

CITY OF CORAL GABLES  
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD WORKSHOP  
VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT

CORAL GABLES CITY COMMISSION CHAMBERS  
405 BILTMORE WAY, CORAL GABLES  
JANUARY 19, 2005, 6:08 P.M.

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

Board Members Present:

Cristina Moreno, Chairwoman  
Eibi Aizenstat  
Tom Korge  
Felix Pardo  
Michael Steffens

City Staff:

Eric Riel, Jr., Planning Director  
Jill Menendez-Duran, Administrative Assistant

Also participating:

Charles Siemon, Legal Consultant

Public Speakers:

Scott Price

- - -

1       THEREUPON:

2                   The following proceedings were had:

3                   MR. RIEL:  Do you just want to go ahead and  
4 call the roll?

5                   MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN:  Eibi Aizenstat?

6                   MR. AIZENSTAT:  Present.

7                   MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN:  Tony Gonzalez?  
8 Tom Korge?

9                   MR. KORGE:  Here.

10                  MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN:  Bill Mayville?  
11 Cristina Moreno?

12                  CHAIRWOMAN MORENO:  Here.

13                  MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN:  Felix Pardo?  
14 Michael Steffens?

15                  MR. STEFFENS:  Here.

16                  MR. RIEL:  I'm going to do is, I'm going to  
17 give you just a brief overview of where we've been  
18 and what our Staff's intentions are this evening.

19                  We've had four public hearings to date,  
20 where the Board has provided Staff policy direction  
21 on various issues.  This is obviously the fifth.  The  
22 focus of the meetings was to secure Planning & Zoning  
23 Board policy direction on nine issues that have been  
24 identified, which is the -- is included on the policy  
25 matrix, which we have copies available for the

1 public, up here.

2 Just briefly, the format of the matrix is,  
3 Column 1 is the actual issue that has been  
4 identified, Column 2 is the positive and negative of  
5 each issue, and then Column 3 is the team  
6 recommendation or the City Staff recommendation, and  
7 the other City Board recommendations that have been  
8 provided an opportunity to provide input on that  
9 specific policy.

10 (Thereupon, Mr. Pardo entered the Commission  
11 Chambers.)

12 MR. RIEL: As you know, we've gone to the  
13 Economic Development Board on two occasions. I've  
14 gone before the Parking Advisory Board on two  
15 occasions, and we've also gone to the Historic  
16 Preservation Board on two occasions. And we also, in  
17 fact, last week, went to the Board of Architects and  
18 secured their input, as well.

19 And then the last column or Column Number 4  
20 includes the date, and it includes what the Board's  
21 policy direction was secured by Staff on each of  
22 those issues.

23 Basically, what we've completed policy  
24 direction on is residential issues, transfer of  
25 development rights, Mediterranean bonuses,

1 nonresidential zoning districts, the planned area  
2 development, mixed uses, the development review  
3 process, and parking.

4 So, this evening, what that does is, that  
5 takes us to Page 6, and starting with Policy 8 and 9,  
6 8 being some various issues, and then 9 being just  
7 miscellaneous, kind of like tying up some issues that  
8 were identified as a part of the public hearing.

9 We have included a schedule, which if you  
10 see the secretary, as you know, the City Commission  
11 adopted a revised schedule that sets public hearing  
12 dates where each specific article of the Zoning Code  
13 will be reviewed. I would encourage everyone to get  
14 a copy of the schedule, and it's also on the web.

15 Staff's intentions are, we finish policy  
16 direction this evening. We'll be coming back with  
17 each of the articles that are identified. We will be  
18 providing those to you probably seven to ten days in  
19 advance of the meeting, and again, I'd welcome any  
20 opportunities to meet with the Board members, to  
21 discuss and further understand.

22 But basically, in summary, the policy  
23 direction or the matrix, that's what we're going to  
24 do, is reduce what you have said in terms of your  
25 direction, as well as all the other boards, and put,

1 you know, basically, the words into the revised  
2 Code.

3 So that's kind of where we're at and where  
4 we're going, and at this point I'm going to turn it  
5 over to Charlie Siemon to continue the discussion and  
6 secure your policy direction.

7 And as we've done in the past, I would ask  
8 the Board that, to make it simpler for Staff, that  
9 you take votes on each one, each of the ones. That  
10 just makes it much easier.

11 MR. SIEMON: Madam Chairman.

12 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Good evening, Mr.  
13 Siemon.

14 MR. SIEMON: It's nice to be here. Happy  
15 New Year to everyone.

16 The first policy area, I think there are no  
17 real policy issues. However, because we  
18 substantially reorganized the Historic Preservation  
19 provisions, there were concerns by the Preservation  
20 Board as to whether we had accurately transformed,  
21 translated what was in the Code into the -- in the  
22 new form, and we have been to them and they recommend  
23 the changes, the modifications, which are really not  
24 substantive, they're editorial. There are a few  
25 major reorganizations, some modest delegations of

1 authority to the Historic Preservation officer,  
2 subject to review by the Board, but they're really  
3 quite, we think, just clarification and editorial.

4 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: So there's no  
5 substantive changes?

6 MR. SIEMON: We don't believe so. There's  
7 some allocation of responsibility in the form of  
8 delegation, but no substantive change in regulations.

9 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: And the Historic  
10 Preservation Board agrees with that?

11 MR. SIEMON: They do.

12 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Then I really -- I have  
13 nothing to say. I don't know if any other Board  
14 member has anything.

15 MR. RIEL: And, Madam Chair, if you note,  
16 this is substantially because the Historic Resources  
17 Department revised the ordinance within about a year  
18 ago.

19 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: I remember that.

20 MR. RIEL: Twelve to eighteen months, they  
21 revised it, so that's another reason why there  
22 weren't substantial changes.

23 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Anybody else here?

24 Is there anyone in the audience on the  
25 Historic Preservation Board ordinance, only?

1           Okay, then, let's take a vote for a motion  
2 to -- I'm not sure what we're doing, to --

3           MR. STEFFENS: What kind of motion would you  
4 like, Eric?

5           MR. RIEL: That's a good question.

6           CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: I don't think there's  
7 anything for us to vote on.

8           MR. KORGE: I have a suggestion, that we  
9 don't really need to vote on --

10          CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Yeah.

11          MR. SIEMON: The vote --

12          MR. RIEL: On that particular one, yeah --

13          MR. SIEMON: -- is to recommend that the  
14 proposed draft contain the text as modified.

15          CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: I would do it as  
16 approved by the Historic Preservation Board and --

17          MR. RIEL: That's fine.

18          CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Thank you.

19          MR. STEFFENS: So moved.

20          CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Do I have a second?

21          MR. KORGE: Second.

22          CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Thank you. Can you call  
23 the roll, please?

24          MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Sure.

25          Eibi Aizenstat?

1 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yes.

2 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Tom Korge?

3 MR. KORGE: Yes.

4 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Felix Pardo?

5 MR. PARDO: No.

6 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Michael Steffens?

7 MR. STEFFENS: Yes.

8 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Cristina Moreno?

9 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Yes.

10 Our next item is landscaping?

11 MR. RIEL: The next item is Policy 9,  
12 miscellaneous landscaping.

13 Mr. Dan Keys and I have been meeting,  
14 probably, I'd say, two or three times. Basically, if  
15 you understand, we are under the provisions of  
16 Miami-Dade County's landscaping requirements, so what  
17 Mr. Keys and I have been doing is taking the County's  
18 Code requirements and basically reformatting them,  
19 and where we feel it should be more restrictive, we  
20 have suggested changes, and we're -- we have still  
21 not completed that process. And we will have those  
22 changes, for the most part -- there haven't been that  
23 many changes, but to further enhance, you know, and  
24 maintain the landscape character of the City, we're  
25 going to suggest more restrictive provisions on

1 certain things.

2           One of the things that we're going to  
3 tighten up more is on the single-family home  
4 provisions, because for the most part the County Code  
5 is silent and the City's Code is silent on that  
6 issue, and that has been one issue that's been  
7 identified by the City Commission that they would  
8 like us to beef up the provisions, so --

9           MR. KORGE: Are you going to run that by the  
10 beautification committee?

11           MR. RIEL: Yes. Dan Keys is the secretary  
12 to the -- they're called the Landscape Advisory  
13 Board.

14           MR. STEFFENS: You're talking about  
15 parking -- I'm sorry, landscaping requirements for  
16 single-family residences?

17           MR. RIEL: Single-family residences.

18           MR. STEFFENS: Is this on the private  
19 property or the public property that --

20           MR. RIEL: Private property. The Commission  
21 had suggested we come up with some provisions for  
22 perhaps a certain type of vegetation cover, certain  
23 types of tree canopy cover, and that, I can tell you,  
24 is one of the issues that, since the County Code is  
25 not very -- doesn't have a lot of regulations on

1 that, we're looking at other codes of other cities.

2 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Are you suggesting that  
3 we table this discussion until you come back with  
4 something fuller?

5 MR. RIEL: That's what I would suggest.

6 MR. STEFFENS: I'd like to see some other  
7 codes relating to that issue, because I don't --

8 MR. RIEL: Okay.

9 MR. STEFFENS: -- necessarily feel that the  
10 City has a problem in the residential areas. I think  
11 the problem is in the commercial areas.

12 MR. RIEL: We can certainly do that. We  
13 have those already.

14 MR. STEFFENS: But I'd like to see anything  
15 related -- if we're going to be applying this to the  
16 residential areas, I'd like to see codes that are  
17 related to the residential areas.

18 MR. RIEL: Yeah. Oh, absolutely. If I were  
19 to -- The draft we've gone through at this point,  
20 that's where I would probably say where the most  
21 changes are being done to the landscape code, that  
22 has to do with the single-family. Most of the  
23 commercial, we're just -- we're increasing the size  
24 of the plant material. Some of the plant materials  
25 that are required in the county are very small, so

1 we're increasing the size and the quantities.

2 MR. AIZENSTAT: What about the type?

3 MR. RIEL: The type, in terms of the list, I  
4 probably -- I can't comment on that. That's Mr.

5 Keys' expertise. But I'm not sure -- I can't recall

6 if there was a list. I've looked at so many

7 landscape codes of other cities, I can't remember

8 which one is the Gables' and which one's not, but --

9 MR. STEFFENS: Do we encourage tropical and  
10 subtropical species instead of desert species?

11 MR. RIEL: The encouragement is for native

12 species. I mean, that's the way most of the codes

13 have been written, but I --

14 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Eric, have you also  
15 looked into Florida Power and Light and whether they  
16 have restrictions --

17 MR. RIEL: Yes.

18 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: -- on what we can put  
19 up?

20 MR. RIEL: Yes. Yes, because Dan -- Dan  
21 Keys has come into that, has had that problem occur  
22 on a number of projects that have come through, where  
23 we've approved landscaping on the rights-of-ways  
24 where there's overhead utility lines, and that's  
25 another section that we're also looking into, in

1 terms of updating.

2 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: And hurricane issues?

3 MR. RIEL: Hurricane issues, in terms of --

4 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Well, I know I had a  
5 client that had an issue with the huge trees in his  
6 neighbor's yard, that they could fall and destroy his  
7 house, and the neighbor wasn't keeping them trimmed  
8 at all. I don't know how you address that in a code  
9 fashion, but it certainly seems to me a legitimate  
10 concern, that, you know, if your neighbor has a big  
11 tree and he's not trimming it for hurricane -- you  
12 know, I don't want him to say, "Hey, I have the big  
13 tree because the City told me I have to have a  
14 13-foot tree," or a 20-foot tree or whatever.

15 MR. RIEL: Okay, we'll look -- I'll look  
16 into that.

17 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay.

18 MR. AIZENSTAT: Probably some of those  
19 issues, I would think, would fall upon canopy, also,  
20 not just on the size but the canopy issue, that would  
21 cause it to go down, so if that's a concern.

22 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay, so let's have a  
23 motion to table that until Eric comes back with a  
24 fuller report.

25 MR. KORGE: I'll move.

1 MR. STEFFENS: Second.

2 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Call the roll.

3 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Tom Korge?

4 MR. KORGE: Yes.

5 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Felix Pardo?

6 MR. PARDO: Yes.

7 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Michael Steffens?

8 MR. STEFFENS: Yes.

9 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Eibi Aizenstat?

10 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yes.

11 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Cristina Moreno?

12 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Yes.

13 MR. SIEMON: What that really means is that  
14 this will be brought back as a part of an article.

15 MR. RIEL: It will be brought back as part  
16 of an article.

17 MR. SIEMON: And at that point, we will have  
18 the complete input. I would just also note, there's  
19 some additional landscape requirements that have been  
20 included in this Code for areas that are used for  
21 vehicle storage and/or parking or driveways, to  
22 provide more of landscape buffer between those and  
23 residential uses, which are not in your existing  
24 provisions.

25 The next is the -- There are various

1 provisions throughout the Code which relate to what  
2 we would call design standards, and they come from  
3 having been adopted as a part of one ordinance,  
4 codified in an area that has procedures, and so when  
5 you're looking at a particular building, a proposed  
6 building there really are as many as five different  
7 locations in which there are design standards that  
8 may apply, and what we have done is, in Article 5,  
9 consolidate all the design standards into one area,  
10 identified the conflicts between them, and there were  
11 some, eliminated those, standardized the language  
12 that's used, organize them in a way that makes them  
13 in packages that we think make sense, and -- but  
14 there is no real substantive change to the design  
15 standards that were in place before. They're really  
16 just reorganization, consolidation into a single  
17 location, elimination of duplications and  
18 harmonization of conflicts.

19 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: When there was a  
20 conflict, how do you decide which one to pick?

21 MR. SIEMON: We talked to Staff about how  
22 they had been applied. I mean, they had obviously  
23 been applying these codes all along, and so, in most  
24 cases, it was, "Oh, we never consider that one,  
25 because it's inconsistent. We know that this is the

1 one we're supposed to follow."

2 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay.

3 MR. STEFFENS: Are we going to see the  
4 specifics of this at some point in time?

5 MR. SIEMON: It's in the draft that was  
6 provided to you.

7 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: But what you're saying  
8 is, there's no policy decision for us to make. We  
9 will be able to see the exact wording when we vote on  
10 that article?

11 MR. SIEMON: (Nods head).

12 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay.

13 MR. SIEMON: And to this point, I'm  
14 unaware -- We're still working with the Board of  
15 Architects. I expect that we're going to have  
16 additional input. When I met -- we met with them, I  
17 called out that provision to them, explained to them  
18 how we -- what we did and why we did it, and I  
19 believe that they will give us some input. It was --  
20 In the preliminary input, however, we got back from  
21 them, it was largely procedural and not substantive,  
22 because we really didn't change anything.

23 MR. AIZENSTAT: When you talk about design  
24 standards, are you talking also about ornamentation?

25 MR. SIEMON: Yeah, anything that has to do

1 with --

2 MR. AIZENSTAT: Anything that fits within  
3 that scope?

4 MR. SIEMON: -- the design of the building  
5 and --

6 MR. AIZENSTAT: Okay.

7 MR. SIEMON: Either in terms of orientation  
8 or character, you know, styles or facade  
9 characteristics or any of those matters, and there's  
10 really quite a body of information, quite a body of  
11 standards in the Code. It's just, they are not  
12 readily identifiable in their current display.

13 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yeah.

14 MR. SIEMON: But I don't think there was  
15 really any policy issue, but this was a matter that  
16 was identified to be one of concern by some people  
17 who reviewed it, because it -- we took the standards  
18 out of where they had been and put them in a new  
19 place, and that's why it got on this list. I don't  
20 think there's any -- that I am aware of, any policy  
21 issues. There may be input from board members about  
22 specific standards.

23 We did not make a significant -- any  
24 significant effort to substantively supplement them  
25 or modify them. Our principal objective was to take

1 what you had and make it work as well as it could,  
2 and not to evaluate their adequacy so much, because  
3 there doesn't seem to be, particularly at the Board  
4 of Architects, serious concern that they have  
5 inadequate standards to guide their discretion. We  
6 tightened some of them up, so that they weren't  
7 open-ended, but we didn't really change the subject  
8 matter of the inquiry or the criterion to be applied.

9 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Eric, can I ask you to  
10 run this by our two architect members of this Board,  
11 as well as the Board of Architects, so that their  
12 input is heard as part of the redrafting process?

13 MR. RIEL: Absolutely.

14 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: If that's all right with  
15 you, Felix and Michael.

16 MR. RIEL: And as Mr. Siemon indicated,  
17 there were no substantial changes, so, I mean, it's  
18 pretty much what's there. It's just been kind of  
19 recodified. Now, it doesn't include what the Board  
20 of Architects' suggestions and recommendations.  
21 We're expecting that within the next week or two,  
22 I'm actually meeting with them.

23 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay, and I'm just  
24 suggesting that if Felix and Michael take a look at  
25 that, as well, it will be helpful to have a

1 cohesively approved issue on this.

2 I gather that on this one, there's really no  
3 recommendation on our part that you need.

4 MR. RIEL: No.

5 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: So we can move on to the  
6 next one.

7 MR. PARDO: I have a question.

8 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Yes.

9 MR. PARDO: In the second page, under the  
10 commercial uses adjacent/contiguous to residential  
11 uses, it says the Board did not support an increase  
12 in parking requirements for commercial usage adjacent  
13 to residential uses.

14 MR. STEFFENS: We haven't gotten there yet.

15 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: We're not there.

16 MR. KORGE: We haven't gotten to that yet.

17 MR. PARDO: Oh, this isn't -- I thought you  
18 were talking about all the parking.

19 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: We're on design  
20 standards. We're at design standards. Okay.

21 MR. PARDO: All right, sorry.

22 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Are we done on design  
23 standards? What's our next issue, Charlie?

24 MR. STEFFENS: Do you need something on  
25 that, Eric?

1 MR. RIEL: No, we don't.

2 In terms of the next issue which we're not  
3 going to discuss, it's parking. That was already  
4 debated by this Board at length on November 17th.  
5 The next issue for discussion is on Page 8, sign  
6 regulations.

7 MR. SIEMON: Sign regulations are on this  
8 list because the sign code had just recently been  
9 updated.

10 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: I'm sorry, I think Felix  
11 had a point of correction on the parking.

12 Is that what your issue was, Felix?

13 MR. PARDO: Yeah, but I think the Director  
14 said that we're not going to discuss that tonight.

15 MR. RIEL: Well, we've discussed it already,  
16 and what you're seeing -- Are you referring on Page  
17 7, Column 3?

18 MR. PARDO: Column 3, correct.

19 MR. RIEL: That is the Parking Advisory  
20 Board's recommendation.

21 MR. PARDO: Oh, okay. Can the record  
22 reflect that it was the Parking --

23 MR. RIEL: It does say that. It says that  
24 at 10/28 -- if you look at the bottom of Page 6,  
25 10/28/04, the Parking Advisory Board. "The Board

1 made the following observations and recommendations,"  
2 and then the five or six bullets that are proceeding  
3 thereafter --

4 MR. PARDO: Well, here's -- you know, I'm  
5 reading this, and I sat through a meeting, and if a  
6 commissioner reads this matrix and you're looking at  
7 this, it seems like when you say "the Board," and  
8 it's coming from the Planning Board, you would assume  
9 that the board that's being referred to on Page 7 is  
10 the Planning Board.

11 MR. KORGE: Well, let me get more to the  
12 point. Are we going to make any recommendation --

13 MR. RIEL: You did, on --

14 MR. KORGE: -- or consider -- no, let me  
15 finish -- consider -- We already looked at the  
16 Parking Advisory Board's --

17 MR. RIEL: Yes.

18 MR. KORGE: And we didn't vote on any of  
19 that?

20 MR. RIEL: Yes, you did. If you look at, on  
21 Column 4, on November 17th, you requested examples of  
22 parking requirements of other local governments and  
23 you recommended deleting the shared parking. So  
24 we're going to come back and discuss that issue at a  
25 later date.

1 MR. KORGE: Okay. So you're going to bring  
2 this to us later. Okay. I understand.

3 MR. RIEL: The third column is the City  
4 Staff recommendation and any other City Board  
5 recommendations.

6 MR. PARDO: You mean, other than the  
7 Planning Board?

8 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Yes.

9 MR. RIEL: Right.

10 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: We're --

11 MR. RIEL: Nothing in the third column is  
12 from the Planning Board.

13 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: We're Column 4.

14 MR. RIEL: Right.

15 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: We're Column 4. Column  
16 3 is something else.

17 MR. RIEL: I just wanted to make sure, when  
18 the matrix goes forward to the Commission, that they  
19 see what the Historic Preservation Board, the Parking  
20 Advisory Board and the Planning Board recommended, so  
21 it's all the recommendations.

22 MR. KORGE: We want to see that, too. Yeah.

23 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Yeah, Column 4 is us.

24 MR. RIEL: Right.

25 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Three is somebody else.

1                   MR. PARDO:  Because -- The only reason --  
2                   Well, I just don't want to keep going over and over,  
3                   but I just -- I just think that this is a great  
4                   opportunity to address key issues and, you know, I  
5                   think that a key issue that I had requested several  
6                   times was, you know, like where you have a distance,  
7                   again, it's trying to make incompatible (sic) uses a  
8                   little more compatible, and somehow it hasn't -- you  
9                   know, maybe in the future, it will be, but somehow it  
10                  hasn't been addressed yet, and what I'm concerned  
11                  with is, you go to the Parking Board and you go up to  
12                  them and you make your presentations and say, "Well,  
13                  you know, do you have any questions or any problems?"  
14                  Maybe they're not even looking from a zoning  
15                  standpoint, when you're a hundred feet away, you  
16                  know, or 150 feet away from single-family  
17                  residential, what the impact is.  If you don't pose  
18                  the question, they may not be able to have any type  
19                  of input or additional comment.

20                  So, you know, I believe, looking at zoning  
21                  applications over so many years, that have come  
22                  before this Board, and also when I sat on the Board  
23                  of Adjustment, you know, I'm concerned that we have  
24                  an opportunity to provide something to relieve the  
25                  incompatible uses, and we're not addressing them yet,

1 and I just hope it doesn't get lost in all the -- in  
2 the verbiage.

3 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay.

4 MR. RIEL: Actually, if you look on Page 7,  
5 the third bullet point down, that issue was discussed  
6 by the Board, commercial uses adjacent or contiguous  
7 to residential uses, and the Parking Advisory Board  
8 did not support an increase in parking requirements.  
9 I can tell you that issue was debated at length.

10 MR. KORGE: But --

11 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: That doesn't mean --  
12 that doesn't mean that we won't discuss it when you  
13 come back to us.

14 MR. RIEL: Absolutely.

15 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: We can discuss it and we  
16 can make a different recommendation.

17 MR. RIEL: Absolutely.

18 MR. KORGE: And what I understand from  
19 this, Felix, is that they're going to bring us more  
20 information, not just the Parking Advisory Board  
21 information, but this matrix, and at that time, when  
22 we have all the information before us, we're going to  
23 go through all these issues.

24 I would like to add to that, for possible  
25 discussion, whether there might be some appropriate

1 changes or modifications to the valet parking system,  
2 because --

3 MR. SIEMON: Maybe I can help you all recall  
4 what you ultimately decided. We brought back the  
5 Parking Advisory Board and we told you that -- I told  
6 you that we had made limited modifications to the  
7 parking because on the list of issues that had been  
8 identified to us originally, the concerns about  
9 increased parking demand, the problems that you  
10 describe, Felix, et cetera, had not been on that  
11 original list, and so we had not independently  
12 evaluated the parking.

13 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: I remember this.

14 MR. SIEMON: And I said to you -- You all  
15 asked, "Well, what would you recommend," and I -- and  
16 we said, "We ought to go through and critically  
17 review all of your parking standards, collect the  
18 standards that are in this marketplace, bring a  
19 revised set of parking standards, and compare them to  
20 what other communities are doing, so that you could  
21 look at them," and that's what this summary statement  
22 over here is intended to convey to you. That's what  
23 we're going to do.

24 When we come back with an independent set of  
25 parking recommendations, which will go through the

1 Advisory Board and they'll tell, we're going to do it  
2 based on our best experience and advice. But we'll  
3 also bring you a matrix of what everybody else is  
4 doing, so you can compare what you're doing with it.  
5 That was your request.

6 MR. KORGE: Right.

7 MR. SIEMON: And that's what we're going to  
8 be doing.

9 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Mr. Siemon, and that is  
10 what we're going to hear on May 18th, where it says  
11 Development Standards, Division 16, Parking and  
12 Loading Requirements?

13 MR. SIEMON: Yes, ma'am.

14 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay. So that -- the  
15 parking issue will be a May 18th item.

16 MR. SIEMON: And we heard, loud and clear,  
17 that you all don't accept the Planning (sic) Advisory  
18 Board's belief --

19 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Yeah.

20 MR. SIEMON: -- that there's not a  
21 problem --

22 MR. PARDO: You mean the Parking.

23 MR. SIEMON: -- between adjacent commercial  
24 and residential.

25 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: The Parking, yes.

1 MR. PARDO: You know, Charlie, when you  
2 bring that up, and the gentleman was here, I asked  
3 him specifically, "What do you think of this and  
4 that?" He said, "That was never brought to our  
5 attention," and that was at their meeting.

6 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Yeah, let him come up  
7 with a set of standards, take it to Parking Advisory,  
8 and then come back to us.

9 MR. SIEMON: Perfect.

10 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay. Sign regulations.

11 MR. SIEMON: But this will be -- this will  
12 be our recommendation, as opposed to just a  
13 recodification of what's in there historically.

14 MR. STEFFENS: The municipalities that  
15 you're developing this matrix with, are they only  
16 Miami-Dade municipalities?

17 MR. SIEMON: No. I'm going to try to find  
18 relevant --

19 MR. STEFFENS: You're going to try other  
20 similar types of municipalities?

21 MR. SIEMON: I'm going to try to identify  
22 communities that have the kind of --

23 MR. STEFFENS: That we feel we're like?

24 MR. SIEMON: -- downtown area you have, the  
25 kind of residential neighbors and the kind of

1 transition zones you have, though most of them have,  
2 as you probably know, dealt with them by sacrificing  
3 the residential layer behind the strip commercial,  
4 rather than the other way, but we'll -- this is a  
5 subject that we have an enormous library of  
6 experience with.

7 MR. KORGE: Madam Chairman, I'd like to be  
8 sure that we bring the issue of valet parking here,  
9 because that --

10 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Yes.

11 MR. KORGE: -- materially affects not just  
12 parking in the Central Business District, but the  
13 flow of traffic itself. I know the Commission has  
14 looked at it before, but I think it, in light of all  
15 the other parking issues, deserves a fresh look.

16 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: I thought I heard -- I  
17 read in the paper the other day that we're going to  
18 like a centralized valet parking system here in the  
19 City. Do you know about that, Eric?

20 MR. RIEL: Well, the issue was discussed at  
21 the last Commission meeting and -- as being  
22 identified as an issue, still a problem, and the City  
23 Manager is actually coming back with a memorandum.  
24 I'd be happy to provide that to you.

25 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: And will that be part of

1 our Code, whatever is done with valet?

2 MR. RIEL: The valet parking section is  
3 actually in the City Code. It's not in the Zoning  
4 Code.

5 MR. PARDO: That doesn't count toward your  
6 required parking. It's only a convenience for the  
7 businesses in certain areas.

8 MR. KORGE: But it really affects --

9 MR. PARDO: Oh, absolutely.

10 MR. KORGE: -- parking and traffic flow.

11 MR. PARDO: You're right, Tom.

12 MR. KORGE: I mean, I don't know if this is  
13 the proper forum, but I really think it needs to be  
14 looked at in the context of the parking problems that  
15 we're looking at, because if, you know, half of a  
16 street of street parking is lost to valet, that  
17 affects the whole issue for us.

18 MR. PARDO: Tom, I think, you know, you're  
19 absolutely right, but what's happening is that that  
20 really doesn't concern planning and zoning of private  
21 properties. It does affect the planning of the  
22 infrastructure of the City, which is part of the  
23 domain of this Board, but the input there usually  
24 comes from Public Works, and it also includes  
25 signalization of traffic lights, direction of flow of

1 streets, and again, when you have, you know, street  
2 closures and when you have, also, the blocking of  
3 streets because of the valet services and the -- and  
4 the loss of those on-street parking spaces that don't  
5 count towards your private property, but they do  
6 serve the community --

7 MR. KORGE: The reason it came to my -- you  
8 know, to my mind when I read through the  
9 recommendations on this spreadsheet, there was  
10 discussion about the possibility of maybe impact  
11 fees, parking impact fees, to contribute to -- pay  
12 for parking garages, for example, so it all seemed to  
13 me to relate to one another, because the valets will  
14 use the nearby garages to park all of their  
15 customers' cars. So, I mean, if it doesn't belong  
16 here, it doesn't belong here, but it just struck  
17 me --

18 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: No, but I think that the  
19 concrete point is, to the extent that you're using  
20 off-street parking as a source of parking to  
21 determine what your parking requirements are for  
22 private developers, if we allow them valet parking,  
23 we cannot consider that off-street parking that's  
24 being used by the valets.

25 MR. PARDO: True. Your requirements for

1 parking today, for example, in the CB -- in the CBD  
2 area is less than when you're outside of the CBD  
3 area, because of the --

4 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Availability of  
5 off-street parking.

6 MR. PARDO: -- availability of off-street  
7 parking and --

8 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Presumed.

9 MR. SIEMON: Excuse me, presumed  
10 availability.

11 MR. PARDO: Correct, but the --

12 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: So I think -- I think  
13 what we're saying is, when you come back with your  
14 recommendation, assume that that off-street parking  
15 is not available.

16 MR. SIEMON: I did not want to disagree with  
17 you, but I mean, you're going to face it in two ways,  
18 that are going to come from our work. One is, you're  
19 going to have to make a hard decision about some of  
20 your CBD uses which are currently built when they go  
21 through a change of use and are required to  
22 demonstrate they have adequate parking and they don't  
23 have parking, because you can't add parking in the  
24 CBD, and the question then is, are you going to play  
25 a role in that or are you going to pass that on to

1       become a municipal obligation to provide centralized  
2       parking or an in-lieu-of program? That's one way  
3       you're going to address it.

4               The other is, some communities are now  
5       starting to include design standards in their codes  
6       for valet stations to provide adequate stacking and  
7       where on the block it's appropriate to locate them  
8       and where not.

9               MR. KORGE: That's what I was talking --

10              CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: I would like to do that.

11              MR. SIEMON: I don't know whether you all  
12       want to get into that, but we'll talk to --

13              MR. KORGE: That's what I was asking.

14              MR. SIEMON: But that has become a problem,  
15       now --

16              CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: I'm not saying I'm going  
17       to vote for it, but I'd like to listen to it.

18              MR. SIEMON: It is -- and I frankly think if  
19       your -- I think, given the character of your  
20       community, you're going to -- and particularly near  
21       the CBD or in the CBD, and some of your other  
22       interesting areas, like down by Merrick Park, you're  
23       going to increasingly rely on valet parking, and if  
24       you are, at least having a set of rules about when  
25       and where it's appropriate will help, I think, in the

1 long run.

2 MR. PARDO: I read recently that we have  
3 another one thousand restaurants coming on board in  
4 the City, one thousand.

5 MR. STEFFENS: A thousand seats.

6 MR. SIEMON: A thousand seats.

7 MR. PARDO: Well, the way the article was  
8 written, it's a thousand restaurants. What is this?

9 MR. AIZENSTAT: You can't believe everything  
10 they write.

11 MR. SIEMON: It's in the newspaper.

12 MR. PARDO: Well, they say --

13 MR. SIEMON: How lucky you are.

14 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay, so now you're  
15 clear, this is a principal concern of all of us, is  
16 parking.

17 MR. SIEMON: We hear that loud and clear  
18 and --

19 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay.

20 MR. SIEMON: -- it was within our -- But I  
21 also assume that there's not great interest in  
22 including -- I just get a policy direction of using  
23 the -- considering the availability of valet parking  
24 as an alternative, for example, p.m. peaks.

25 I have written an ordinance where we

1 allowed -- where there's a parking structure, we have  
2 allowed valet parking in the structure, because you  
3 can -- when you've got valet drivers taking in and  
4 out, you can put about one and a half times as many  
5 cars in the garage as you can when it's self-park.

6 So, to avoid overbuilding parking garages,  
7 at least one of our clients chose to allow the p.m.  
8 peak of restaurants to be served by valet parking use  
9 of a garage. That also went to where the stacked  
10 spaces were allowed to include as two in garages --

11 MR. STEFFENS: But was it designed with  
12 spaces like you just mentioned, or was it a regular  
13 garage?

14 MR. SIEMON: Both. Both would be eligible.  
15 They park in the aisles.

16 MR. STEFFENS: Because if you specify it as  
17 a p.m. use and then you design it with double spaces,  
18 it's a 24-hour use, so it has to have 24-hour valet.  
19 It can't just be a p.m. operation.

20 MR. SIEMON: Well, most of this is in a  
21 redevelopment environment, where you have -- whether  
22 you apply the shared parking formula or not, you have  
23 differential peaks, and it's the excess parking  
24 demand to meet the p.m. restaurant that this  
25 particular program was designed to meet.

1           MR. AIZENSTAT:  When you say shared, do you  
2 mean have a valet take out a car and have a resident  
3 or so forth park their car in its place?

4           MR. SIEMON:  No.  The --

5           MR. AIZENSTAT:  They would control that  
6 section?

7           MR. SIEMON:  Yeah.  The garage is used for  
8 valet and valet only, and in that circumstance where  
9 they use -- that's one circumstance.  The other is,  
10 we did accommodate the double-stacked parking, but  
11 only for valet.  They only counted for one space,  
12 meeting the daytime parking demand, even though they  
13 were two spaces deep.  As long as it was self-park,  
14 it was one space, but if it was valet parking, it  
15 counted as two.

16          MR. KORGE:  Then a certain area was reserved  
17 for valet during certain hours of the day?

18          MR. STEFFENS:  With double stacking.

19          MR. KORGE:  Right.

20          CHAIRWOMAN MORENO:  If you're asking for  
21 positive direction, though, I think all of us are  
22 very concerned about parking, and reduced parking is  
23 not one of the things that we are primarily  
24 interested in, although I -- at least speaking for  
25 myself, I'm willing to listen to anything, but I

1 cannot conceive of a situation where we would have  
2 excess parking.

3 MR. KORGE: Well, I didn't understand that  
4 to mean there would be a reduction in parking, but  
5 rather that there be a maximization of the use of the  
6 space.

7 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: No, I thought what he  
8 said was, in order to reduce the number of parking  
9 garages built, they allowed for this shared parking.

10 MR. SIEMON: That was a particular  
11 community's objective, but the other turn of it is to  
12 accommodate, maybe you have a retail street that  
13 traditionally had retail and now it's being replaced  
14 by restaurants, because it's become a restaurant  
15 district. You're generating more parking demand than  
16 the retail, particularly in the evening, and whether  
17 you can permit those and whether they have adequate  
18 parking -- would you take into -- if a garage is  
19 available, it could be dedicated a hundred percent to  
20 valet, and they can make more efficient use of that  
21 column -- of that floor space in that building --

22 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: The problem, I think,  
23 with our restaurants is -- what I see is that they're  
24 in use from 11:30 in the morning until, you know, one  
25 o'clock at night, pretty steadily. I mean, there's

1 not a lesser use at lunchtime. I don't know about  
2 the rest of you, but it seems to me, in the CBD area,  
3 they're as busy at lunchtime as at any other time,  
4 and the lunch hour can stretch from 11:30 to 3:30.

5 MR. KORGE: Yeah, but if we've got a garage,  
6 like over by Giralda, that new garage there -- well,  
7 it's not new anymore, but it's a beautiful garage,  
8 it's got so many floors, and if we have enough volume  
9 of valet parking, because of the restaurants located  
10 nearby, to justify it, maybe one floor is dedicated  
11 to valet and they stack them in there so that there's  
12 more space available with the same facility for  
13 parking than would otherwise have been available.

14 That's what I'm thinking, in terms of  
15 allowing stacking, not to avoid providing for  
16 additional space when we build new facilities, but to  
17 maximize the use of the facilities that we already  
18 have built.

19 I don't know how you get there. I mean,  
20 it's just a concept.

21 MR. SIEMON: Obviously -- I appreciate your  
22 input and I recognize the concerns and your  
23 willingness to consider some things, and we'll try to  
24 do our best shot and come armed with how some other  
25 people are dealing with this issue.

1 MR. KORGE: Yeah.

2 MR. PARDO: Charlie, Giralda is a great  
3 example, as Tom gave, because it's called Restaurant  
4 Row. It is wall-to-wall restaurants, up and down  
5 both sides of the street, and the valet issue there  
6 has become -- with only a couple of exceptions,  
7 they're all restaurants, and it's become a real  
8 nightmare to negotiate through those narrow streets.

9 MR. SIEMON: Well, I can tell you that a  
10 number of municipalities have required consolidation  
11 of valet on those kinds of restaurant streets into a  
12 single set, require either the formation of a  
13 business district association or something to run  
14 them, or actually undertake them as a municipally  
15 franchised operation.

16 We'll -- we'll -- we'll come armed for a  
17 full discussion and some examples of how others have  
18 done it.

19 If you look to Page 8, we included sign  
20 regulations on the policy list under Miscellaneous  
21 only for one reason. You all just went through a  
22 really extensive study of your sign ordinance. It  
23 was something that we were told didn't need any  
24 modifications, but the City Attorney told us to read  
25 them and make sure that we were comfortable with the

1     legality of all of them.  There were several  
2     provisions where the sign standards were defined in  
3     terms of the content of the sign, as opposed to some  
4     physical characteristic, and the law generally does  
5     not allow to you discriminate in communications on  
6     the basis of the content.

7             So we rewrote them, those provisions,  
8     recommended rewrites, that substituted a  
9     non-content-based description of the same sign, and  
10    we believe, working through Staff, that we've  
11    achieved that, but because we had just been through  
12    the sign code, we put this on the list.  I don't  
13    happen to think there are any policy issues, and I  
14    think the City Attorney agreed with our assessment  
15    that it was better to be safe than sorry with those  
16    content elements.

17            The sign industry has recently had a very  
18    interesting strategy.  They challenge any provision  
19    of the code and then use it to leverage a settlement  
20    that affects billboards, and we're very defensive of  
21    our clients' ability to fend off that.

22            And there was a suggestion that pole signs  
23    should be prohibited throughout the City, that came  
24    out.  I'm not -- I can't recall what the origins of  
25    that was, Eric, whether we recommended it.  We were

1 surprised to find that you all allow pole signs.

2 Generally, pole signs which have a pole and  
3 are up, have no context, no relationship to the site.  
4 We prefer and recommend monument sites. We think  
5 they're easier and better. A driver can see them  
6 better. They're not up. The driver is looking at  
7 street level. And so that was a substantive  
8 recommendation that came out.

9 We asked. When we saw that, I was surprised  
10 that you allowed it. We asked Eric, and he said that  
11 it was just something that was carried over, and  
12 encouraged us to include it, and we did. I don't  
13 know whether there's any real policy decision and  
14 recommendation, unless somebody wants us to change  
15 some provision --

16 MR. KORGE: Do you want a vote on it?

17 MR. SIEMON: -- of what we've done.

18 MR. RIEL: Yeah.

19 MR. KORGE: Well, I'll move first to approve  
20 removing any content-specific sign regulations, which  
21 is the first of the two items listed in that policy  
22 issue on Page 8.

23 MR. STEFFENS: Second.

24 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay, let's call the  
25 roll.

1 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Felix Pardo?

2 MR. PARDO: No.

3 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Michael Steffens?

4 MR. STEFFENS: Yes.

5 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Eibi Aizenstat?

6 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yes.

7 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Tom Korge?

8 MR. KORGE: Yes.

9 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Cristina Moreno?

10 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Yes.

11 MR. STEFFENS: On this second item, the pole

12 signs, those are not in the CBD, those are in the

13 U.S. 1?

14 MR. RIEL: U.S. 1 corridor.

15 MR. STEFFENS: U.S. 1 corridor?

16 MR. RIEL: Correct.

17 MR. STEFFENS: And my understanding was that

18 we didn't tackle the U.S. 1 corridor in the sign code

19 rewrite, and there's a lot of aspects to signage in

20 that area that we really need to address.

21 MR. RIEL: And we're going to do that,

22 basically try to take the CBD provisions and

23 obviously look at what needs to be changed with the

24 U.S. 1, but this is one of the -- the pole sign

25 versus monument issue.

1           MR. KORGE: So you're going to bring some  
2 more later?

3           MR. RIEL: Yeah, we'll bring that back.

4           MR. KORGE: Fine.

5           MR. RIEL: Yes.

6           MR. STEFFENS: So you just want to do a  
7 little piece of that?

8           MR. RIEL: At this point in time, probably,  
9 I would say yes. Yes.

10          CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: The conception, you want  
11 us to decide whether we want to prohibit pole signs?

12          MR. RIEL: We'd like your direction on pole  
13 versus monument, yes.

14          MR. KORGE: What is -- I'm sorry, he  
15 explained it, but I don't think I have a visual  
16 concept of what a pole sign is.

17          MR. RIEL: A pole sign basically is just  
18 a --

19          MR. STEFFENS: You know, that thing --

20          MR. RIEL: It's a pole with a sign on the  
21 top. I mean --

22          MR. STEFFENS: BP --

23          MR. RIEL: Yeah.

24          MR. STEFFENS: BP or Shell or --

25          MR. SIEMON: It's a lollipop sign.

1 MR. RIEL: Yeah, basically.

2 MR. PARDO: But without reviewing -- you  
3 know, again, going back to the conditions where they  
4 are, you know, you should be -- you should have a  
5 carrot and stick type of thing. For example, you  
6 should have a sunset provision. You should have, you  
7 know, a square foot. You should look at the  
8 property. You should look at -- you know, there are  
9 quite a few issues.

10 That's why, conceptually, it's very easy to  
11 say, well, you know, if we had a brand-new city and  
12 we didn't have any provisions and we didn't have any  
13 properties, we didn't have any existing facilities,  
14 no pole signs.

15 MR. KORGE: Well, before we get to that,  
16 what's a monument sign? I know I'm ignorant.

17 MR. STEFFENS: Like a tombstone.

18 MR. PARDO: Like a pedestal.

19 MR. RIEL: A tombstone, yeah.

20 MR. KORGE: Oh, okay.

21 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Well, wait a minute.  
22 Are you talking about on -- like on a strip shopping  
23 center, they couldn't have a pylon sign? They could  
24 just have a monument?

25 MR. RIEL: Correct.

1 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: I'm not in favor of  
2 that.

3 MR. PARDO: Again --

4 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Because, as a shopper, I  
5 hate that. I don't know what's in the shopping  
6 center, and I'm driving and I'm going to crash,  
7 looking to see if the store I want is there.

8 MR. AIZENSTAT: You can make a monument  
9 sign with the different stores in it.

10 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: But those are down low,  
11 and then there's traffic on U.S 1.

12 MR. AIZENSTAT: No, no, no, you can do any  
13 height, I would assume.

14 MR. RIEL: The height is the same.

15 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yeah.

16 MR. SIEMON: The difference is the monument  
17 sign, or what I call the monument sign, has  
18 architectural mass and character that stands from the  
19 ground upward --

20 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay.

21 MR. SIEMON: -- as opposed to a sign which  
22 is mounted on top of a -- just usually --

23 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay.

24 MR. SIEMON: -- a steel pole.

25 MR. KORGE: Does that create a problem with

1 traffic visibility at all?

2 MR. SIEMON: Yeah, you have to place the  
3 monument sign so that it doesn't violate the sight  
4 triangle of drivers, but I will tell you that in  
5 survey after survey after survey of communities and  
6 signs, one of the -- this is an issue that is always  
7 resolved in favor of not including pole signs. You  
8 still can put the same size of height.

9 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: The same height.

10 MR. STEFFENS: I think I sort of tend to  
11 agree with Cristina, and maybe it's a semantic issue  
12 here, where you're saying a pole sign, but I think  
13 Cristina is talking about maybe a double pole sign,  
14 where you have two poles or two pylons with the  
15 signage in between it --

16 MR. PARDO: It's still a pylon sign.

17 MR. STEFFENS: -- as opposed to a single  
18 pole sign, where you have one pole with the lollipop  
19 analogy that you were talking about.

20 MR. PARDO: But in --

21 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: I would like to see --

22 MR. STEFFENS: Yeah.

23 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: -- see what you're  
24 talking about --

25 MR. SIEMON: Okay.

1                   CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: -- before I vote on  
2 eliminating it, and it seems to me, since the Chamber  
3 of Commerce, or whatever that business group was, was  
4 very vehement on signs. Before we vote to eliminate  
5 something that is already there, we should give them  
6 notice and a chance to speak their mind.

7                   MR. STEFFENS: And you know, Felix, there  
8 are still existing pole signs in the CBD.

9                   MR. PARDO: Oh, absolutely. I know that. I  
10 know there are, and that's why you have to look at a  
11 sunseting provision, how you're going to affect that  
12 business. Usually, these -- you know, and we're  
13 calling them pole signs, but usually they're called  
14 pylon signs by most communities, and, you know, when  
15 you look at the signs that were placed originally on  
16 the highway, you know, U.S. 1 probably has the most  
17 speed, actual speed, not speed limit, and when you're  
18 negotiating those lanes, et cetera, it's like  
19 Cristina said, you know, I'm looking for a business,  
20 and I can't find it.

21                   But I hate to generalize without looking at  
22 more specific examples of certain areas and looking  
23 at this in detail, and just blanket saying this is  
24 our policy. It's almost like saying, ban logos. At  
25 one time we had logos, then they were banned, then

1 they were brought back, and there's certain --  
2 certain things that you can't just, blanket, you  
3 know, you ban them. You may blanket -- let's say  
4 limit the areas of those signs for logos, where it's  
5 not a 10-foot-by-10-foot, big M for McDonalds, and  
6 maybe it could be reduced on certain streets,  
7 depending on the width of the street, the speed of  
8 the street, et cetera.

9 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: There's a big difference  
10 between, you know, driving down Miracle Mile and  
11 looking for a sign, when you're going --

12 MR. PARDO: Exactly.

13 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: -- at most, 30 miles an  
14 hour, if you're lucky, and driving down Dixie  
15 Highway, when you're going 45 or 50 miles an hour,  
16 and the guy behind you is honking if you slow down.

17 MR. PARDO: And there's one more thing. On  
18 Miracle Mile, you have trees in front of it, anyway,  
19 so you wouldn't be able to see it, but on the  
20 highway, it may provide a purpose. I'm just saying  
21 that in my opinion, you know, you should maybe give  
22 us examples and -- because this is a policy change.

23 The reason, you know, on some of these  
24 issues, that I'm voting against it, is because that  
25 blanket statement is not necessarily, I don't think,

1 my opinion, because I could see many ways that it  
2 could be done, and a blanket statement then would  
3 just extinguish the possibility of looking at that.

4 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay. So let's hear a  
5 motion to have them come back with pole signs.

6 MR. KORGE: Okay. I'll move to table it and  
7 ask them to come back with some illustrations and  
8 more detail on the proposed change for pole --  
9 prohibiting pole signs and promoting only monument  
10 signs.

11 MR. STEFFENS: Second.

12 MR. AIZENSTAT: Just one question. You can  
13 do, I would assume, a monument sign to be not a pole  
14 sign, but to have some kind of mass or width to where  
15 after a certain height you can start doing your  
16 lettering. That would constitute a pole sign, or  
17 that would constitute a monument sign?

18 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: I think that's what we  
19 need him to come back and tell us, because --

20 MR. AIZENSTAT: That's what I'm assuming.  
21 I'm assuming that what we're -- that what we were  
22 looking at is getting rid of that skinny pole.

23 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: See, to me, the monument  
24 signs are the ones that are like right at the  
25 entrance and they're, you know, waist high --

1 MR. AIZENSTAT: No, I would say that as long  
2 as you do a monument --

3 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: They're waist high.

4 MR. AIZENSTAT: -- that goes with your  
5 project or with your building --

6 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Right.

7 MR. AIZENSTAT: -- you could go up to a  
8 height that's allowable today.

9 MR. SIEMON: We'd be glad to show you. I  
10 mean, this is something I love to do.

11 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay. Let's do it.

12 MR. SIEMON: Because I have to justify my  
13 bias against pole signs.

14 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay, let's take the  
15 roll.

16 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Michael Steffens?

17 MR. STEFFENS: Yes.

18 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Eibi Aizenstat?

19 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yes.

20 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Tom Korge?

21 MR. KORGE: Yes.

22 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Felix Pardo?

23 MR. PARDO: This is the motion to table?

24 MR. KORGE: Yes.

25 MR. PARDO: Yes.

1 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Cristina Moreno?

2 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Yes.

3 MR. SIEMON: The last ones that appear under  
4 this gray border in the middle of Page 8 are specific  
5 issues that were raised during our meetings with you  
6 by the public, sometimes not really related to a  
7 subject you all were discussing, but it was brought  
8 to us, and we have listed those on the left side, and  
9 given on the right our recommendation or, where it  
10 came from the Economic Development Board, their  
11 recommendation to you, and we -- because we haven't  
12 addressed these, we would like to get your direction  
13 as to what we should do in the Code.

14 There was a request submitted by a speaker  
15 to allow pre-schools in residential areas.

16 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Now, when she said  
17 residential areas, though, I think she was talking  
18 about multifamily, as opposed to what we think of as  
19 a residential area.

20 MR. STEFFENS: Yes, she was.

21 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: So, to me, that's a very  
22 different proposal. I certainly don't want houses  
23 converted into day care centers in our single-family  
24 residential areas. But I'm assuming that in the  
25 multifamily areas, that is a permitted use; is it

1 not? Because we do have some day cares in the CBD  
2 area.

3 MR. RIEL: I don't know the answer to that.

4 MR. PARDO: The CBD area is different than  
5 the apartment district.

6 MR. RIEL: It might have a different -- an S  
7 use or something to that effect.

8 MR. KORGE: Right, and bear in mind, you  
9 know, that there are multifamily areas all over the  
10 residential areas. On Granada at the Circle, there's  
11 an apartment house, right, you know, across from the  
12 golf course community, so --

13 MR. PARDO: Yeah, it's --

14 MR. KORGE: -- I don't know that that would  
15 really work.

16 MR. RIEL: As I recall, I think they're only  
17 allowed in commercial districts.

18 MR. PARDO: Exactly.

19 MR. RIEL: Commercial or an S.

20 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Commercial districts.

21 MR. RIEL: Or an S.

22 MR. PARDO: I would think you're treading on  
23 thin ice --

24 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Well, what do you do  
25 with the mixed-use districts? Those are commercial

1 districts by definition?

2 MR. RIEL: Yes.

3 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: It seems to me that if  
4 we are creating -- and I guess this is what we're  
5 discussing here. If we're creating a significant  
6 growth in our multifamily areas along Ponce, and it  
7 seems to me that that's what we're doing, there is  
8 going to be a need for day care in that area and we  
9 need to address it and discuss it and say where we  
10 want it put.

11 I think all of us are in agreement, we don't  
12 want it in the single-family area, but is it proper  
13 to have day care in the CBD, with all the traffic  
14 that's there, or should it be closer to that  
15 multifamily area, perhaps on the back streets?

16 MR. KORGE: Yeah, a mixed use.

17 MR. RIEL: As part of a mixed-use component.

18 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Or part -- yeah, or  
19 permitted as part of the mixed-use component.

20 MR. KORGE: I would think that it's  
21 appropriate because it's commercial and/or retail and  
22 residential, in mixed use. So I would think it's  
23 entirely appropriate.

24 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Well, in Downtown  
25 Miami, there's an office building that has a day care

1 center in it, where a lot of people who work downtown  
2 take their children, so that's --

3 MR. PARDO: And that's true, and that's a  
4 commercial area.

5 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: So I think we just -- I  
6 don't have a fixed opinion. I do think this is a  
7 use, and I think we need to identify where we want to  
8 put it.

9 MR. RIEL: All right.

10 MR. PARDO: I think, right now, I feel  
11 comfortable allowing it where it's allowed now, which  
12 is in the commercial areas. I understand -- you  
13 know, I understand what you're talking about in the  
14 apartment districts, et cetera, but for example, if  
15 you look at the North Ponce area, the spine, the  
16 Ponce spine, is commercial. And in that spine, if  
17 you put that day care, people that are dropping  
18 children off are going to stay in that spine area.  
19 You're not bringing them through those small streets  
20 to a destination point.

21 MR. KORGE: I agree. I'm only thinking in  
22 terms of the mixed-use facilities, so that if the  
23 area is zoned for mixed use, not the adjacent area,  
24 but the area in which the facility, you know, the day  
25 care would be located, I would consider allowing day

1 care to be considered one of those mixed uses. It  
2 may already be permitted by virtue of the mixed use.

3 MR. PARDO: And commercial --

4 MR. KORGE: Is it permitted?

5 MR. SIEMON: Yeah.

6 MR. RIEL: Typically, the mixed uses are in  
7 commercial areas, so --

8 MR. PARDO: Yeah, they're commercial uses --

9 MR. RIEL: Except when there's a change in  
10 land use done --

11 MR. PARDO: Exactly.

12 MR. RIEL: -- which comes before this Board.

13 MR. PARDO: Commercial uses are allowed in  
14 mixed-use areas, as long as they meet that commercial  
15 use. What you have to be careful with when you look  
16 at this particular issue is, remember that day cares  
17 are very, very different. They have a peak time of  
18 drop-off and a peak time of pick-off -- of pick-up.

19 Those standards should be designed into the Code, and  
20 special circumstances should be analyzed for those  
21 mixed-use projects, because if you think valet is  
22 bad, you could choke off entire streets at certain  
23 points of time during that pick-up and drop-off.

24 MR. KORGE: But a day care is like a  
25 school.

1 MR. PARDO: Correct, and --

2 MR. KORGE: It's a little kids' school. So  
3 wherever we would think that schools are appropriate  
4 would be an appropriate place to put these  
5 facilities.

6 MR. STEFFENS: Which is in the middle of  
7 neighborhoods.

8 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Yeah.

9 MR. KORGE: Is that what we have now in the  
10 current Code?

11 MR. PARDO: No. We --

12 MR. KORGE: Do we have it identified by  
13 virtue --

14 MR. PARDO: The Code does not identify  
15 special requirements for schools, as the County does.  
16 Believe it or not, the County provides a certain  
17 distance, or a certain amount of cars of stacking for  
18 schools and day cares, a certain amount of employee  
19 parking for the teachers and people giving care, a  
20 certain amount of, you know, all these things.  
21 That's, in the Unincorporated Dade County Code, very,  
22 very specific.

23 Our Code is very, very -- has -- does not  
24 really address those issues. But if you are thinking  
25 of that, what I'm saying is, Tom, you have to be

1 really careful with what those ramifications are. It  
2 was the same thing with valet, you know, valet  
3 parking. Everybody thought it was the answer. Now  
4 people are seeing that they're blocking off streets.

5           What I'm saying is, you have to look at  
6 those ramifications. Right now, in commercial,  
7 you're allowed, but additional standards should be  
8 put into place to be able to accommodate those peak  
9 times and those requirements, because if not, you  
10 could probably create havoc.

11           CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Ideally -- ideally,  
12 though, if what you're creating is a multifamily  
13 community along that area, some of those people would  
14 either live in the building and be bringing their  
15 children down to a ground floor day care or would  
16 live in the adjacent building and walk their children  
17 over. I mean, that is the goal of everything you're  
18 trying to do, right?

19           MR. PARDO: But the reality is that someone  
20 living across the City of Coral Gables, or not even  
21 in the City of Coral Gables, is going to transport  
22 that child to that point, and that traffic, that  
23 additional traffic, impeding ingress and egress into  
24 that mixed-use building, you know, it could create  
25 all sorts of havoc.

1 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Yeah, and the problem  
2 with day care is, you've got to actually park your  
3 car and walk your child in, not just --

4 MR. PARDO: Absolutely. Absolutely. And  
5 they also require --

6 MR. RIEL: I would suggest, let Staff go  
7 back and look at this, and perhaps we'll come up with  
8 some supplemental regulations that deal with, you  
9 know, if we did put them in multifamily areas, they  
10 have to go through a certain type of review, such as  
11 a drive-through facility does. It's kind of like a  
12 conditional use review. So let us look at that and  
13 let us look at some -- certain different areas.

14 MR. PARDO: But, you know, Eric, this --

15 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: I think what I'd like  
16 you to do is tell us what we have now, what is there  
17 now --

18 MR. RIEL: Okay.

19 MR. PARDO: Exactly.

20 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: -- how can we make it  
21 better, and how can we address two separate concerns.  
22 One is that we're bringing a ton of families here, so  
23 we're going to have to provide for their children, we  
24 can't just ignore it, and the other is the concern  
25 raised by Felix of, how do you provide the temporary

1 parking at those drop-off and pick-up times.

2 MR. PARDO: It's a compatibility problem,  
3 and the problem right now is, we don't have enough  
4 requirements in our existing Code to be able to  
5 expand it beyond the commercial district.

6 MR. RIEL: There's plenty of examples of  
7 supplemental regulations that deal with, you know,  
8 conditional use of this sort in residential areas.

9 MR. STEFFENS: I think you need to look at  
10 this from another point of view, also. While it's  
11 nice that they fit into the -- or they're supposedly  
12 designed to fit into the commercial zoning, and  
13 that's the Ponce corridor, I wouldn't want my child  
14 going to day care on the Ponce corridor. I would  
15 want my child in an area that is lower scale, lower  
16 density, lower traffic, lower everything, moving him  
17 off of the commercial corridor and putting him into a  
18 more sort of residential setting, which is much more  
19 appropriate for a school and small children and the  
20 activities.

21 The commercial is fine for commercial  
22 businesses, but I think that these type of activities  
23 are part of a neighborhood and they belong in  
24 neighborhoods, and I think we should look at how to  
25 make them work within these high-density

1 neighborhoods that we're creating.

2 MR. PARDO: I really disagree with what you  
3 just said, and the reason is that the -- it's a  
4 commercial activity, and it's an intense commercial  
5 activity. The problem that you're having is that  
6 when you go into these residential areas, and the  
7 impact, and I keep -- I've said it consistently for  
8 years -- the impact that you have on the smaller  
9 streets, on those arteries. Thinking that people --  
10 that kids are going to be walked to any school  
11 facility or whatever is not real, and I'll tell you  
12 why, that --

13 MR. KORGE: Let me jump in --

14 MR. PARDO: -- even in the public -- even in  
15 the public school system -- if I could finish. Even  
16 in the public school system, for blocks and blocks,  
17 we have school buses that have to queue blocks and  
18 blocks away from the schools that exist here now, in  
19 those single-family residential areas, because they  
20 simply can't fit where the school is located.

21 MR. KORGE: But one other point. I mean,  
22 we've already -- the City is already built out. The  
23 residential area is completely built out, and areas  
24 have been planned. There are schools. There are  
25 some parochial schools, there are public schools, you

1 know, throughout the City, and the only way that  
2 more, you know, pre-schools are going to pop up in  
3 residential areas is to convert existing lots or  
4 houses in pre-school areas, and that's going to  
5 create tremendous friction in those neighborhoods,  
6 which aren't really designed for that use. I just  
7 don't know that that's a practical alternative for  
8 this City.

9 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: No, I think what  
10 Michael is suggesting is that you don't limit it to  
11 the Ponce corridor, but you allow it to go behind, on  
12 Galiano or Salzedo.

13 MR. STEFFENS: Exactly.

14 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: He's not saying to take  
15 it into --

16 MR. STEFFENS: Single-family residential  
17 neighborhoods.

18 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: -- you know, into a  
19 single-family area. He's talking about allowing us  
20 to move back -- Now, the other thing, I know that  
21 there's criteria for green space and outdoor area for  
22 day cares. You might need to look at that, as well,  
23 because I was involved with Coral Gables  
24 Congregational and I know that was a concern.

25 MR. RIEL: No, there are State

1 requirements --

2 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Yes.

3 MR. RIEL: -- for that. Yes.

4 MR. PARDO: There are State requirements.

5 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay. Our next one is,  
6 prohibit tennis courts on single-family residences to  
7 seek variances and the recommendation of someone --

8 MR. SIEMON: Well, the request was that a  
9 tennis court should never be eligible for a  
10 variance.

11 MR. STEFFENS: Are tennis courts permitted  
12 in the Code, or you need to seek a variance for a  
13 tennis court?

14 MR. SIEMON: The issue really relates to  
15 compliance with setback requirements and getting a  
16 variance from those setback requirements in order to  
17 accommodate a tennis court.

18 MR. STEFFENS: So, if you can meet the  
19 setback requirements, you can have a tennis court?

20 MR. SIEMON: You can build a tennis court.

21 MR. PARDO: It's not an unusual use.

22 MR. SIEMON: Yeah. And --

23 MR. AIZENSTAT: With appropriate buffers and  
24 so forth, or --

25 MR. SIEMON: Well, there's setback

1 requirements.

2 MR. PARDO: Setbacks give you the buffers.

3 MR. SIEMON: But the issue here was that, as  
4 I recall the circumstances, someone applied for and  
5 was granted a hardship variance to build a tennis  
6 court, and this attorney representing the neighbor  
7 felt that the inability to have a golf -- a tennis  
8 court hardly qualified as a hardship.

9 MR. STEFFENS: Was it a tennis court or a  
10 lit tennis court?

11 MR. SIEMON: A tennis court. There was no  
12 mention of lighting, that I recall.

13 MR. STEFFENS: Was there lighting, Eric?

14 MR. RIEL: I don't remember that one.

15 MR. PARDO: No, you're talking specifically  
16 about possibly the same case --

17 MR. SIEMON: I don't know.

18 MR. PARDO: -- where it was one of the  
19 annexed areas, which had gone through a public  
20 hearing, that had been granted a variance, and then  
21 it became a free-for-all here, because then it became  
22 the City of Coral Gables.

23 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Well, the question is,  
24 is the inability to have a tennis court without a  
25 variance a hardship.

1           MR. SIEMON: No, that's not -- The question  
2 here -- What was proposed was that in no case could a  
3 variance be applied for, for a tennis court, and all  
4 we're saying in our recommendation to you is, if you  
5 can meet the standards for a variance, you meet the  
6 standards for a variance.

7           MR. STEFFENS: Right.

8           MR. SIEMON: The reality in that case was,  
9 it probably didn't meet the standards for a variance,  
10 but they were sympathetic to the interest.

11          CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: So that is not a  
12 code-writing issue, it's an exercise of discretion  
13 issue that we cannot legislate.

14          MR. SIEMON: That's our recommendation.

15          CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay. So we'll go with  
16 your recommendation, or is that -- Are we doing  
17 anything on these issues?

18          MR. RIEL: If we can get your direction or  
19 vote, that would be great.

20          CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay. So should we do  
21 the pre-schools first?

22          MR. PARDO: Sure.

23          MR. SIEMON: You want us to look at  
24 pre-schools again.

25          CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Yes.

1           MR. SIEMON: They're permitted in your  
2 commercial and mixed-use districts now, and that's  
3 what they're permitted in the new Code.

4           CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay. I think --

5           MR. STEFFENS: We're looking at how to  
6 accommodate them in --

7           MR. SIEMON: Yeah.

8           MR. STEFFENS: -- our specific situation.

9           MR. SIEMON: I think that the -- what I  
10 heard from you is that we have some emerging urban  
11 neighborhoods that are in -- not only urban  
12 residential neighborhoods, but we're trying to  
13 promote pedestrianism, but they're also transition  
14 zones for more intense CBD and other uses to  
15 single-family neighborhoods, and we're going to  
16 include in our examination of that issue the  
17 appropriateness of appropriate day care facilities.

18           CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Yeah. I think what  
19 concerns at least me is that Coral Gables is  
20 transitioning from a city with very little  
21 multifamily housing for families, into a city that's  
22 going to have significant multifamily housing for  
23 families.

24           Our residential apartments typically have  
25 been either older people in small buildings -- and

1 now you're putting up these condominiums that I am  
2 presuming are going to bring a fair number of  
3 families into apartment living and therefore create a  
4 use that has not been -- or a need that has not  
5 existed to date. That, at least, is my concern.

6 MR. SIEMON: That's the issue that we're  
7 going to address. As I recall it, actually, it was,  
8 there's some small residential, sort of a mixed area,  
9 mixed-use area, but it's just a checkerboard or  
10 pattern of zones, on the southeast side of U.S. 1,  
11 towards Coconut Grove, and it was in that area where  
12 that particular woman was looking to convert what was  
13 once a single-family home into a day care, and I  
14 don't think you guys want to go down that slope.

15 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Yeah, I don't think we  
16 want to do that.

17 MR. PARDO: I think this is so dangerous.  
18 There are many areas that are apartment districts  
19 abutting, interwoven, across the street from existing  
20 single-family. How are you going to -- I mean, we  
21 have treated --

22 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: I think we're very  
23 clear, we don't want single-family converted into day  
24 care.

25 MR. SIEMON: Well, I just wanted to repeat,

1 that's a part of this recommendation.

2 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay, so --

3 MR. PARDO: That's not what I said, though.

4 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: But what we are asking  
5 you to do, in the motion that I'd like to hear, is  
6 have you recommend to us a way of accommodating day  
7 care or advising us whether we have enough in place,  
8 or otherwise recommending to us alternatives that  
9 would allow some day care in the multifamily area.

10 MR. STEFFENS: So moved.

11 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Do I get a second?

12 MR. KORGE: The multifamily area --

13 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Uh-huh.

14 MR. KORGE: -- or in the mixed-use area?

15 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: In the multifamily  
16 mixed-use area. That's really what we're saying.

17 MR. PARDO: No, there are two --

18 MR. KORGE: There's two different areas.

19 MR. PARDO: They're two separate areas.

20 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay, what are we  
21 looking at, Eric? Multifamily or mixed use?

22 MR. RIEL: Multifamily.

23 MR. SIEMON: It's already in mixed use.

24 MR. AIZENSTAT: Multifamily would qualify as  
25 a duplex?

1 MR. RIEL: Yes.

2 MR. PARDO: Sure.

3 MR. AIZENSTAT: I, for one --

4 MR. PARDO: Right on -- up and down LeJeune  
5 Road.

6 MR. AIZENSTAT: I mean, I, for one, would  
7 not be in favor of that.

8 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Yeah, I agree.

9 MR. AIZENSTAT: The City of Miami actually,  
10 I think, does allow that --

11 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: I agree with that.

12 MR. PARDO: Exactly. This is going to  
13 become --

14 MR. AIZENSTAT: -- and I don't like it.

15 MR. STEFFENS: I'm not in favor of it. I  
16 think we need to hear the recommendations and the  
17 issues, and then vote on it.

18 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Yeah, but in giving them  
19 policy guidelines, we want to say, "We don't want it  
20 in duplex areas."

21 MR. STEFFENS: Fine.

22 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: I mean, I think we're  
23 really talking about primarily in mixed-use areas,  
24 Eric.

25 MR. RIEL: What you're talking about is

1 mixed-use areas.

2 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Yes.

3 MR. AIZENSTAT: Can you -- Is mixed use  
4 separated between multifamily over a certain amount  
5 of apartments or dwelling units and just an R2 or a  
6 duplex? Is that separated?

7 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: You know, that might be  
8 the way to go.

9 MR. PARDO: Not the way that it's going to  
10 be converted to, and that's --

11 MR. AIZENSTAT: So, then, how do you --

12 MR. PARDO: The way the present zoning is,  
13 yes, you could say duplex is duplex and apartments  
14 are apartments, and you could have an overlay for  
15 mixed use. But the way that the new classifications  
16 are, they all become a blur, so therefore, you will  
17 be able to take all the duplex areas up and down  
18 LeJeune Road now, and down Ponce and everywhere else,  
19 and make them into commercial day cares, and --

20 MR. STEFFENS: No, you could easily nip that  
21 in the bud by saying you can't put a day care center  
22 within 150 feet or 200 feet of single-family  
23 residential.

24 MR. RIEL: I would just ask you all --

25 MR. STEFFENS: Including any duplex area.

1 MR. PARDO: You know --

2 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay, as a policy -- as  
3 a policy issue.

4 MR. STEFFENS: I think we need to hear the  
5 recommendations --

6 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Yes.

7 MR. PARDO: Eric, I don't think I need to  
8 hear it. I'm against it.

9 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: We just want to  
10 convey -- we want to convey to you that we don't want  
11 it in single-family, we don't want it in duplex, we  
12 don't want in it townhouse. We want it in, you know,  
13 areas where the zoning is for multi-- big multifamily  
14 buildings, and I may not be using the right  
15 terminology.

16 MR. SIEMON: I hear you, except for one  
17 exception, and I just want to ask you all to let me  
18 evaluate it, because I've not looked at it. There  
19 are a number of areas where you have what used to be  
20 the duplex district, zoned along a street that is --

21 MR. PARDO: LeJeune Road.

22 MR. SIEMON: Yeah, but not LeJeune, because  
23 you can't handle those on curb cuts, but I think  
24 Segovia is one where you have duplexes along there.  
25 You don't have the high volume of traffic that you

1 have on LeJeune so that the day cares could be  
2 conflicting with it, and whether or not those  
3 would be --

4 MR. PARDO: Charlie, I've got to tell you --

5 MR. SIEMON: -- a desirable day care or not,  
6 I just want to look at.

7 MR. PARDO: Let me give you -- Let me give  
8 you my input.

9 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: But Segovia backs onto  
10 residential.

11 MR. SIEMON: I understand that.

12 MR. PARDO: Absolutely, and on top of that,  
13 the residential feeling is there. I mean, that's my  
14 neighborhood. I don't want to have a day care there,  
15 because the day care -- Right now, for example, if  
16 you have a church, the church intensity occurs on  
17 certain days. There's a -- and it's part of the  
18 community. This is a commercial venture, that is  
19 only going to degrade that area.

20 Those duplexes, over so many years, were  
21 carefully designed to look like the residential  
22 areas, to look like single-family residences. By  
23 sticking in employees, handicapped parking space,  
24 commercial lighting for the parking lots, you know,  
25 all of these things, you're transforming and making a

1 neighborhood that is serene and compatible, that the  
2 only reason it's duplex is because it's facing a huge  
3 street like Segovia, into another commercial strip.  
4 I think that's wrong. I think it's wrong.

5 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: But you already have --  
6 you already have the church there.

7 MR. PARDO: I know there's a need, but  
8 that's the wrong place.

9 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: You have a couple of  
10 churches there.

11 MR. STEFFENS: You know what, Felix?

12 MR. PARDO: You have a couple churches.

13 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: And they probably have  
14 some day care.

15 MR. STEFFENS: No, you know what, Felix?  
16 No, I would bet that every church in these wonderful  
17 residential neighborhoods that you're talking  
18 about, every one --

19 MR. AIZENSTAT: That's what I wanted to ask.

20 MR. STEFFENS: -- of them in Coral Gables  
21 has a day care.

22 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Absolutely, in the Code.

23 MR. PARDO: What happens, Michael, when the  
24 church sells the property and moves away? They're  
25 all special use. It reverts back to the underlying

1 zoning.

2 MR. STEFFENS: They still have day care in  
3 the middle of single-family residential  
4 neighborhoods.

5 MR. PARDO: It's contained in a larger  
6 property.

7 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay, we're in  
8 disagreement.

9 MR. PARDO: You're talking about taking --

10 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: We're in disagreement.  
11 Let's have Mr. Siemon look at it and come back, and  
12 we can discuss it in the realm of all the  
13 information.

14 MR. KORGE: Well, I just want you to know  
15 that I would consider mixed use -- including day care  
16 in mixed use, but I'm, so far, not persuaded either  
17 in apartment, duplex or single-family.

18 MR. SIEMON: We've talked about them just  
19 grossly. I mean, there are programs that regulate  
20 the size of them. In the spirit of what the Chair  
21 described as the emerging need for day care in a  
22 community which is attracting younger adult families,  
23 it's difficult. Not everybody can have a corporate-  
24 sponsored, 100-bed day care facility, and a  
25 significant part of it is being met in South Florida

1 by small, five-children centers that are -- don't  
2 have all the negative aspects you've drawn, and all I  
3 want to do is, we'll bring you back an overview,  
4 we'll look at each of the districts --

5 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay, so let's have a  
6 motion --

7 MR. SIEMON: -- and let you all judge them.  
8 But I --

9 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Let's have a very simple  
10 motion to have Mr. Siemon come back with a  
11 recommendation, just like we've had with the others.

12 MR. SIEMON: But having a kinder care in a  
13 single-family neighborhood does not make any sense at  
14 all.

15 MR. STEFFENS: That's a recommendation  
16 about pre-school centers.

17 MR. KORGE: I'll second that.

18 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay. Can we call the  
19 roll on that?

20 MR. AIZENSTAT: The motion is what, again,  
21 please?

22 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: For Mr. Siemon to come  
23 back with recommendations on day care centers.

24 MR. AIZENSTAT: For us to look at?

25 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: For us to look at and

1 fully discuss with available information in front of  
2 us.

3 MR. AIZENSTAT: Having information in front  
4 of us. At the same time, would it be possible to  
5 bring some kind of a map, to where we could see  
6 visually, also, what you're talking about?

7 MR. SIEMON: We have one.

8 MR. AIZENSTAT: Okay. That would help me.

9 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Yes. It would help me,  
10 too. Okay?

11 MR. SIEMON: The next issue relates to the  
12 University --

13 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Oh, wait. We didn't  
14 call the roll.

15 MR. AIZENSTAT: We didn't go to that vote.

16 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Tom Korge?

17 MR. KORGE: Yes.

18 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Felix Pardo?

19 MR. PARDO: No.

20 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Michael Steffens?

21 MR. STEFFENS: Yes.

22 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Eibi Aizenstat?

23 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yes.

24 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Cristina Moreno?

25 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Yes.

1           MR. SIEMON: The last one I'm going to  
2 address, and then Eric can address the others,  
3 because I wasn't involved in the conversations.  
4 There's been an issue about certain day camps that  
5 are operated at the University of Miami, and there's  
6 been some conflicts and litigation, and there's been  
7 a suggestion that we could resolve those conflicts by  
8 including the use and some performance standards, and  
9 we're recommending that that be included.

10           MR. STEFFENS: I only know my experience  
11 with a day camp at the University of Miami. My son  
12 was signed up for one, and nobody at the University  
13 of Miami had any clue about this day camp. I called  
14 Donna Shalala. I called her office and she found  
15 somebody, after several days, that finally knew what  
16 was going on with this day camp that was on that  
17 campus.

18           I think, within these guidelines or  
19 whatever, there needs to be something that says that  
20 somebody on that campus needs to know what's going  
21 on. I mean, there has to be somebody in control of  
22 these things.

23           MR. SIEMON: We agree.

24           CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay.

25           MR. AIZENSTAT: What -- just -- I'm sorry.

1 I apologize. There's also a lot of businesses that,  
2 through whatever they do, create day camps or create  
3 some kind of camps during the summer in those  
4 businesses. How do you handle that? In other words,  
5 not a place that's specific -- there might be a store  
6 that does some kind of crafts or whatever it is, and  
7 they might want to set up a day camp or some kind of  
8 summer camp, or certain hours. Is that involved in  
9 this?

10 MR. SIEMON: No. I think this is only in  
11 the UM --

12 MR. RIEL: Actually, I think it goes beyond  
13 the UM. It does.

14 MR. KORGE: The Youth Center has a day camp.

15 MR. RIEL: Yeah.

16 MR. SIEMON: Oh, I know the activities go  
17 beyond.

18 MR. RIEL: Right, right, right.

19 MR. SIEMON: I don't think our  
20 recommendation does.

21 MR. RIEL: No, I think that's one of the  
22 things that we need to look into, though.

23 MR. SIEMON: I think they're treated as  
24 accessory uses.

25 MR. KORGE: So do the churches.

1                   CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: But are they -- an  
2 accessory use to what? Because --

3                   MR. SIEMON: Usually, a retail. For  
4 example, an art supply or artists' store runs a  
5 summer arts camp.

6                   MR. STEFFENS: Would this include like the  
7 Venetian Pool? They have a summer camp, also.

8                   CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Well, to me --

9                   MR. RIEL: I don't know the answer to that.

10                  MR. PARDO: No, that's part of the  
11 recreation.

12                  CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay, wait, wait --

13                  MR. RIEL: I don't know the answer to that.

14                  CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: I think there's a  
15 significant difference between the University of  
16 Miami, the Youth Center, Venetian Pool, or a school  
17 running a day camp, where that is consistent with  
18 what they normally do, and a store that usually has  
19 ten people walk in, all of a sudden having a day camp  
20 and having, you know, a hundred kids show up for  
21 cooking lessons or whatever.

22                  To me, there's a difference. I don't know  
23 about the rest of you. But, you know, the Youth  
24 Center normally has children there, as do schools.  
25 But to turn a retail facility into a school for the

1 summer, to me, is significantly different.

2 MR. KORGE: Does anybody do that? They do?

3 MR. RIEL: Yes.

4 MR. KORGE: Really?

5 MR. RIEL: Yes, they do. Let us look at  
6 that issue. It just slips me.

7 MR. SIEMON: The provisions that I've  
8 drafted don't go to that.

9 MR. RIEL: No, no, they don't include that.

10 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Don't go there, okay.

11 MR. SIEMON: But that is obviously something  
12 that is -- I think, the way it's currently treated,  
13 it would have to fall into the accessory use, either  
14 into the principal or accessory use of retail, and  
15 clearly, there's a line there of what makes sense and  
16 what doesn't make sense.

17 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: We're not having a  
18 motion?

19 MR. SIEMON: Do you know anything about  
20 these last two?

21 MR. RIEL: Yes, I do. The last two were  
22 just --

23 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Eric, we don't need a  
24 motion on that?

25 MR. RIEL: No. On those last two, they

1 were just -- The Economic Development Board just  
2 wanted to identify those issues and make sure that  
3 we're looking into those, and a separate provision  
4 dealing with telecommunications is being drafted by  
5 the City Attorney with some outside legal counsel,  
6 and the public art provisions are also being drafted,  
7 as well, so --

8 So this basically concludes, after five  
9 meetings, the policy direction from the Board.

10 We will update this chart. We will get it  
11 back to the Board. I'll make sure it gets on the  
12 web, and then the first hearing, in which we will  
13 discuss Article 1, Article 5, 7 and 8, is February  
14 23rd of 2005, beginning at 6 p.m.

15 You will be getting provisions, underlined  
16 and strike-out format, based upon your policy  
17 direction, probably about seven to ten days prior to  
18 the meeting, not, you know, your typical four to five  
19 days before. So it will give you sufficient time to  
20 review those, but they will also be on the web at the  
21 time which you all get those, and I'd certainly  
22 encourage the public to meet with Staff, and any  
23 members of the Board to meet with Staff prior to, to  
24 discuss all the matters here.

25 MR. SIEMON: It's going to be produced in

1 this format.

2 MR. KORGE: Are there going to be additional  
3 Board of Architects comments on there?

4 MR. RIEL: We'll get those by that time.  
5 When that particular issue comes up, which I cannot  
6 remember, I want to say it's probably -- Is it  
7 Article --

8 MR. KORGE: Page 5.

9 MR. RIEL: I'm trying to think which  
10 article, the development --

11 MR. SIEMON: In this format, right?

12 MR. RIEL: It will be in that format. It  
13 will be in a one-page, double-sided format.

14 MR. SIEMON: No more gigantic books.

15 MR. RIEL: It won't be a large book. It  
16 will be this size.

17 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay, and this schedule  
18 here is when each these provisions will be --

19 MR. RIEL: Absolutely. That was the  
20 schedule that was adopted by the City Commission.

21 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay.

22 MR. RIEL: Staff has nothing further,  
23 unless --

24 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay. Anything further,  
25 Mr. Siemon?

1 MR. SIEMON: I do not have anything further.

2 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Since we really haven't  
3 voted on anything, do we need any public testimony?

4 Is there anyone in the public that needs to  
5 speak on anything we've -- We haven't voted on  
6 anything, so -- I don't think we did.

7 MR. AIZENSTAT: No, but there's people here.  
8 Maybe they --

9 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Is there anyone who  
10 needs to speak on something? You're welcome. We're  
11 happy to hear you.

12 Okay. If you have specific comments, you're  
13 welcome to give them to Mr. Riel to incorporate when  
14 the issue comes back before all of us, and you're  
15 invited to look at the schedule and come back before  
16 us on the specific issues before we adopt anything  
17 definitive.

18 MR. KORGE: I'd like to add that the  
19 written -- I find the written comments especially  
20 helpful, because I don't -- I can read them and think  
21 about them and go back and re-read.

22 MR. RIEL: And the list we're doing is, as  
23 we get new comments, we're putting them in, and I  
24 can't encourage you more that any information that  
25 Staff has and that this Board has, and the City

1 Commission, is on the City web page within probably  
2 five hours of it being distributed to this Board or  
3 anyone. So I cannot encourage you more to go to the  
4 web page.

5 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay, with that --

6 MR. KORGE: A motion to adjourn?

7 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: -- the meeting is  
8 adjourned.

9 MR. AIZENSTAT: The gentleman had a  
10 question.

11 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: I'm sorry?

12 MR. PRICE: I just had a question. I don't  
13 know if it's applicable here or not.

14 MR. RIEL: You're going to have to --

15 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay, you need to  
16 identify yourself at the podium.

17 MR. PRICE: I'm sorry. Scott Price.

18 MR. RIEL: And you need to state your  
19 address.

20 MR. PRICE: I operate a business on Madruga  
21 Avenue in Coral Gables, 1533 Madruga Avenue.

22 Just a question on the zoning map, or the  
23 conceptual zoning map. I notice that you've gone  
24 from three different classifications of commercial to  
25 one classification -- or two different

1 classifications in the commercial use. You have the  
2 limited use district and the, I guess, commercial use  
3 district.

4 Here, you have density and how high you can  
5 go, is identified on this map to the left, but on the  
6 conceptual map, it's not identified.

7 MR. RIEL: That's why it's a conceptual map,  
8 because it was a map that was prepared to just  
9 illustrate the changes.

10 MR. PRICE: Uh-huh.

11 MR. RIEL: We're going to come back with a  
12 more specific map, that has the more specific  
13 information, and that's going to be discussed  
14 starting on April 20th.

15 MR. PRICE: Yeah.

16 MR. RIEL: And actually, we have two or  
17 three meetings scheduled to discuss that. But I'd be  
18 happy to meet with you. If you have any specific  
19 areas that you're talking about --

20 MR. PRICE: Oh, yeah.

21 MR. RIEL: -- please come into my office,  
22 okay?

23 MR. PRICE: Sure. Thanks. Maybe I'll get a  
24 card from you.

25 MR. RIEL: Please do.

1                   CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay, thank you very  
2 much. The meeting is adjourned.

3                   (Thereupon, the meeting was adjourned at  
4 7:25 p.m.)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

CERTIFICATE

STATE OF FLORIDA:

SS.

COUNTY OF MIAMI-DADE:

I, JOAN L. BAILEY, Registered Diplomate Reporter, and a Notary Public for the State of Florida at Large, do hereby certify that I was authorized to and did stenographically report the foregoing proceedings and that the transcript is a true and complete record of my stenographic notes.

DATED this 24th day of January, 2005.

JOAN L. BAILEY, RDR

