of any future buildings on the North side of the 700 block of Valencia Avenue to prevent the loss of their balcony views from the South side of their building at 700 Biltmore Way.</p> <p>We all are well aware of their efforts with the Historic Preservation Board, where they tried to declare our properties historic landmarks, along with their appeal to the City Commission, their efforts through the Moratorium to again accomplish this height reduction. We, the property owners, negotiated with the City and reached an agreement that modified the Zoning regulations for the Area, We compromised on height and relinquished Mediterranean bonuses, while accepting this architectural standard when designing new structures. Despite all this the Condo owners are still not satisfied and now want to accomplish the same height reduction through TDRs.</p> <p>Tucker Gibbs' proposed Ordinance and Mark Alvarez's recommendations again apply only to the Valencia Avenue North Side, specifically to blocks 700, 500, and 400 blocks as they themselves state in their respective documents, Attachments B and C. They want to include this very specific issue in the rewrite of the new City Zoning Code.</p> <p>Mr. Gibbs' proposed Ordinance is more an expression of intent. Its language is extremely vague and it would create another set of complex requirements and studies for the Receiving Areas, which are not included in the proposed City Code rewrite. The new requirements are so cumbersome, time consuming and costly, that once can only wonder why a builder in the receiving areas would go to all the trouble to get TDRs. With Mr. Gibbs suggested requirements, another set of zoning regulation will be incorporated in the new City Code.</p> <p>The proposed TDR Ordinance fails to address or is absent on important considerations such as 1- TDRs should not be mandatory for Donor Areas, if accepted they should only be optional. 2- TDRs to be effective need to offer an economic incentive above what owners in donor areas can realize by developing their properties to the full potential permitted by the Zoning Code. 3- The Ordinance does not take into account the time factor. Donor and Receiving Area markets do not happen at the same time, nor do the prices in these areas vary at the same rate over time. 4- There is no certainty that a market for these TDRs will exist in the future. The City, again, could change the Zoning Code to meet new political pressures thus eliminating any viable market for TDRs. 5- The simple mechanical/statistical calculations such as those presented by Mr. Alvarez are based on current conditions and, as such, do not reflect future market conditions.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>The following comments pertain to Mr. Alvarez's analysis:</p> <p>1- His analysis of property values was exclusively based on the Condo values at the David-Williams as he himself states. He states that most increases in the assessed value of Valencia properties for 2004 are about 10% higher than for 2003. While this may be true for the Condo units, it is not true for the Valencia Properties. Here are some examples of assessed values for 2004 just received:</p> <p>726 Valencia going up by 51.5% 740 Valencia going up by 38.25% 717 Valencia going up by 38.48% 731 Almeria going up by 41.17% 735 Almeria going up by 31.55% 743 Almeria going up by 27.32% 2617 Anderson going up by 41.67%</p> <p>So much for Mr. Alvarez's calculations. He can not base his valuation of Valencia Properties on the David-Williams Condo prices: They are not the same. The David-Williams was built as a hotel years ago. It was built as a hotel and therefore has many inherent, undesirable conditions when switching the hotel units for sale as individual condos.</p> <p>2. Mr. Alvarez has the wrong Zoning classification for 744 Biltmore, 2509 Anderson, 745 Valencia, 2615 Anderson, 743 Almeria. This properties are not A-17. They are A-13. He also has the wrong Zoning code for 740 and 726 Valencia, and Weitzer's Valencia Grande properties. These are zoned A-15 not A-13.</p> <p>3. Mr. Alvarez seems to ignore the Moratorium Ordinance just passed this July: His maximum floor space, which should be based on a 2.0 FAR ratio, are wrong.</p> <p>4. Mr. Alvarez's calculations of what he calls "Floor Area Displaced" is based on limiting the height of the North side of Valencia buildings to 60 ft. Current height limitations are either 100/70 or 60 feet depending on the size of the parcel of land. In some cases, he proposes to subject to TDR transfer, the equivalent of 1.5 floors. This is done without any regard for what would remain of the permitted building. In most cases the remaining structure becomes economically not viable and architecturally unattractive.</p> <p>5. The worst serious error in Mr. Alvarez's valuation for Valencia is based on the average estimated cost per square foot for the Condo units at the David-Williams of \$176 per sq. ft. (2003 prices). Current land prices for Valencia are between \$210 and \$250 per sq. ft. and the current value of luxury apartments in the area could run around \$400 per sq. ft.</p> <p>TDR valuation, market acceptance, market access, time factors affecting cost, and property value</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>variances in Donor and Receiving Areas are very complex issues that a simplistic statistical calculation can not address.</p> <p>Should the City make Mr. Gibbs' Transfer of Development Rights for Valencia Avenue mandatory, we, the property owners of Valencia, will naturally oppose it, specially when we just finished negotiating, in good faith, with the city and it outside consultant the Moratorium Ordinance, just passed this July, which down size our properties.</p> <p>TDRs have at best an uncertain future value, in a market that is both unpredictable and unknown, We also would not to see a third party setting the value and the amount of Transfer Development Rights involved.</p> <p>Jaime Saldarriaga Valencia Property owner</p>
47.	10 27 04	(no name provided)		<p>Height restrictions for tenant storefront signage: Height used to be 25' max as of 2001-As of 2004 it is 18' max- University Center is an existing retail shopping center on U.S.-1 & Mariposa Ct. This center was originally built in 1953 and was updated in th 1980's. Currently all signage is at appox. 23' above grade. There must be a consideration for signage criteria along the U.S.-1 corridor or existing signage when changed.</p>
48.	10 27 04	Informal Study Sessions Comments		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Growth & effect on schools 2. Provisions to allow pre-schools 3. Standardize lot separation 4. Height of signage along US 1 5. Shortage of "empty-nester" housing 6. Property rights vs. "monster home" regulations 7. FAR- TDR/Med proposal (capping @ 3.5)
49.	10 27 04	Vincent E. Damian 2550 Brickell Bayview Centre 80 S.W. 8 th Street Miami, FL 33130		<p>Dear Mr. Riel: Re: Proposed Land Development Regulations/Preliminary Comments Please review the enclosed letter with the Planning Department as part of your 3:00 p.m. Workshop. You are also requested to read the letter to the Members of the Planning and Zoning Board as part of the public forum and place in their packets.</p> <p>Re: Re-Write of Coral Gables Zoning Code a Flawed Procedure As the citizens of Coral Gables are beginning to become aware, the Administration is in the process of doing a major revision to the existing Coral Gables Zoning Code. We have a document at the present time that has served us well for the past seventy-five years with few changes. Great</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>care should be taken before making major changes.</p> <p>There is not doubt that the Code needs to be reviewed and some changes need to be made to update the Code to present circumstances. For example, thirty to forty years ago, the business climate of Coral Gables was a quiet one and few businesses operated in such a way that they conflicted with their neighboring residential areas. Today, the hours of operation have expanded, the intensity has expanded and many new businesses never thought of before are moving into commercially zoned areas that abut residential neighborhoods. These do need to be addressed. The most glaring example is doctor's offices and medical clinics which thirty years ago operated from 9:00 a.m. to 5 p.m., 4 ½ days a week and did little more than examine patients with minor in-office treatment. Today, we see major in-office surgery taking place with recuperation taking place in those same offices. We have rehabilitation clinics operating at an expanded hours. These are not compatible directly adjacent to residential neighborhoods and these needs to be addressed. There are other examples too far numerous to set forth here. However, our Zoning Code needs to be tweaked and it needs minor improvements. What we do not need is a major re-write of our Code without prior citizen input.</p> <p>What has happened is that the City, several years ago, directed the Planning Department to make suggestions for modifications to our Zoning Code. The Planning Department did not do so. They requested and the Commission approved the hiring of outside counsel to assist the Planning Department in re-writing the Code. The Planning Department and outside counsel then went about redrafting the entire Code of the City of Coral Gables. They have informed us that only about 10% of the Code has been changed. However, they have handed us a 750 page document (present Code is around 100 pages).</p> <p>The planned procedure is to now have hearings on this huge document and then have the Planning & Zoning Board to approve it or disapprove it. They will then go to the City Commission and the City Commission will approve it or disapprove it. This is wrong. We need certain minor changes to our Zoning Code. But these should be separately identified and they should be voted on individually. The procedure as it is now is wrong.</p> <p>It is unreasonable to expect the Planning & Zoning Board to review 750 pages and then vote "Yes or No". There are many items contained in that 750 pages which are objectionable. Many others are acceptable. The Planning Department and special counsel must prepare a Memorandum detailing each change that is being made to the Code and explaining why it is being made. The Planning & Zoning Board should, then, have the right to examine each one and to vote each one</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>up or down.</p> <p>In addition, there should be citizen input as to changes that the residents of the City want. For example, we must provide a buffer zone between residential neighborhoods and intense office use (such as medical clinics, rehabilitation centers, operating hours that go beyond 6:00 p.m., heavy traffic, restaurants, etc..).</p> <p>We must change certain of the administrative areas of the Code. The Board of Adjustment has too much power of affect zoning changes. This must be curtailed. All decisions of the Board of Adjustment affecting re-zonings must automatically be reviewed by the City Commission.</p> <p>Possibly, the second most egregious error in this new Zoning Code (second only to the codification allowing 24 hour businesses directly adjacent to residential neighborhoods) is empowering a City bureaucrat to make subjective determinations to split lots and allow buildings on 50 foot lots where previously buildings were allowed on only 100 foot lots. This is completely contrary to the concept of Coral Gables. Outside counsel has apparently done this in many cities before, but not Coral Gables. Outside counsel should get to know Coral Gables better before making the kinds of recommendations that have been made. The head of the Planning Department should burn the midnight oil and put in some extra hours to review with special counsel, the special needs of Coral Gables. Then the citizens should have their input and then the redrafting should take place.</p> <p>I urge the City to re-look at this process and scrap it. Right now, they are aiming to adopt this new Code during the first week of December. This is wrong and we will end up with a Code that is complex, burdensome and not suitable to Coral Gables.</p>
50.	10 25 04	Roger D. Soman The Biltmore- Valencia Neighborhood Association		<p>“The Biltmore-Valencia Neighborhood Assn. will created ordinances for special districts and Transfer of Development Rights and submit them to you. Our attorney is reviewing all the documents that the city has created.</p> <p>There are areas in Coral Gables that would benefit very much from being designated donor areas, from which develop rights could be created, and donee areas that would benefit from receiving them. As a donor area we suggest the 700 Block of Valencia Ave. and other low density blocks zoned for high or medium rise that are adjacent to single family neighborhoods. As donee, or receiving areas, we suggest the declining industrial area near the new Village of Merrick Park, which would benefit from increased population. Another area that would benefit as a donee, or receiving area, is the northeast, with its aging low density multifamily neighborhoods. In neither case would single family neighborhoods be affected by these moves. Coral Gables needs to be</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>built out in the northeast between Douglas and Ponce or LeJeune.</p> <p>We see the use of special districts and TDRs as the means of solving everybody's problems."</p>
51.	10 22 04	Catamal Realty, Inc. 3001 Ponce de Leon Blvd., Ste. 200 Coral Gables, FL 33134		<p>Dear Mr. Reil:</p> <p>The undersigned is the owner of the property located at 3001 Ponce de Leon Boulevard in Coral Gables, legally described as Lots 1, 2, 3, 16, 17, 18, and 19, and Catamal Corner, Tracts A, B, and C, Block 30, Coral Gables Craft Section.</p> <p>The purpose of this letter is to bring to our attention certain policy recommendations made by the recent Coral Gables Charrette that appear to have been overlooked, with respect to our property, in the process of arriving at the current draft of the new zoning code. Specifically, we make reference to Policy Recommendation 2 and Policy Recommendation 17.</p> <p>Policy Recommendation 17 provides:</p> <p>"Revise zoning code to bring FAR and height restrictions into conformance with land use and platting regulations."</p> <p>Under the existing Comprehensive Land Use Plan, Catamal Corner Tracts B and C and a portion of Tract A are designated for "Commercial Use Mid-Rise Intensity (6 Stories; FAR 3.0) " and Lots 1 through 3 and 16 through 19 are designated for "Commercial Use Low-Rise Intensity (4 Stories; FAR 3.0)" Under the existing zoning code, all of this property is in the CB zoning classification. As you know, the existing CB classification restricts the height of buildings to 3 stories. Accordingly, to revised the exiting zoning code to bring the FAR and height restrictions into conformance with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, Catamal Corner, Tracts B and C, and a portion of Tract A should be placed in a zoning classification which provides for commercial use with a 6 story height restriction and an FAR of 3.0. Lots 1 through 3 and 16 through 19 should be placed in a zoning classification which provides for commercial use with a 4 story height restriction and an FAR of 3.0.</p> <p>We attended the Planning and Zoning Board meeting held last Thursday, October 14th and were surprised to see that the new "Conceptual Zoning Map" placed all of this property in the "CL" zoning classification, which has a height restriction of 35 feet and an FAR of 1.0. This appears to be a down zoning of our property and is clearly contrary to Policy Recommendation 17. To bring the zoning code into conformance with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, the new "Conceptual Zoning Map" should place Catamal Corner Tracts B, C, and a portion of Tract A together with Lots 1 through 3 and 16 through 19 in the "C" zoning classification, which specifically provides for an</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>FAR of 3.0 and at least purports to conform the height restrictions with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan (see Article 3, Division 4 E, 6 are not entirely in conformance with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, in that the Comprehensive Land Use Map speaks about height restrictions in terms of the number of stories, while Article 3, Division 4 E 6 of the draft zoning code speaks about height restrictions in terms of feet. For example, Article 3, Division 4 E 6 restricts "Parcels of land designated in the Comprehensive Land Use Plan as commercial use mid-rise intensity" to a height of 72 feet. We question whether or not 72 feet equates to 6 stories. This is something which also needs to be addressed.</p> <p>Policy Recommendation 2 of the Charrette provides as follows:</p> <p>"Engage property owners, residents, and merchants to address issues of design, regulations and management in area south of the Downtown boundary and north of University Drive."</p> <p>To the best of our knowledge the Planning Department has not engaged the property owners, residents, and merchants in this area to address the issues regarding the design, regulation and management of the area. We believe this is vitally important and respectfully request that the Planning Department do so before completing the zoning code rewrite.</p> <p>In summary, we respectfully request that the Planning Department amend the new "Conceptual Zoning Map" to conform to the existing Comprehensive Land Use Plan by placing Catamal Corner, Tract B and C, and a portion of Tract A together with Lots 1 through 3 and 16 through 19 in the "C" zoning designation, as contemplated and directed by Policy Recommendation 17 of the Charrette. We also respectfully request that the Planning Department engage the property owners, residents, and merchants in the area to discuss the future of the area as contemplated and directed by Policy Recommendation 2 of the Charrette.</p> <p>We look forward to your response.</p> <p>Your very truly, Catamal Realty, Inc. By: Wirt T. Maxey Its President</p>
52.	10 20 04	Jorge L. Hernandez Architect 337 Palermo Ave.	jlharchitect@bell south.net	Mrs. Christina Moreno Chair Coral Gables Planning & Zoning Board

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
	Coral Gables, FL 33134		<p>Dear Christina and Members of the Planning and Zoning Board;</p> <p>Thank you for inviting me to share my thoughts on the issue of lot splitting to help inform your current re-write of the Zoning Code. Unfortunately, I cannot join you because my graduate design students are presenting their final projects at the University of Miami tonight. Due to the conflict in my schedule, Christina suggested I jot down some thoughts which I am pleased to share with you now.</p> <p>Last year, while I was still on the board, we drafted the existing language governing lot splitting. Some of you will remember that the language was drafted on the heels of a very arduous and difficult legal case. Although I believe ours was a good document; the passing of time has lead me to think you should seize this opportunity to make lot splitting less restrictive. A more open outlook on lot splitting should focus on creating sites that are contextually compatible with surrounding properties and therefore will mitigate the proliferation of so called "Monster Houses". Let me clarify that I am not against the construction of large houses. They do belong in Coral Gables in those places appropriately assigned in the plan for large stately residences. No one thinks of the mansions on Granada Boulevard as "Monster Houses". They are not. The "Monster House" comes about as a result of bad design or the employment of a scale and massing incompatible with the context of neighboring homes, or both. The former is difficult to control through legislation; indeed preventing bad design is more efficiently handled by the Board of Architects. The latter is a planning principle which can be controlled by legislation. When re-writing the code I would focus less on whether multiple lots have been unified by minor physical improvements such as walls, fences, sprinklers systems or accessory structures and instead judge if dividing the lot would create parcels in harmony with surrounding sites that reinforce the qualities of the neighborhood where the lot is situated. Subscribing to this practice will create a harmony of scale street by street, block by block and precinct by precinct. Harmony is necessary to establish the character of an ensemble of buildings so they can be contrasted to a complimentary ensemble, along a cross street. This practice creates variety in urban design. You first need to establish harmony to accomplish variety. The principles of harmony and variety in urban design are very different from the jarring effect of building an enormous house next to a cottage. The juxtaposition of structures of jarring scales produces disparity and destroys the potential for beauty in urban compositions. Scalar disparity should generally be avoided and the lot splitting ordinance may assist in this if the principles of contextual neighborhood design are applied in making the determination of splitting a multiple lot. Of course, this practice should be done with care, taking into account the full force of our historic preservation ordinances.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>The fact that there is development pressure in Coral Gables is good. It means our city is a valuable and desirable place in which to live and work. It is important to manage those pressures and reaffirm the first principles put forth in the original the plan of the City. We are still building out Merrick's plan. Indeed an eighty year old city is still in its infancy. We should look at the lot separation ordinance as yet another opportunity to promote contextual neighborhood design and continue the work of building out the Merrick plan. .</p> <p>I hope this is a position we could all agree on. Thank you for this opportunity to collaborate with you in this process. I wish that I could have joined you in the chamber tonight, and wish you well in your good work.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jorge L. Hernandez</p>
53.	Via email 10 18 04	Jaime L. Saldarriaga	Saldarriaga_Jaime_L@solarturbin.es.com	<p>Attached is the e- mail I sent to Eric upon learning that the issue of Valencia Avenue was also included in the discussions of the re-write of the code. I would seem that this issue is like a cancer than never goes away, always to come back under a different form. The stress, anguish and cost that this issue has brought us is unimaginable.</p> <p>I am not totally oppose to TDRs if they are not mandated by the City and thus are optional to property owners. For TDRs to be attractive several conditions need to be addressed: 1. TDRs need to provide an incentive to property owners in the way of higher returns to compensate for forgoing full development of their properties 2. There has to be a reliable market where these instruments can be sold and traded. I would not want to speculate with the value of my properties in a market that is uncertain and where these instrument are almost like junk bonds. The Valuation of these instruments has to be fair in a way that protect the property owners. Maybe they should be guarantee by the City or if the City believes that these instruments have high potential market value they should be bought by the City and resold to make some extra revenue for the city. 4. The Code would need to specify what building heights are subjects to the incentive of the TDRs. (The Condo owners that live on the third floor would like to reduce all heights in Valencia to 45 feet). We the property owners have spent more than a year defending and fighting for our property rights. We have argue our case in front of several City Boards, including yours at a great expense. In July of this year we reached and agreement the City and a Resolution was approved for the Valencia area under which we accepted to reduce the height of our buildings, to forgo the FAR and height bonus offered by the Mediterranean Ordinance but still build to this architectural standard. It would appear that all this work was to no avail and that again we need to defend our rights, which we intend to do. (Reference Line No. 4 for attached email mentioned above.)</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
54.	Via email 10 15 04	Carlos Lopez-Cantera	carlosc@panamgroup.com	<p>A lot of discussion has been heard regarding the overbuilding on relatively small lots in the Gables. The "Mac Mansion" syndrome.</p> <p>The market value of the land dictates the overbuilding to account for the very high land value.</p> <p>Coral Gables is blessed in that there are certain areas in the City which have a natural ground elevation many feet above sea level. In those areas, the City should encourage the construction of basements, without penalties in the calculation of overall maximum square footage. This would allow for construction of game rooms, storage and the like below ground where it has little or no effect on the visual impact of the house upon the neighborhood.</p> <p>As an Example: minimum average ground elevation of the lot should be no less than 12 feet above sea level (MSL). 'ground' floor elevation of the main floor would be approx. +14 MSL . 1 foot for structure and 8 ft ceiling height would put the basement floor elevation at +5.5 MSL which is well above ground water elevation of +3 MSL.</p> <p>There are many areas in the gables well above the +12 MSL suggested above.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration. Carlos C. Lopez-Cantera</p>
55.	10 14 04	Vincent E. Damian, Jr. 2550 Brickell Bayview Centre 80 S.W. 8 th Street Miami, FL 33130		<p>I received a copy of the working draft on Monday, October 11, 2004, afternoon. I have not had an opportunity to review it in full. However, I have observed that you have not properly addressed the long standing problem with respect to the operation of commercial businesses adjacent to single family residential areas. Because of the unique layout of certain streets outside of the central business district, the commercial zoned area is only one lot wide. For example, on Ponce de Leon Blvd. south of the circle. This has been recognized as a continuing problem and must be addressed with respect to the present businesses and residents and future planning.</p> <p>24 hour Commercial Operation Adjacent to Residential</p> <p>More particularly the potential problem (and partially existing problem) of 24 hour use of commercial businesses immediately adjacent to single family residences, has unfortunately, been addressed but improperly. At Article IV, Division 3, Paragraph 7, you refer to Night Time Uses. The only protection you give to the residential area from night time uses is a landscape buffer. This is unacceptable. We previously discussed this issue before the Planning & Zoning Board. Your previous suggestion to the Planning & Zoning Board that would allow night time uses immediately adjacent to single family residences with only a landscape buffer were properly turned down by the</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>Planning & Zoning Board. They clearly were responding to the citizens who have informed you through those hearings that night time uses or 24 hour uses of businesses adjacent to single family residences must be prohibited. Such night time uses must be contained within a commercial zone and no closer than 300 feet from any single family residential use and must also contain the buffers that you have required. The residents of this City could not have voiced their concerns on this issue more strongly than they did when Building & Zoning voted unanimously to reject that proposal.</p> <p>In addition, sound residential and City Planning require it. More particularly, the City of Coral Gables which is based upon its strong residential base requires it. Will you please withdraw the night time uses section and redraw it in accordance with the above suggestion.</p> <p>Sleep Centers Notwithstanding common sense and the very strong opinions voiced by the residents of Coral Gables to the Planning & Zoning Board, you have included sleep centers in the definition of Medical Clinics. This citizens of Coral Gables have made it absolutely clear that this is unacceptable. The Planning & Zoning Board recommended to the Coral Gables City Commission that sleep center are medical clinics and they should be located in hospital zones. Notwithstanding that you have, again, thwarted the citizens desires and common sense and have included sleep center in the definition of Medical Clinics. It shows up at Article IV, Division 3, Paragraph 7g and it also show up in your Definition Section of Medical Clinics. This must be rectified.</p> <p>Because the issue of the sleep center and the 24 hour operation has been a high visibility item and it has gone through your office and through the Planning & Zoning Board and the residents of the City of Coral Gables made their wishes known and the Planning & Zoning Board has made its recommendations, The Planning Department's deliberate attempt to define Medical Clinics as including sleep centers and to specifically allow 24 hour use adjacent to single family residence is an obvious attempt to grant a favor to a particular person or entity. This action by the Planning Department does a disservice to the whole function of the City of Coral Gables in reviewing the Zoning Code. It casts a very bad shadow on the whole operation. Must we now fine comb the proposed Land Development Regulations or other instances of intended favoritism. Withdraw the above transgressions immediately so that the process can move forward without this shadow on it.</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
56.	10 14 04	Richard Namon		<p>CORAL GABLES PROPOSED LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS & ZONING CODE REWRITE</p> <p>The future of Coral Gables is at crossroads today. We are talking about rewriting a zoning code that has seen our City built out. With the exception of University of Miami, the vast majority Coral Gables has been developed since Coral Gables was incorporated. Today we are evaluating a code designed mainly for tear down and rebuild. In most cases this will result in larger and/or more intensive use of properties. What is decided here will either result in extensive teardown of the city we know as Coral Gables or our holding to the city we have come to know.</p> <p>With intensive apartment development in the Douglas Le Jeune area, there will be a change in voting demographics. When there are more apartment dwellers than single-family home dwellers, the voting control will shift to the apartment dwellers. When that happens, those voters likely will open the single-family areas for denser development. Then, Coral Gables will shift from a single-family residence city to an apartment city. That is likely to happen if we blindly accept this Code Rewrite.</p> <p>It appears the "Proposed Land Development Regulations & Zoning Code" rewrite (Code Rewrite) incorporates several previous documents that have not been put out for recent comment. They are: The Coral Gables Master Plan, The 2002 Charrette that was limited to a small part of the City, and The University of Miami Master Plan.</p> <p>These elements should be reviewed again by the public before their incorporation in the Code Rewrite. They should be looked at for their combined effect on quality of life issues for Coral Gables citizens. Our quality of life includes aesthetic, privacy, traffic, and parking issues.</p> <p>In undertaking a complete rewrite of the existing code, it is imperative our goal is clearly defined. Do we want the concrete canyons of Miami Beach? I remember when you could see the sandy beaches from the road. Or do we want to have a city like Boca Raton? There intensive development has been restricted.</p> <p>Starting the public review of the proposed code during the last days of a presidential campaign along with other national, statewide, and local elections is at least badly timed. Otherwise, these meetings are intended to give a pretense of showing an interesting public input. In 61 short days the City Commission will be voting on the Code Rewrite. This document has been in the works for more than a year. 28 days after that the Code Rewrite is scheduled for a final vote. This is hardy a</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>fair amount of time for public review of a lengthy document with wide ranging effects.</p> <p>The Code Rewrite calls for an Official Zoning Map (Section 1-107) that is not available at this time. I am afraid this rush to final passage of an incomplete Rewrite Code (a document only available to the public for the last two days) gives the appearance of political motives. With the current schedule for final approval of the Code Rewrite, this important document will be signed and sealed before the next city elections and the campaigns begin in earnest. It appears these efforts are much like the ones made to build a giant City Hall Annex before an election. It seems the questions of overbuilding and development were not answered for Coral Gables as a whole at that time- just the Annex. I would prefer more time be allowed for public input on the Code Rewrite, and suggest its final passage be postponed until after the next City election.</p>
57.	10 14 04	Informal Study Session Comments		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. TFR should be available for properties adjacent to "commercial core" (i.e. Valencia). 2. TDR's should be available to effect down zonings in areas adjacent to "commercial core" (i.e. Valencia) 3. Prohibit swale buttons (cement) from City parkways (R.O.W.).
58.	10 13 04	Anthony R. Parrish, Jr. 145 Grand Avenue Coral Gables, FL		<p>This letter asks that the City of Coral Gables extend Transferrable Development Rights (TDR's) to the commercial properties along Grand Avenue in the MacFarlane Homestead subdivision. MacFarlane Investments, L.L.C. and 145 Grand Avenue, L.L.C. have made substantial investments in the historic MacFarland Homestead subdivision of Coral Gables. These investment include 213-215 Grand Avenue, 141-149 Grand Avenue, 101-111 Grand Avenue, and 4718 Brooker Street. Our new construction and renovations to these properties have tried to be sensitive and complimentary to the historic character of the neighborhood.</p> <p>We are now in the process of planning the renovation of the four 1930's vintage wooden "shotgun" houses located at 105-111 into retail stores compatible with the existing CB Commercial zoning. Our plan is to do a unity of title for the 3 contiguous 5,000 sq. ft. lots at 101-111 Grand Avenue and to build a new 4,500 st. ft. commercial building alongside the four shoguns, all with shared parking. However, this renovation is not economically feasible without TDR's.</p> <p>If the four wooden structures were not contributing structures of the MacFarlane Historic District, we would be able to demolish them, allowing a new commercial building to be built covering all three lots comprising 15,000 sq. ft. of commercially zoned land. The FAR of 3.0 would than allow a new structure of up to 45,000 sq. ft. depending upon how the parking is configured. Instead, we are limited to a new building of only 4,500 sq. ft. and four converted wooden structures totaling approx. 2,400 sq. ft. The tax appraiser has assessed these three lots for a land value in excess of \$500,000. It is simply not feasible to build such a small new building on such a valuable</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				<p>commercial property, when the contribution in rent from the historic wooden structures will be marginal at best, even after a costly renovation, including ADA requirements.</p> <p>My research on the internet has confirmed that TDR's are an appropriate and viable method for balancing that "...redevelopment of a site in accordance with zoning and development principles which would otherwise apply to the site, were it not heritage listed." (See "Transfer of Development Rights as Incentive for Historic Preservation" by Brian Hayes, copy attached).</p> <p>In the case of the MacFarlane Homestead subdivision, it would be only the commercially zoned properties on Grand Avenue (comprising Brooker Street to Jefferson Street) which would be included as DONOR properties, and then only those few properties having historic contributing structures upon them. Extending TDR's to these few properties will serve to preserve the historic structures because the owners would then be compensated by the TDR's for the economic detriment represented by the expense of preserving them and the loss of potential income from the forfeiture of "highest and best use" of the underlying land.</p> <p>We think this is both fair and in the public interest.</p>
59.	Via email 10 13 04	Amado J. Acosta Riviera Neighborhood Association	Al_Acosta@meg atran.net	<p>Hello, I got a call today from a realtor friend who said the City is re-writing its codes to allow, among other things, separating and joining of parcel lots for new construction. Maybe I did not hear well, but in our area just yesterday, our President and myself went to the Commission Meeting for the final reading and acceptance of the zoning that applies to the newly incorporated 33 home of the Gables Waterway Section of Riviera, and during the entire process over several months of working with Mr... Carlson on this matter, time and again emphasis was given to the preservation of the existing code.</p> <p>Now I understand there is going to be a series of public hearings on these matters, starting tomorrow at 4 p.m. at City Hall. We will be there.</p> <p>Can someone please keep us advised by email of any and all meetings coming up on these matters? Not just the announced meetings as they appear on the city's website, but also of any committees or subcommittees meeting? We will sure appreciate it.</p>
60.	Via email 10 12 04	Pat Klock Parker	pat@klockparker. com	<p>How can the City change their position about lot splitting without it being in the "Sunshine".</p> <p>This has been a huge benefit to the City so that we don't begin to look like the other Cities with "huge houses, side by side because a house was taken off 2 lots and 2 houses were put in their</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
				place.
61.	Via email 10 12 04	Jaime L. Saldarriaga	Saldarriaga_Jaim e_L@solarturbin es.com	<p>A cursory review of the proposed re-write of the Coral Gables City Zoning Code shows that Transfer Development Rights are being proposed/considered for the Valencia Area. How can something so specific to this Area be included in the new Re-write of the City Code. During the moratorium discussions it was my impression that City commissioners had instructed the attorney for the David-Williams condo owners to present a detail plan showing the merits of this plan: Valuation to sellers, availability of markets, recipient area etc. Mr. Gibbs was also instructed to discuss this issue with affected parties, which has not been done to my knowledge.</p> <p>I would like to know who in the City Government asked for this issue to be included in the proposed rewrite. Responsible Government in need to be transparent in their actions and avoid the appearance that they are favoring certain groups of people with political connections. I guess that despite of more than six months of good faith negotiations with the city regarding Valencia, this issue has found its way in the re-write of the City code. This issue will again force us property owners to engage the services of an attorney to defend our rights. As I said many times to the City Commissioners I am not going to accept TDR of questionable value just to please the David-Williams condo owners.</p> <p>To see this issue in the new proposed re-write of the City Code is to say the list amazing .</p>
62.	Via email 10 12 04	William M. Grodnick	wgrodnick@ci.hi aleah.fl.us	<p>Congratulations. This looks like a successful rewrite. Please e-mail the proposed land use regulations and zoning code, if it is possible. Thank you.</p>
63.	Via email 10 06 04	Arlene Adams Easley 1444 Ancona Avenue Coral Gables, FL 33146	aeasley@miami. edu	<p>Will your building and zoning meeting include discussion regarding changing the code enforcement rules on having tiles sitting atop roofs awaiting installation when a Hurricane watch or warning has been issued?</p> <p>I believe the City should have a stricter code than the county. Tying tiles together in bundles will not prevent them from flying apart when a strong hurricane hits our area. The tiles should be required to be removed from the rooftops when a Hurricane warning is issued. Roofing contractors will need to keep an eye on the weather during hurricane season. For those of us with impact resistant windows on our homes, the potential damage from these tiles is tremendous, costly and unnecessary. And insurance is not what it used to be since most of our long-standing companies have left the state.</p> <p>Just fyi, during the past few hurricanes we had FOUR different homes surrounding us with tiles remaining on their roofs after hurricane warnings were issued. Thankfully, the storms never hit the Gables very hard (not like Andrew).</p>

Zoning Code Rewrite

Public Comments - Verbatim (Updated: 04 01 05)

	Date	Name & Address	Email Address	Verbatim Comments
64.	Via email 10 06 04	Richard Namon	RN@miamimiami.com	<p>Wouldn't it be nice if you would post proposed changes to the zoning code on the City website in advance of the meetings? Then carefully thought out responses can be made by the public to what is already proposed within the city administration. Your announcement seems to indicate a set of proposals are in their initial stages, but they have in fact been in the works for some length of time.</p> <p>As far as I can tell, these meeting will have little effect on the proposed changes. It appears the main purpose of the meetings is to sell Coral Gables residents on changes that are ready to be voted on by the public. The public has not had a fair chance to comment during the formative stages of this important process.</p>