

1 CITY OF CORAL GABLES
2 PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD STUDY SESSION
3 VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT

3 BILTMORE HOTEL, BOWMAN ROOM
4 1200 ANASTASIA AVENUE
5 CORAL GABLES, FLORIDA
6 JUNE 29, 2005, 5:25 P.M.

6 Planning & Zoning Board Members Present:

7 Cristina Moreno, Chairwoman
8 F. Michael Steffens, Vice-Chairman
9 Eibi Aizenstat
10 Pat Keon
11 Tom Korge
12 Javier Salman
13 Michael R. Tein

11 Board of Architects Members Present:

12 Burton Hersh
13 Donald Sackman

13 City Staff:

14 Eric Riel, Jr., Planning Director
15 Walter Carlson, Assistant Planning Director
16 Elizabeth M. Hernandez, City Attorney
17 Dona Lubin, Assistant City Manager
18 Martha Salazar-Blanco, representing Building & Zoning
19 Jill Menendez-Duran, Administrative Assistant

18 Also Participating:

19 Charles Siemon, Consultant
20 Matt Barnes
21 Ellie Zachariades

21
22
23
24
25

1 THEREUPON:

2 The following proceedings were had:

3 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Mr. Riel, are we ready
4 to start the meeting?

5 MR. RIEL: Yes.

6 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Jill, if we can have a
7 roll call, please.

8 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Eibi Aizenstat?

9 MR. AIZENSTAT: Present.

10 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Pat Keon?

11 MS. KEON: Present.

12 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Tom Korge?

13 MR. KORGE: Here.

14 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Javier Salman?

15 Michael Tein?

16 MR. TEIN: Present.

17 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Michael Steffens?

18 MR. STEFFENS: Here.

19 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Cristina Moreno?

20 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Here.

21 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Mitch Alvarez?

22 Daphne Gurri?

23 Burton Hersh?

24 MR. HERSH: Here.

25 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Hector Oliva?

1 Don Sackman?

2 MR. SACKMAN: Here.

3 MS. MENENDEZ-DURAN: Natividad Soto?

4 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Are you going to lead
5 the introduction, please?

6 MR. RIEL: Yes, I'm going to make a couple
7 comments, and then I'm going to turn it over to Mr.
8 Siemon.

9 Obviously, we're here this evening for a
10 study session. This is a study session with the
11 Planning & Zoning Board and the Board of Architects.

12 To date, we've completed about four or five
13 public hearings on the issue of single-family
14 limitations on size. We've also solicited input, and
15 actually, we've gone to the Board of Architects and
16 we've also discussed the issue with the Historic
17 Preservation Board.

18 Before you, you have, on the pink pages,
19 comments, the most up-to-date comments, Part 2 and
20 Part 3, on the Zoning Code, and it includes those
21 comments received on single-family limitations. We
22 have put in comments that we've received as of two
23 o'clock this afternoon, so you have the most
24 up-to-date comments. Some of those individuals are
25 also here this evening.

1 The end result of the public hearings that
2 we've had to date resulted in the enactment of
3 interim limitations on the size of single-family
4 homes, which included -- those will go into effect
5 until the time that the final version is adopted, the
6 new regulations regarding single-family are adopted
7 in the Zoning Code, or December 31st of this year,
8 whichever occurs first.

9 Today's session, and I'm using the word
10 study session, is -- the intent of this evening is to
11 get input from the Board of Architects and the
12 Planning & Zoning Board. We've had enough -- a
13 significant amount of input from the public, but Mr.
14 Siemon would like to introduce you to some different
15 opportunities that are available regarding the issue
16 of single-family.

17 We have Dona Lubin here, from the City
18 Manager's Office; Walter Carlson; from the Building &
19 Zoning Department, Martha Salazar-Blanco, in terms of
20 resources from City Staff.

21 What I'd like to do this evening is, I
22 have -- the agenda I have before you is very
23 specific, in terms of time frames. There's a lot of
24 issues we want to cover this evening, and we'd like
25 to try to get you out of here at a reasonable hour.

1 So I'm kind of going to be the gate-keeper,
2 and I'm going to kind of, you know, through this,
3 probably say, "Let's move on to the next issue," and
4 I hate to take that responsibility away from the
5 Chair, but we really would like to just try to get
6 your input on all the issues this evening.

7 We're going to talk about neighborhood
8 character, is the first issue, in Coral Gables,
9 overview of single-family typologies, some variables
10 to consider, and then we're going to look at the
11 neighborhood unit of analysis.

12 The final regulations, or the proposed
13 regulations, will be before the Planning & Zoning
14 Board on August 10th, and that is indicated on the
15 bottom of the agenda. That's the intention, for
16 Staff and the consultants to come back with the
17 regulations, given all the input that we've received
18 to date, as well as what we receive this evening.

19 So, at this point, I'm going to turn it over
20 to Mr. Siemon, of Siemon & Larson, who is going to
21 run the show this evening.

22 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay, before we go on,
23 we're doing this as an informal discussion, without
24 motions, et cetera; right?

25 MR. RIEL: That's correct.

1 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: And I believe several of
2 us think that part of the solution to the oversized
3 home issue is historical. For that reason, why can't
4 we have Dona sitting up here with us?

5 MR. RIEL: It's not a matter of -- I mean,
6 she can certainly sit up here.

7 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: I'd like to invite her
8 to come up and sit with us.

9 MR. RIEL: And we can have Martha come up,
10 as well. I mean, this is informal. You can walk
11 around, whatever. Whatever.

12 MS. LUBIN: I'm here. I mean, I'm --

13 MS. KEON: It would be nice if you join us.

14 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Come and take the hot
15 seat.

16 MS. LUBIN: Is this where I should --

17 MR. SIEMON: I'll stand right behind you.

18 MS. HERNANDEZ: I said -- Did I say
19 anything? No. Hide the note. Okay.

20 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: It's only -- Dona, the
21 only reason I'm asking in particular for you is
22 because we have had several discussions on this, and
23 we on the Board have several times voiced the idea
24 that the solution to some of this is with Historical
25 Preservation. So one of my reasons for inviting you

1 up is so that you jump in whenever you think that
2 there's something Historical Preservation can do --

3 MS. LUBIN: I'll be happy to.

4 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: -- that we're not seeing
5 or that we're not --

6 MS. LUBIN: I appreciate it.

7 MR. RIEL: I apologize, also. The City
8 Manager, David Brown, is here, and also the
9 Vice-Mayor Anderson is here, as well.

10 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Thank you for coming.

11 MR. RIEL: Charlie?

12 MR. SIEMON: Okay.

13 Madam Chairman and Members of the Board, I'm
14 going to start off -- I suggested this session. When
15 we were discussing both the temporary ordinance and
16 then we had a public -- a work support session on the
17 Draft Code, several things became clear to me. One
18 of them is that many of you here weren't here the
19 first time we went through this. Last year, we
20 prepared a draft, went through it, and there were
21 some decisions and directions that were made. Some
22 of the things we talked about have changed since
23 then. Some of the things that we discussed weren't
24 going to happen in the community, have happened in
25 the community, in just the short period we've been

1 working, so what I'd like to do first is to make sure
2 everybody understands what our work program is, so
3 that you understand the problem we're having about
4 the single-family districts.

5 We were hired to rewrite the Code, and the
6 key was rewrite. In most instances, it was expected
7 that we would harmonize, organize, unify, use the
8 same words, et cetera, and improve the efficiency and
9 effect of the Code. We weren't hired to start over
10 with your land use, and in fact, we assumed that most
11 of the substance of the Code would not change.

12 Now, we said -- we told Liz and the Manager
13 and everybody else who would listen to us, that we
14 knew as we started reconfiguring this Code, we were
15 going to expose inconsistencies and gaps and
16 shortfalls, and so there were going to be substantive
17 matters we were going to address. But, by and large,
18 our first task was not to identify all the regulatory
19 problems in the community. It was to reorganize and
20 rewrite the Code.

21 In the time frame that we have worked on
22 this, the first time I raised the subject of
23 redevelopment, expansion and enlargement of homes in
24 front of the P & Z Board, it was generally -- there
25 were many members of the Board at that time who

1 didn't think it was an issue. "Why are we talking
2 about this?" And I said, "Well, I can predict to
3 you" -- I remember very clearly saying -- Michael and
4 Cristina, I know, were there that night -- I said, "I
5 think we're seeing early signs of it, but I can
6 predict to you that the value of this community and
7 the quality of your residential neighborhoods is
8 going to put more and more pressure on the size and
9 the character of the homes that are built in this
10 community."

11 And so my advice, I said then, was we needed
12 to start thinking about, how are we going to protect
13 ourselves?

14 With regard to the single-family districts,
15 we first went through the Code, and we were fairly
16 astonished. You had 18 single-family districts.
17 I've never worked in a community that has 18
18 single-family districts. And then we looked closely
19 at it, and the fact of the matter is, the only thing
20 that's different from those codes -- those districts,
21 from one to another, is the minimum building that's
22 required in each of those districts. The rest of it
23 is really -- is all the same, setbacks, height,
24 volume, all those characteristics.

25 And we said, well, you know, the minimum lot

1 size, minimum building size, was a phenomenon that
2 was of great concern in the '20s, about the quality
3 of the minimum buildings, so that somebody wouldn't
4 put a shack or a trailer or something on a home
5 (sic), but in modern Coral Gables, we forecast that
6 the minimum building area was not going to be the
7 future challenge.

8 And so that led us to say to Eric, we needed
9 to look at the reality of this community, if we were
10 going to change those regulations, we needed to
11 figure out what was really going on in the community,
12 and so we undertook some research, that some of you
13 all have seen, but not all of you have seen it, and I
14 think it's important that, as we go through tonight
15 and now the future steps, that you all see it and
16 understand at least what we've seen.

17 Lastly, before I get into that, I want to --
18 My view, right now, is that while we have a draft,
19 that draft was born out of some policy direction we
20 received about 12 months ago, maybe 13 months ago,
21 from a different Board, for all practical purposes,
22 and that we should not feel constrained to keep
23 working from those ideas, that we need to do in the
24 single-family districts what's right. And we
25 originally said was, we see two broad areas of

1 residential development outside the apartment/
2 multi-family districts. One is what I call Old Coral
3 Gables, and I just jumped to some of the data, but
4 it's this area here, and New Coral Gables, and if you
5 look at this map, which you can't see very well --
6 I'm sorry for that, I'd hoped we'd have better
7 lighting -- these are just sorting, not by zoning
8 districts, not by house sizes, but by lot sizes on
9 which homes are located.

10 As you know, many parts of the community,
11 the old community, are divided into relatively small
12 lots, but homes are built on assemblies of two or
13 three, or two and a half, et cetera. So this
14 reflects the lots may be composed of several
15 different lots. Maybe that one is easier to see.

16 And we went and sorted them in various
17 different categories. This one happens to be below
18 7,500, 7,500 to 10,000, greater than 10,000, and what
19 we found is, there is a remarkable difference in what
20 I call the two Coral Gables, and so we originally
21 recommended that there be two single-family
22 districts, because in this area -- and this is the
23 bottom line of -- I want to explain it to you and
24 take you through it, but the punch line here is, this
25 is not what you see in most cities. In most cities,

1 you see relatively similar districts. You would see
2 five different zones, and the truth is that what we
3 have in the Old City, what I call the Old City --

4 MR. AIZENSTAT: What are the boundaries, I'm
5 sorry, for the Old City?

6 MR. SIEMON: Eric?

7 MR. RIEL: Sunset, north --

8 MR. SIEMON: Really, Sunset and the City
9 limits on this side, and if you look at this, this is
10 what you see in most of our communities, large blocks
11 of similar zoning.

12 But what this shows you, and this shows you,
13 as well, is that there are very few streets, blocks,
14 in the Old City where the lots on which the homes are
15 built, the homes and the lots that they are related
16 to, are identical. In fact, the real richness of
17 these neighborhoods is that they're not identical.

18 You go through the classic complaint about
19 suburban sprawl, is, it's the same home, same lot
20 size, over and over again, and everybody has always
21 extolled the virtues of Coral Gables, but there it is
22 in graphic form.

23 And so, I'm really getting to the bottom
24 line. We have to find out a way to manage change
25 within this environment. If it were all 50-foot lots

1 and all 4,000 or 3,000 or 2,000-square-foot homes,
2 managing change in that template would be relatively
3 easy. We could do it quantitatively, we could do
4 whatever. But the fact of the matter is, the change
5 is in a system where there are five different lot
6 sizes and five different home types and five
7 different sizes in a single block, and there are
8 examples of change that don't fit in, but there are
9 also a lot of ones that do fit in.

10 So that's what we have -- that's what we
11 wrestled with before and that's what we came to
12 understand, and what we did, and I just want to --
13 because I want you to understand, also, with the
14 resources here that are available. We plotted, where
15 are these lots of 7,500 square feet to 10,000? Where
16 are the lots of greater than -- 10 to 12,500? And
17 you can see, and we have them for every category. We
18 did it over and over again, looking for, are there
19 breaks? Are there logical patterns that emerge?

20 And ultimately, we began to sort them, and
21 somewheres -- you didn't put it up. Let's try -- See
22 if the PowerPoint has it. That's the only map we've
23 got?

24 MR. BARNES: No.

25 MR. SIEMON: There's one that shows the --

1 MR. BARNES: Is it the --

2 MR. SIEMON: It's this one that's down, I
3 think, on the floor.

4 No, it's the one I wanted to finish with, I
5 told you.

6 MS. ZACHARIADES: This one over here, then.

7 MR. SIEMON: No. No, it's not.

8 Is this one on it, Matt?

9 We thought this was going to be an informal
10 setting, where we could just hold things up.

11 Yeah, there it is. What we did is, we
12 finally went through and we looked for some way to
13 understand, what are these -- what's really happening
14 in these communities. And what we began to see is
15 that there really are the internal blocks and then
16 these really important roads that have these
17 incredibly important, scenic character to them.

18 MS. HERNANDEZ: Uh-huh.

19 MR. SIEMON: And so the regulatory construct
20 that we originally created was to recognize, first,
21 the old versus the new; second, that these corridors
22 represent extremely important values, probably aren't
23 a separate district, but when a lot sits on those
24 streets, needs to have different standards, because
25 they're different right-of-ways, different

1 characters, et cetera.

2 And then, within these blocks, we had to
3 figure out a way to accommodate change that would
4 balance all the competing interests, so that you
5 wouldn't hit that tip point, or if you did hit that
6 tip point and made a change, it was a conscious
7 choice that that's where you want to go.

8 Now, I have to tell you, all during the time
9 I've been working here, there's a conflicting --
10 there's an undercurrent that we've not been able to
11 come to intellectual comfort with. On one hand, much
12 of the dialogue we've had is about conservation and
13 protection and preservation of what we have. On the
14 other hand, there has been a -- probably not shared
15 at the same time, but in other occasions, stimulated
16 by other subjects we're talking about, an equally
17 strong perspective that we can't stifle the future,
18 we need to be able to adapt and grow and to make
19 these neighborhoods work over time, and that this is
20 not all about historic preservation. There are many
21 resources in there, but one of the things you've got,
22 and we have all these slides, and if you all want to
23 go through them, I'd be glad to, but one of the
24 things I've always marveled about Coral Gables is --
25 first off, your most important thing are your trees

1 in your old town. I mean, they're really a fabulous
2 resource, and if you didn't have them, we'd have some
3 real serious -- we'd have a different community.
4 It's a really important part of the landscape. But
5 there's all kinds of homes, of all kinds of
6 architectural character, all of them -- I think most
7 of them reasonably well and some of them
8 exceptionally well done, and they fit because of
9 diversity, because of their character, because of
10 those things.

11 For a zoner, for somebody who is a planning
12 and zoning expert, that's a nightmare, and all the
13 trouble we're having is because zoning forces
14 uniformity, zoning forces regularity, and what we're
15 really trying to do is respect the diversity we have
16 and develop a system that will, on a legal basis --
17 and if we didn't have a constitution and we didn't
18 have due process, it would be easy, because we can
19 get six people who are good and tried and true and
20 you all can sit around, and I think every time you'd
21 come up with good decisions about what would work.
22 The law doesn't let us do that. There have got to be
23 rules and standards, and you've got to have written
24 things on which you base these decisions, and so
25 that's what we're doing here.

1 So I hope, by this introduction, you
2 appreciate the challenge we have, and then some of
3 the decisions we early on made weren't really --
4 didn't have a policy decision; we just decided -- and
5 I will take the subject that nobody ever wants to
6 talk about, but lot splits. The outcome of that was
7 one that was not a principal decision on policy. It
8 got tired and we dumped it. It's going to continue
9 to be an issue, and it's going to continue to be an
10 issue going both ways --

11 MS. HERNANDEZ: Uh-huh.

12 MR. SIEMON: -- because people are going to
13 come in and some people are going to want to assemble
14 lots and build bigger homes, and some people are not,
15 and so that's really where we are.

16 Can you focus that at all, Matt? No?

17 Okay.

18 Anyway, we have -- so then, from there, we
19 went to this level, and I only brought one of these
20 drawings, but if you look at this, you can see,
21 sorted at a fairly fine grain, in 5,000 -- no, this
22 is 2,500-square-foot increments of lot sizes -- these
23 are not the buildings, these are the lots -- and
24 these show you, just in this part of town, what they
25 look like.

1 And for those who are far away, I apologize,
2 but what we started looking at is, okay, what happens
3 if this lot is proposed to be redeveloped and
4 expanded, or this lot? We began to say, how would we
5 analyze it? How would we try to set up an
6 information system that would allow an applicant to
7 come in and propose, in any one of these blocks --
8 and every one of them is different. Every one has
9 its own character. It's almost as if the standard of
10 compatibility, of appropriateness is -- there has to
11 be one for every one of these areas, because they're,
12 every one of them, different.

13 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Charlie, excuse me.

14 MR. SIEMON: Yes.

15 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: When you have a green,
16 does that mean that there's actually a 50-foot lot
17 house there? Or, what if I have two 50-foot lots, so
18 one hundred -- you know, I'm using the house as a
19 hundred foot?

20 MR. SIEMON: It is the parcel on which the
21 home sits. It may be two 50-foot lots, it may be
22 three, maybe a 50 and a 75. It may be --

23 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: So it's the reality,
24 not the lot?

25 MR. SIEMON: It's the reality, not the

1 plat. It is not the plat. It is the reality of the
2 relationship to structures, to land, and so --

3 MS. KEON: Excuse me, Charlie --

4 MR. SIEMON: Yeah.

5 MS. KEON: -- but where there's a block of
6 green, that's multiple homes that --

7 MR. SIEMON: No, no. That means that there
8 are --

9 MS. HERNANDEZ: Compatible houses.

10 MR. SIEMON: Each one is a home. Each one
11 of these has a home. And we've got some -- we can go
12 to an image and show you -- and the City's GIS has a
13 boundary around the lot on which the home would sit,
14 and that's what the basis for this is, not the
15 Merrick plan. These will show you where they are,
16 and this is probably -- I can't tell you, but
17 probably two lots. But the parcel in our data
18 inventory is just here, and you can see each of
19 these, and we just have these examples.

20 I do want to point out, my comment about the
21 mature vegetation, if you look at the streetscapes
22 and the homes in these areas, there is a direct
23 correlation between areas we all admire and areas
24 that are less -- that could use some improvement.

25 Go ahead, just go through them. You get

1 some areas where there is some more -- but even here,
2 where you've got some lots that line up, three or
3 four of them -- in this case, you have five or six
4 all in a row, on the right side, but you still get --
5 look, here, here. Here on the corner of this,
6 there's quite a diversity, and that is a consistent
7 theme, and it has a lot to do -- it has a lot to do
8 with why it's so difficult to address this, and I
9 would contrast -- we did a project for the Town of
10 Jupiter Island, which is a very affluent -- Hobe
11 Sound, a very affluent area, and they're wrestling --
12 they were wrestling with a monster home project, and
13 while it's a different sort of environment, the bulk
14 of the landscape was relatively uniform, and it was
15 relatively easy to identify what didn't fit in.

16 But, you know, this home is significantly --
17 and its situation is significantly greater than the
18 size of these homes, but yet it all fits in because
19 of a character, so how do we deal -- if these two
20 homes are not the best homes on this street and
21 somebody buys them and wants to tear them down and
22 replace them with a home here, why not? I mean, it's
23 clearly not that kind of home -- that size home is
24 not anathematic to the health and character of the
25 street.

1 Now, if all of these turned into those, if
2 every one of these two-lot associations, I would
3 imagine that there would be a change in character,
4 and that would be noticeable. Whether it would be
5 acceptable or not, I think is something we have to be
6 careful about, because it might be that well-designed
7 larger homes are the future.

8 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: But look at that block
9 over there, one, two, three -- no, down to the
10 left -- one more to the left -- one down.

11 Okay, all of those --

12 MR. SIEMON: Right.

13 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: -- seem to be --

14 MR. SIEMON: Relatively uniform.

15 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: -- large. Yeah, and
16 relatively large --

17 MR. SIEMON: Yeah, and --

18 MS. LUBIN: Do you know what street that is?
19 Do you have any idea?

20 MR. SIEMON: Yeah.

21 MR. STEFFENS: It's off of Blue, north of
22 Miller.

23 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: How do you know that,
24 Michael?

25 MR. SIEMON: He just does.

1 MS. LUBIN: That's Red Road on the left?

2 MR. SIEMON: Yeah, Red Road on the left.

3 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: And then, see that house
4 in that --

5 MR. SIEMON: We didn't put those streets on
6 them.

7 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Charlie, see the house
8 right there on the corner, right above you? That.
9 Okay. That doesn't seem to have any setback on the
10 rear and on the side. How did that --

11 MR. STEFFENS: It's got five feet.

12 MR. SIEMON: Five feet.

13 MR. STEFFENS: On two sides.

14 MR. SIEMON: Five feet at this scale is --

15 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Not noticeable?

16 MR. STEFFENS: It's the angle of the
17 photograph, too --

18 MR. SIEMON: Yeah.

19 MR. STEFFENS: -- doesn't line up with the
20 lot lines.

21 MR. SIEMON: There's only one of these lots
22 which is true. Everything else, these lines are --
23 because you have -- this is a perfect planar drawing
24 that's scaled correctly. All these aerial
25 photographs are off the point, and the further away

1 you go from the center point of the aerial, there's
2 some dislocation.

3 But I can assure you, because we've gone out
4 and checked, that's five feet and this is five feet.
5 We recently went and checked all of the ones that
6 appear this way in the North Ponce area, and they're
7 all five feet. I mean five feet, not five feet one
8 inches, but five feet. But that gives you -- you see
9 what's happened here, is that these two homes have
10 oriented themselves in a way to that.

11 But you also should note, while we have this
12 up here, that a significant number of these buildings
13 do not exploit the full rear yard that they could.
14 Here is one, you notice, of the larger lots, and one
15 of the issues we have identified, if there is a home,
16 say this one, that has not exploited all the FAR
17 that's potential on it, and I don't know whether it
18 has or not, this particular one, you know, where you
19 would put that expansion could have a lot of impact
20 on -- effect on how it affects the neighborhood. If
21 it goes back to this five-foot line, that would be
22 different, but if it was all the way across, it might
23 not be nearly as significant.

24 So you're going to see, when we get to one
25 of the variables that we need to address, is the

1 possibility that -- well, first off, there's a
2 question that's been raised, somebody had raised it
3 recently with the Mayor, we talked about it before,
4 but there's never been any consensus, whether five
5 feet is too small to be a minimum. It is
6 significantly smaller than most communities.

7 MS. LUBIN: You mean, in the rear? You're
8 talking about the rear setback?

9 MR. SIEMON: Yeah, the rear setback is --
10 substantially deviates from it. Now, you know, in
11 many of the discussions, it's really, this is the
12 community character-defining address.

13 This relationship across the back, and I
14 think you raised the subject of this, it really has
15 to do with how the neighbors, the internal function
16 of the homes and the quiet enjoyment of the
17 individual, as opposed to the community character,
18 which has really been the focus, I think, of the
19 prior dialogue we've had.

20 Is there another slide, Matt?

21 And then we've moved down, and you see that
22 things change, and they change very much. And, you
23 know, we get here, if you'll pardon our -- I don't
24 mean to be condescending, but this is a regular,
25 typical subdivision regulatory environment. You need

1 to have some general -- you need setbacks, you need
2 open space requirements, et cetera. But the type --
3 integrated sort of community character that's defined
4 by the composite character of the structures, is very
5 different.

6 This is a series of -- this is sort of like
7 a string of pearls, and each of these homes
8 represents a jewel along that string, as opposed to
9 the older area, where we think the jewel is really
10 the composite character of the street.

11 Anyway, this is the -- was supposed to be,
12 and somebody is going to have to monitor it, because
13 I can't wear a watch because of my -- I have small --
14 my timing --

15 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Eric is in charge of
16 that.

17 MR. SIEMON: Okay.

18 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: He took it away from me.

19 MS. HERNANDEZ: Uh-oh.

20 MR. SIEMON: He'll never hear the end of
21 that.

22 MS. HERNANDEZ: Uh-oh. I think the Chair is
23 not happy with you.

24 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: You're not doing too
25 good a job, Eric.

1 MR. SIEMON: No, I think I've got a lot of
2 time for this first one.

3 MR. RIEL: Yes, you do.

4 MS. LUBIN: Could I ask you a question? I'm
5 sorry.

6 MR. SIEMON: Yeah.

7 MS. LUBIN: Could you go back to this slide,
8 before you get too far away from it, that had -- that
9 has like the patchwork quilt and that you were
10 talking about the special streets?

11 MR. SIEMON: Go back.

12 MS. LUBIN: Did you try --

13 MR. SIEMON: Go back -- hold on. Go back,
14 Matt.

15 MS. LUBIN: Did you try to correlate those
16 streets with the site-specifics that are already in
17 the Zoning Code now?

18 MR. SIEMON: Yes.

19 MS. LUBIN: And was there a correlation?

20 MR. SIEMON: Yes, there is a correlation,
21 and they are -- along these major corridors are
22 places where those site-specific -- there's a
23 predominance, not an exclusive, but a predominance of
24 those site-specifics, and, you know, we --

25 MR. KORGE: Site-specific what?

1 MR. SIEMON: Site-specific regulations, and,
2 you know, we made an attempt -- our first aspiration
3 was to take those site-specific regulations and
4 transform them into uniform standards that could be
5 incorporated in the Code, and we just -- there was
6 too much history, and given the focus on rewriting
7 the Code, as opposed to reinventing the residential
8 districts, we saw taking them from 19 to two or three
9 or four, whatever it was, as an appropriate way of
10 improving the efficiency. I mean, people are

11 bewildered by the Zoning Code. You pick it up the
12 first time --

13 MS. LUBIN: You don't have to tell me. I
14 know.

15 MR. SIEMON: -- and even if you're an
16 accomplished attorney or a planner, and you don't
17 know where you are, and so I think our aspiration was
18 good, we just -- we didn't get engaged in a way that
19 allowed us to do it, in part because we didn't do
20 that.

21 Now I think what's happened is, with the
22 concern about oversized homes and the discussion
23 that's been going on, and frankly, this Board's more
24 increased interest in the big policy issues that are
25 implicit in this, I think that we may have to revisit

1 that and see whether -- and part of why I brought all
2 these resources is, I want you all to know we have it
3 and that if you want to address it, we can address
4 it.

5 And I also want to make sure that everybody
6 understands, in this regard, that there's -- Charlie
7 Siemon doesn't have an agenda here. I'm trying to
8 make sense of it, to help you all make sense of it,
9 put in place a sense of regulations that will endure
10 for 10 or 20 years and let you rationally move
11 forward without these -- every time there's a new
12 proposal, having to sound a fire alarm and trying to
13 deal with it.

14 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Charlie, what is the
15 current code for that green area?

16 MR. SIEMON: First off, most of it is
17 subject to very detailed site-specific regulations,
18 and the reason for that is, they were approved in the
19 County and then came into the City, and basically,
20 all we've done is import those, the plan development
21 approvals, into site-specific regulations, and so the
22 effort to really build a fine-grained ordinance here,
23 I don't think it makes any sense to do that, given
24 the number of site-specific regulations.

25 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Where on there is Gables

1 Estates? Right there, where you had your thing,
2 right?

3 MS. KEON: No, that's Cocoplum.

4 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: That's Cocoplum.

5 MS. LUBIN: That's Cocoplum.

6 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Right there.

7 MR. SIEMON: Yeah. Now, I mean, these
8 regulations have -- Lot 8 has a 25-foot side yard and
9 a 50-foot rear yard, and et cetera. I mean, that's
10 the level of detail that came out of those planned
11 developments, lot by lot, and we think that
12 properly -- if we ultimately get the Code adopted,
13 ultimately get it into a computerized version, where
14 you could actually search your block number, and it
15 would pop up with that site-specific regulation, we
16 can make that efficient.

17 MR. RIEL: Ultimately.

18 MR. SIEMON: I said ultimately. That's not
19 in this contract.

20 MR. RIEL: Three months.

21 MS. LUBIN: But there's also site-specifics
22 on the older section.

23 MR. SIEMON: Right, there are, but some of
24 those make a lot less sense today --

25 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Charlie, what happens

1 now if we adopt these interim regulations today,
2 where you reduce the size of the home? What happens
3 to those site-specific things? Which trumps?

4 MR. SIEMON: Well, the language, I believe,
5 of the regulations is whichever is more restrictive,
6 as it's currently drafted. We have not gone back to
7 the New City, subsequent to the dialogue that you all
8 had, and in that context, part of this overview -- I
9 mean, when we first looked at this curve of FAR, you
10 know, it's the first 5,000 feet, you get a .48. Then
11 you get, for the next 5,000, .35, and then it goes
12 to -- .3, is it, for the rest?

13 MS. LUBIN: Yes.

14 MR. SIEMON: And what you get is this ladder
15 of density, and it exacerbates the possibility of
16 buildings that are out of size, because of that --
17 you know, you reach these thresholds of density, and
18 we actually suggested a -- smooth the curve out, with
19 the contextual analysis to make sure as you expanded
20 and took advantage of that in the smaller lots, and
21 it actually would have, I think, had very little
22 impact on the real expectations in this area, where
23 we judged it to not be a significant problem. We
24 didn't hear many complaints about the size of homes
25 in this area and their being out of character, and we

1 wouldn't expect it, if you go back to that picture
2 map of the New City.

3 MS. KEON: But I think that you will.

4 MR. SIEMON: Well, you might.

5 MS. KEON: I think that it's going to.

6 MR. SIEMON: But -- I'm sure it will, but
7 I've been -- I've seen a lot of communities of this
8 character, where, you know, it starts here, these two
9 lots end up being in a larger home, and it -- because
10 it is -- they're all contemporary, they all have the
11 same sort of -- it really doesn't have the same kind
12 of -- but it may be. I'm not dismissing it.

13 MS. KEON: But I think that in some of the
14 areas, I know that, you know, lots of people, anybody
15 that lives along the water, in any of these
16 communities as we go south, are getting offers for
17 large sums on their homes now, and the other people
18 that live there are concerned, again, about the sizes
19 of the homes that will potentially be built there
20 because of, you know, the setback requirements and
21 whatever else. They're very concerned.

22 MR. SIEMON: I just have to tell you -- I
23 just want to tell you, because that is not something
24 that came up, has not been in any of the public
25 meetings and concerns --

1 MS. HERNANDEZ: Correct.

2 MR. SIEMON: -- as identified areas, as we
3 worked through it.

4 MS. KEON: But I think it's just happening
5 now.

6 MR. SIEMON: Yeah, well, I --

7 MS. KEON: I mean, you know, people I
8 hear -- I mean, over the last week, I've had people
9 tell me that live, like, in Old Cutler Bay, that they
10 are getting offers on their homes, and when they get
11 them, "Oh, my God, I can't believe you'll give me
12 that," and they say it's the land, essentially. They
13 know that it is to knock down the home and to rebuild
14 a much larger home on that site.

15 MR. KORGE: But does that offend the
16 neighbors?

17 MS. KEON: Some of them are very concerned
18 about it, yeah.

19 MR. KORGE: Why?

20 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Because it affects the
21 plats. If they don't allow it, then that's going to
22 reduce whatever they get for their houses.

23 MS. KEON: Yeah, but I think --

24 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: It's a balancing act.

25 MR. SIEMON: That's the natural paradox.

1 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: It's a balancing test.
2 If you want to sell, you want the guy to be able to
3 build as big as he can so he pays you maximum
4 dollars.

5 MS. KEON: Right.

6 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: If you want to live
7 there, you don't want your neighbor to have a huge
8 house.

9 MS. KEON: Right, but I think it's --

10 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: It's a balancing.

11 MS. KEON: Right. But that's a matter of,
12 how do you want that area to grow, what do you want
13 that area to look like? I mean, the concern is, you
14 know, the character of Cocoplum is very, very large
15 homes on not so large lots, and so you decide if
16 that -- do you want to see those areas develop along
17 those lines, and does it make a difference, and does
18 anybody care, and is that a problem, and if it's not,
19 then you let it go.

20 If you say, you know, you'd like to see
21 something where there is a little more open space,
22 and there's more foliage, and there's more whatever,
23 whatever, and you'd like to guide the development of
24 those areas because you have concerns as to how they
25 look and how they work and whatever else, then I

1 think you have to -- then, you know, that becomes the
2 issue that the City has with regard to planning, so
3 that's -- I mean, that's all. I mean, does that make
4 a difference?

5 Does it make a difference, Mr. Siemon?

6 MR. SIEMON: Yes. I mean, obviously, if
7 there's a concern and there's a public policy
8 decision to respond to that concern, it's -- it
9 merits attention.

10 MS. KEON: Right. I mean, so is it our --
11 you know, is it the City's position that everybody
12 should have the opportunity to maximize the value of
13 their lot, irrespective of what it may look like when
14 it's done, or do you somehow guide the development
15 within your community because you want to maintain a
16 certain ambience or look to your community? And I
17 guess that's a policy decision that --

18 MR. AIZENSTAT: At the same time, there are
19 certain areas that merit larger homes, regardless of
20 the value or the price, such as maybe in areas such
21 as this. The concerns that I've been listening to,
22 of the residents that have been coming, is more on
23 the north end, on certain other areas --

24 MS. KEON: Right, because I think that's
25 where it started, because it was more affordable, but

1 I'm going to tell you that, you know, because of the
2 value, the prices people are getting for homes, and
3 the land values and the home values here, you know,
4 what -- you know, you used to think to pay \$100,000
5 for a lot was a lot, and then \$500,000 was a lot, and
6 then, you know, there is that home in -- there's a
7 home in Snapper Creek that was on two lots, that sold
8 for seven million dollars, that they're going to
9 knock them down. They're going to knock down the
10 houses. So they paid seven million dollars for land.

11 So, you know, now that -- you know, I think
12 it will move throughout the City, because of the
13 amount of money that is available for construction
14 and the amount of money that people are willing to
15 pay for homes.

16 MR. AIZENSTAT: I don't know if it will move
17 throughout the City in an even fashion. I think
18 certain areas will always demand it, and it will be
19 there, but in certain areas I don't think it will,
20 and it's determined by supply and demand. As land
21 becomes less scarce (sic) and people want to build
22 their homes and live in certain areas, the only thing
23 they can do is look at homes -- and tear down those
24 homes to have a brand-new home.

25 MS. KEON: But I think that when you look

1 at -- probably the most affluent community in Coral
2 Gables is Gables Estates, the most affluent. They
3 have -- amongst themselves, have employed certain
4 standards, because they have determined how they want
5 that neighborhood to look.

6 MR. AIZENSTAT: Right.

7 MS. KEON: And they don't want the market to
8 drive that. It isn't the market that's driving how
9 that neighborhood looks.

10 MR. KORGE: But I don't think they have a
11 problem with large houses there.

12 MS. HERNANDEZ: Correct.

13 MS. KEON: No, but they have a problem with
14 too large of houses.

15 MS. HERNANDEZ: Do they?

16 MR. KORGE: I don't think so.

17 MS. KEON: They have --

18 MR. AIZENSTAT: I don't --

19 MS. LUBIN: I think they have their own
20 architectural review board.

21 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yeah, they have --

22 MS. LUBIN: Ask Martha.

23 (Simultaneous voices)

24 MS. LUBIN: They have their own
25 architectural review board.

1 MS. KEON: Because they still want to
2 maintain --

3 MR. KORGE: A 12,000-square-foot house in
4 Gables Estates is not unheard of.

5 MS. KEON: No, it's not, but maybe they
6 don't want a 20,000-square-foot house in Gables
7 Estates. I mean, I don't -- but I know that the
8 regulations are in place that still guide the
9 development of those homes.

10 MR. KORGE: Regulations are in place to
11 guide development everywhere in the City. The
12 question is, do we need to change them, and if so,
13 where do we need to change them to prevent houses
14 from -- really, from being on top of each other and
15 making it unpleasant to live there. That's the real
16 issue.

17 MS. KEON: But I think that's an issue
18 throughout the whole City.

19 MR. HERSH: But isn't it, also, the older
20 neighborhoods have a character which, just because of
21 its scale, is more delicate.

22 MS. HERNANDEZ: Uh-huh.

23 MR. HERSH: Whereas these more suburban or
24 whatever types of -- these are the kind of -- these
25 are -- you know, people usually will put walls. You

1 know, it's kind of -- it's not the same walkable,
2 low-scale, delicate community that the older section
3 is, and it really seems to me that the impact is more
4 in these older sections, where it's not as
5 important -- not that it doesn't have to be
6 regulated, but to me, it's just, the real issues are
7 more in the older neighborhoods that are more -- just
8 delicate.

9 MR. STEFFENS: I think Pat's comment about
10 Cocoplum was very telling, because you said Cocoplum
11 is really big houses on not really big lots, as
12 opposed to, most of these other areas we're talking
13 about, like Gables Estates, the lots are
14 substantially bigger than Cocoplum. Hammock Lakes
15 and all the other more southern communities down
16 there have lots that are substantially bigger than
17 Cocoplum, and even when you max out the FAR that you
18 can build on those lots --

19 MS. KEON: It's still --

20 MR. STEFFENS: -- you still have a lot of
21 space around your building.

22 MR. KORGE: Exactly.

23 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: See, to me, one of the
24 problems that I had with the interim regulations is
25 that they drastically addressed the big home, where I

1 didn't see such a big problem, and left untouched the
2 50-foot lots, where all the neighbors are coming in,
3 complaining about the problems.

4 MR. KORGE: Right.

5 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: So it seems to me that
6 with our limited resources, and at least my concern
7 about rendering too many homes nonconforming, if we
8 could focus on the North Gables and leave these
9 communities as they are, until we hear from those
10 architectural boards and those architectural review
11 committees as to whether they need regulation, we
12 might have a more focused discussion, rather than
13 trying to, at least for me, address the problem of
14 not rendering all of Cocoplum nonconforming, which I
15 think we were doing, to try to fix a problem that we
16 weren't fixing in the North Gables.

17 MR. STEFFENS: I agree with your comments,
18 Cristina, but my concern is for the little lots, that
19 we don't put so much restrictions on them that there
20 is only one or two forms of houses that --

21 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: I agree with that.

22 MR. STEFFENS: -- allow to you take
23 advantage of what you're allowed to do, and we end up
24 with this cookie-cutter --

25 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: No, I'm not suggesting

1 that we --

2 MR. STEFFENS: -- form that just gets
3 extrapolated all over every lot in the Northern
4 Gables.

5 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: All I'm -- I'm not
6 suggesting that we do that. All I'm suggesting --
7 I'm sorry, if we do adopt anything in particular
8 about the North Gables, all I'm suggesting is that we
9 limit our discussion right now, excluding what
10 Charlie has called the New City. Let's not deal with
11 the New City. Let's deal with the Old City, and when
12 the --

13 MR. KORGE: The Old City, and also eliminate
14 the corridors of the special interests that require
15 additional separate treatment, because they're
16 different in character from the Old City itself.

17 MS. LUBIN: You're talking about the street.

18 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: And then let's focus our
19 discussion on that area --

20 MS. LUBIN: You're talking about the street
21 that --

22 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: -- and what solutions we
23 can come up with for that area.

24 MS. LUBIN: (Overlapping) -- the site
25 specifics, so that's -- if they were taken care of by

1 the site-specifics somehow, then you all could
2 concentrate on the stuff in between, you know, that
3 have all the different sizes.

4 MR. RIEL: I'm sure it would be a challenge
5 to try to change the site-specifics, because that was
6 part of the negotiations for the annexation, so --

7 MS. LUBIN: Yeah, but --

8 MR. RIEL: -- that, in itself, would be very
9 difficult.

10 MS. LUBIN: -- I don't think it's
11 necessary --

12 MR. RIEL: And as Charlie indicated, they're
13 so specific that they have different setbacks for
14 different lots and different locations.

15 MS. KEON: Right, but that's in the New
16 City.

17 MR. RIEL: Right, that's where it is.

18 (Simultaneous voices)

19 MS. LUBIN: But what we're talking about is
20 those corridors in the old --

21 MR. KORGE: The old part, those corridors,
22 those special corridors in the old part of the City.

23 MS. KEON: Right, like North Greenway and
24 South Greenway and Granada.

25 MR. KORGE: So if we focus on where the

1 biggest part of the problem is, and then the north
2 end, where the smaller lots predominate, maybe we can
3 address that problem and actually get something
4 accomplished, instead of trying to, you know, fit
5 everything into one size fits all, which may delay
6 this indefinitely. I mean --

7 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: That's my suggestion.

8 MR. KORGE: And then let me just -- let me
9 interject that that's where I thought you were headed
10 last time when we met on this and we voted initially
11 for the interim regulations to isolate the different
12 areas so we could address each one separately. So I
13 agree with it. I think it's the most expeditious way
14 and probably the most efficient way to address this
15 and actually see some real positive results.

16 MR. AIZENSTAT: In the new Building Code,
17 wasn't it set up as, or wasn't it trying to be set up
18 as, two, Single-Family 1 and Single-Family 2? And
19 how are you dividing 1 from 2?

20 MR. SIEMON: New and old.

21 MR. AIZENSTAT: So you are taking a look at
22 what we're talking about, Number 1 being, let's say,
23 the north --

24 MR. SIEMON: Well, as it was originally
25 drafted, it really responded to -- ultimately, this

1 draft which I showed you was down here, and that the
2 green south and -- was SF 2 --

3 MR. AIZENSTAT: Right.

4 MR. SIEMON: -- and the area to the north
5 was SF 1, and then within the SF 1 were the special
6 corridor treatments.

7 MR. AIZENSTAT: That's what I'm actually
8 hearing from my fellow Board members, at this point.

9 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: See, to me, I think we
10 need to start focusing on SF 1, come to a conclusion
11 on SF 1, and then see if we need to address SF 2,
12 because everything we do for SF 1 then creates a
13 problem for the people in SF 2.

14 So let's just focus on 1, address it, and --
15 you know, part, I think, of what you were saying,
16 Charlie, that I agree with, variety is part of the
17 beauty of the North Gables, and I don't want to end
18 up with, you know, a townhouse community where
19 everything looks the same in Coral Gables. That
20 takes away from the richness of what we have.

21 So I guess because I'm a lawyer and not an
22 architect and I don't see it, I'd like to listen to
23 what the architects have to suggest about how to
24 address the oversized issue and what are possible
25 solutions to the problems that people are seeing.

1 And, you know, we've heard from people, you know, the
2 public, that has said to us, you know, "Maybe you
3 need to look at setbacks," but I know that members of
4 the Board and several architects have come up and
5 spoke to us and said, "Setbacks isn't everything." I
6 remember Jorge Hernandez saying to us, "I can design
7 a 2,400-square-foot home that doesn't impact a
8 neighbor, it's just a question of how you design it."

9 So, if we could just focus on that area and
10 hear some discussion of solutions, I think maybe led
11 by you, if you've thought about it, Charlie, and then
12 open it up for discussion, or if you haven't thought
13 about it -- I'm throwing your agenda off, Eric,
14 but --

15 MR. SIEMON: No, I think that that's exactly
16 what we have thought about. The next subject that we
17 really want to talk about is that it really is -- and
18 Matt, if you could just go to the pictures we have of
19 homes, and these are here -- they are not here for
20 any specific -- we're not targeting anything as good,
21 bad or indifferent, but what we tried to do -- we
22 always try to step back and look at things sort of as
23 an outsider, from afar, and what we did, it was just
24 collect pictures from every source as we could get,
25 and what I think you're going to -- what you see here

1 is this remarkable sense of individuality of each
2 home. There are common elements, the barrel roof,
3 the nature of the windows, but the kinds of roofs,
4 the angles, there is just -- and here, right in the
5 middle of it, is a relatively ordinary suburban
6 community home.

7 But what we began to try to say is, what's
8 the standard by which a new home ought to be judged?
9 And, you know, a lot of architects --

10 Go back to that last drawing. A lot of
11 architects have drawn all kinds of typologies of
12 your -- as models, but if every -- there are a
13 couple -- if every home on the street looked this
14 way, it would not be the community that you have
15 today.

16 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Uh-huh.

17 MR. SIEMON: And so what we tried to do is,
18 we tried to pull the elements of this -- not a full
19 wall across, the fact that you have a room, a part of
20 the building that's set back where the entrance is
21 located. The varying heights, I think, is an
22 important part. If you look in these pictures, we
23 start seeing the variability of height, and when we
24 see the buildings we don't like, guess what? We
25 start seeing a very common roof structure that has

1 a -- here it is -- and some of it is almost fake, but
2 yet it fits.

3 Go on, Matt.

4 So, you know, as we went through this, there
5 is -- we start seeing common elements. Here is even
6 a relatively contemporary building. Again, we have
7 this vertical displacement, and part of this, I want
8 to make -- Go back, go back.

9 Part of this is that this is a home that
10 does not exploit a hundred percent of the building
11 envelope. But as this property gets more valuable,
12 if this home gets obsolete and is replaced, there is
13 going to be a significant, a powerful economic desire
14 to exploit all of that, and these are the unused
15 portions of that envelope there, and how we deal with
16 that is really -- and so one of the things we looked
17 at was, as you go up the FAR scale, and we picked
18 .35 --

19 MR. STEFFENS: Charlie, you're saying that's
20 not exploiting the building envelope by building to
21 the front setback.

22 MR. SIEMON: Right.

23 MR. STEFFENS: But they might have pushed
24 the volume of the building all the way to the back
25 setback.

1 MR. SIEMON: I just happen to know that this
2 one didn't.

3 MR. STEFFENS: It doesn't take --

4 MR. SIEMON: It doesn't.

5 MR. STEFFENS: -- full advantage of the FAR?

6 MR. SIEMON: It doesn't take advantage of
7 the full FAR that's there. You could add some to
8 this home.

9 MR. STEFFENS: But with a house of that
10 appearance, that could have easily taken full
11 advantage of the full envelope.

12 MR. SIEMON: Oh, absolutely. You could.

13 MR. STEFFENS: But that one didn't.

14 MR. SIEMON: They don't, unfortunately.

15 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay, but let's take a
16 house like this, that's not historical. Don't we
17 want to allow these people to, you know, improve
18 their house or make it bigger, if they need more
19 space for their children, and doesn't that, some of
20 that, depend on where it's located and what its
21 neighbors are?

22 MR. SIEMON: Exactly. What I was just about
23 to say, what we said was, we began to see a
24 threshold. When the home on the lot is above about
25 .35, you begin to ask more questions about whether

1 this will fit in. And remember that if we're in a
2 lot size above 5,000 square feet, we're moving
3 towards an average. Now we're averaging .48 with
4 .35, and we're moving the density down.

5 As you get up closer towards .4, the issues
6 about compatibility, does it fit in, begin to get
7 more and more sharp, and so what we suggested is that
8 there would be -- that if it's below .35, you don't
9 really -- it doesn't need to be evaluated, because
10 the probabilities that it's going to be adverse to a
11 neighbor would be relatively small, and we did a
12 whole series of just line drawings of examples of how
13 that could be expressed, to try to illustrate that.

14 But once you got -- go beyond that, then it
15 seems -- it would seem to us that these questions
16 that you've asked, how can we allow them to grow this
17 building, replace this building, and in the context
18 of where it's located, with the neighbors, and let
19 them take advantage of their property rights but also
20 protect and potentially enhance the value of the
21 neighborhood, and that is the -- was the
22 philosophical grounding of the district that we
23 produced in the original draft.

24 And we were not -- as I said, we proposed
25 that the curve -- I should really draw it, because

1 it's -- you know, we wanted to slightly increase
2 the -- if this were the floor area ratio, we wanted
3 to -- and the existing curve is sort of like this, we
4 wanted to do this, because when we surveyed the
5 homes, they're all below this, in the big lot areas.
6 And so our belief was that we could preserve their
7 rights and expectations and -- but on the smaller
8 homes, at that end of the FAR, it had a big impact.

9 But, you know, we did an analysis. It
10 didn't -- it wasn't magic, it was what we saw, and
11 we're going to have to revisit that, because if you
12 decide to have some home -- some development in old
13 town take place without really rigorous review, and
14 some of the things -- you know, one of the reasons,
15 one of the things we ended up is, you all, those who
16 were here, know that we ended up saying, when you
17 make a decision about this home on this street, you
18 need to look at this neighborhood and make a
19 judgment, comparing it to that, what we call the
20 context, you know, and the problem is, collecting the
21 information to make that contextual analysis requires
22 some effort on behalf of the applicant, and so we
23 don't want to impose those efforts to collect the
24 information about the size and, you know, the
25 dimensions, et cetera, although it's going to get

1 cheaper pretty quickly.

2 There is something that I think the City may
3 want to consider doing, at some time in the future,
4 but -- so if you're under that threshold, whether
5 it's .35 or .4 or whatever it is, it ought not to
6 require that contextual analysis, because the
7 probability of inconsistency is relatively small.

8 It's still going to go through the
9 Architectural Review Board. It's whether there is a
10 broader planning context that needs to be observed.

11 MR. TEIN: Charlie, I wonder whether one of
12 the problems that we're having is a conceptual one in
13 defining the problem. We are trying to find a
14 solution to a problem that I think, if you asked
15 everyone sitting around this table and back there, we
16 would come up with a lot of different answers as to
17 what just the problem was.

18 This house is a good example of an issue
19 that our Board has been grappling with, whether to a
20 large extent this isn't a design issue that is one of
21 architecture or one that really is more -- that can
22 be addressed by our Board, Planning & Zoning, and
23 this house is a good example because, if you look at
24 the right-hand side of this house, this is a house
25 that the neighbors -- well, let's say this is a house

1 that folks that are concerned about setbacks would be
2 possibly concerned about, because the setback issue
3 is one of light and air, and they say, "I don't want
4 you too close to my side of the house."

5 The question of FAR is -- this house would
6 fit in just fine, but the question is, how much would
7 it impact on the neighbors? Folks who are concerned
8 about setbacks and light and air, and want the 50 and
9 100-square-foot lots regulated in the North Gables,
10 this house would probably pass muster on FAR, but it
11 does, as a matter of just practical reality, the
12 design of it, impact the neighbor on the right-hand
13 side.

14 MR. KORGE: Certainly the second story
15 does.

16 MR. TEIN: And so, you know, let's say I
17 say, well, I want more strict regulations on
18 setbacks, I'm not bothered by the house coming
19 forward on this street, but look where it already is
20 on the right-hand side. So this brings me back to
21 the issue of, number one, what is the problem that
22 we're really focused on in the North Gables? Is it
23 side setbacks, rear setbacks? Is it total volume of
24 it, of the house, vis-a-vis the property? It
25 probably isn't total volume of the house, vis-a-vis

1 property, because folks don't care as much, as in
2 your comments in the first five minutes, about the
3 house being built up a little bit more and putting
4 another room in the front of this house, but if you
5 were to increase the height on the right-hand side or
6 move that right-hand side over a little bit or build
7 up the left-hand side, you would impact the neighbor.
8 So maybe it is --

9 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: I think that point that
10 you're making is great on a two-story house, because
11 I think a two-story house has more impacts on the
12 side setback than a one-story house. If you have a
13 one-story house and you've got a one-story house next
14 to it, it doesn't really bother you that there's only
15 10 feet between your properties, because you've got a
16 wall there, but if you've got a one-story house and
17 all of a sudden this guy is shadowing over you, then,
18 you know, perhaps one of the things we need to say
19 is, if you've got a two-story house, you've got to
20 have more setback, at least at the two-story level.

21 MR. TIEN: Right, and that's --

22 MR. AIZENSTAT: You're talking about a
23 step-back?

24 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Yeah, so that -- because
25 this house -- I don't know what's not here, because

1 you don't have the picture, but certainly if the
2 house to the right is a one-story Old Coral Gables
3 house, building this house has totally shadowed it.
4 So perhaps one of the issues, from what Michael is
5 saying, he's saying, "Hey, you know, if you've got a
6 two-story house, you've got to have a bigger setback,
7 at least on the second story."

8 MR. KORGE: Well, that's what Dennis's
9 proposal, interim proposal, was designed to do, to
10 force, you know, step-backs and all these design
11 changes in return for getting back the FAR that
12 you're losing, and we discussed this and I'd asked
13 the question, "Well, why don't we just make it
14 mandatory, if that's what we want to assure," and the
15 consensus was, "Well, we don't want to make it
16 mandatory."

17 MR. STEFFENS: Could we go back several
18 slides?

19 MR. BARNES: Sure.

20 MR. STEFFENS: Keep going. Keep going.
21 Going, going, going. There. We have a two-story
22 house, and I will bet my bottom dollar that the left
23 side of that two-story house is two and a half feet
24 from the property setback, from the property line.

25 Now, is it worse to be a one-story house

1 next to this house, which is two and a half feet from
2 the property, or is it worse to be a house next to
3 that other house, that's five feet or six feet or
4 seven or eight feet from the property line?

5 MR. KORGE: It depends on what's on your
6 side of the lot.

7 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: I still think that --

8 MR. KORGE: I mean, here there's a carport.

9 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Even though I like this
10 house, because I like Old Spanish, if my little
11 one-story house was sitting right there under two and
12 a half stories, I still wouldn't like this house
13 being built there, because it takes away all my light
14 and air.

15 MR. STEFFENS: But the Code -- before they
16 changed the Code to five feet, the setback was two
17 and a half feet.

18 MR. SIEMON: It's a pretty narrow lot, in
19 this particular area.

20 MR. STEFFENS: And there's a driveway on the
21 right-hand side.

22 MS. KEON: But I thought it would be on the
23 right side, where there's a carport, that the carport
24 could encroach into that setback, but I thought -- so
25 many feet, but this one, where there's no carport,

1 where there's just a wall, I thought that one had to
2 be the seven feet or something; if this one was the
3 two feet, then this one had to be --

4 MS. LUBIN: Now it does, but in the '20s and
5 '30, when they were building, there were a lot of
6 houses that were built at two and a half feet, and in
7 fact, there were garages that were right on the
8 property line.

9 MS. KEON: Right, the garages were, but
10 not --

11 MS. LUBIN: Also, the main residence.

12 MS. KEON: The house itself?

13 MS. LUBIN: Yeah, they had. I think there's
14 also an issue, since you asked me up here -- you can
15 just tell me to go sit down when I've said too
16 much -- but I think there's also an issue on height
17 of residence, overall height of residence, because
18 when you're talking about floor area, you're talking
19 about two dimensions, and that's it. You're talking
20 about -- you're not talking about the height of
21 anything. You're just talking about, you know,
22 floor, and you could have a 5,000 square foot house
23 that's 28 feet or something, but you can build to a
24 maximum now of 34 feet, and I know for the
25 neighborhood that I live in, a 34-foot house is out

1 of scale, because there's one across the street from
2 me, and they could easily have done a house that's
3 lower, and it would have been more in keeping with
4 the neighborhood and still had the square footage and
5 FAR and max it out. So I think that's something
6 else.

7 MR. KORGE: Do we have any examples of the
8 problem homes, of the homes that people have been
9 complaining vociferously about?

10 MS. LUBIN: We have a list of them. Mr.
11 Riel has a list of homes.

12 MR. KORGE: No, do we have any pictures of
13 them, so we can get a feel on it?

14 MR. RIEL: We have asked for that, and I'm
15 a little apprehensive about putting a photograph of
16 that home --

17 MR. KORGE: Oh, yeah.

18 MR. RIEL: -- up for public display.

19 MR. SIEMON: Does anybody in this room own
20 this house?

21 MS. HERNANDEZ: No.

22 MR. TEIN: Well, the Fryers had included, in
23 their comments from two meetings ago, pictures of
24 some of the houses that are -- that some folks on one
25 side of this have found objectionable, and, you know,

1 a lot of times when you look at some of these houses,
2 like if you go back to the one that Michael Steffens
3 has pointed out, the Old Spanish, this -- and I'm not
4 familiar with this house, but I'm assuming that is an
5 Old Spanish, and it is a historic home, and the
6 question is, could it be built today? And if the
7 answer to that question is no, then we have to define
8 the problem better.

9 MS. LUBIN: Right. That's right.

10 MR. TEIN: And while I know that if you look
11 at this house which is on Page 6, which is not sold,
12 in the Comments Part 3 -- Comments Part 2, that is --
13 the only reason I say it hasn't sold is because that
14 was a comment that was made when we had public
15 comment last time on this. I don't know it for a
16 fact, but I think that's right. That is a house that
17 has design elements that seem not to fit in with the
18 neighborhood, but it appears to be a design problem,
19 not necessarily one that is a zoning and planning
20 problem, because look at that house that you have
21 right in front of us. That is a historic home that
22 fits in with -- according to Number 1 of your agenda,
23 it fits in with the character of the neighborhood,
24 and Coral Gables would want to encourage a home like
25 that, but you couldn't build that home, with that

1 sheer wall, and there's no setback of the different
2 elements of the house, there's no difference in
3 forward, backwards, and there's no horizontal design
4 difference. Those are the types of design elements
5 that, what Tom was referring to, you get trade-offs
6 now for, and we want to encourage. This house has a
7 couple of them. There's a little grillwork and a
8 little balcony, but other than that, I could see this
9 house not being able to be built today.

10 So the question I say is, we need to define
11 the problem better before we try to answer with a
12 solution.

13 MR. SIEMON: Matt, do you want to go through
14 the rest of these we mentioned? I don't know how
15 many are left.

16 Go back to that slide. There are two
17 two-story buildings, side by side. The shadow line,
18 air and space is almost nonexistent. And again,
19 it's -- while the character of the structure, I
20 suspect, has enormous to do with what you're
21 willing -- what the resident is willing to
22 accommodate when he makes his housing choice, our
23 challenge is to identify, if this home were to be
24 demolished, if it's not a historic structure, and
25 replaced, what if any regulations -- should this now,

1 then, have a wider setback at that point, to create
2 more openness, spacing between the buildings, a
3 bigger gap for sunlight and air?

4 Those are the kinds of things we have to
5 look at, because we know that outside the historic
6 district -- historic landmark buildings, there's
7 going to be pressure on these structures, given the
8 value that's going up and up, and I can show you a
9 lot of communities -- West Palm Beach, where I grew
10 up, this is the classic style of a home that we had
11 in Old West Palm Beach. They are now prized, the
12 ones that survived, the few that survived, but for a
13 long time they were not valued, and they were
14 demolished and replaced with very regular homes.

15 MS. LUBIN: I need to point out that this
16 home would not be allowed to be demolished, even if
17 it weren't historically -- not historically
18 designated. It was probably built in the 1920s --

19 MR. SIEMON: Because it's eligible?

20 MS. LUBIN: Because it's eligible for
21 listing. However, it's also probably 20, 22 feet
22 tall, and if something like that, that isn't
23 historically significant, were developed, they could
24 build something that's 14 feet taller than that now.
25 That's huge.

1 MS. HERNANDEZ: Right.

2 MS. LUBIN: 34, that's huge --

3 MS. KEON: I think it's the height --

4 MS. LUBIN: -- in a lot like that, in a
5 small lot.

6 MS. KEON: -- of that building and the
7 change in the roof line as it goes across, and all of
8 those architectural elements, that make that so much
9 more palatable than a box.

10 MR. STEFFENS: I think another thing that's
11 a major, significant difference between this and the
12 yellow house that we were talking about before is, in
13 many of the historic houses, or the older houses,
14 there's no overhang in these roofs, so the appearance
15 of the mass is substantially smaller, even though the
16 mass might be the same.

17 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: To me, the most
18 significant difference is, this is a carport, instead
19 of a garage sticking out that's the first thing you
20 see.

21 MS. HERNANDEZ: Right.

22 MS. LUBIN: Right.

23 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: That -- whatever we did
24 in our Code that promoted people sticking their
25 garages out front --

1 MS. LUBIN: I can tell you what that is.

2 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: It's just that it gets
3 half a credit for FAR.

4 MS. LUBIN: That's right.

5 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: It really -- How did
6 that happen?

7 MS. LUBIN: So, when that was put in,
8 everything became garages.

9 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: That's something I think
10 we need to change.

11 MR. AIZENSTAT: How does the City treat --

12 MR. STEFFENS: Carports (inaudible).

13 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Uh-huh, that's what I
14 would do.

15 MR. AIZENSTAT: -- balconies that are into
16 the setback? How does that work, if you have, let's
17 say, a second-story balcony that protrudes out over
18 the top?

19 MR. STEFFENS: You can project a certain
20 percentage with an overhang or balcony.

21 MR. AIZENSTAT: So, let's say, within the
22 five-foot setback, you can project --

23 MR. STEFFENS: Project like 16 or 18 inches.

24 MR. AIZENSTAT: Only 16 or 18 inches?

25 MS. LUBIN: Is that right, 16 or 18?

1 MR. AIZENSTAT: Which would be about the
2 same as --

3 MR. SIEMON: In the side yards.

4 MS. LUBIN: I'm asking Martha, behind you.
5 18 inches?

6 MR. STEFFENS: Martha would know. What is
7 it? In the five-foot setback, how far could you
8 project?

9 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: Through the overhang?

10 MR. STEFFENS: Yeah.

11 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: Two and a half.

12 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Martha, do you want to
13 come and take a seat up here?

14 MR. STEFFENS: About two and a half feet.

15 MS. LUBIN: Two and a half? And what about
16 the -- and what about the --

17 MR. AIZENSTAT: I thought it was about three
18 feet, actually.

19 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Martha, do you want to
20 come and take this other seat up here?

21 MR. RIEL: Come on down.

22 MS. LUBIN: Yeah, she's very good.

23 MS. HERNANDEZ: Yes, she is.

24 MS. LUBIN: She's not happy right now, but
25 she's good.

1 MS. HERNANDEZ: Smile.

2 MS. LUBIN: I didn't say anything.

3 MR. SIEMON: I just -- I want to go back to,
4 the purpose here today is to get some direction so
5 that we can -- whether it's clearly defining what the
6 issue is or some policy direction, we need to
7 understand where you all want to go in this draft, as
8 a basis for the next iteration of what we've drafted.

9 Are there any more slides on this, Matt?

10 MR. BARNES: A few more.

11 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Can you go back one?

12 MR. BARNES: Yeah. One more?

13 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: One more.

14 Dona, let's say that that house is
15 historical. How much can they add to that? Anything
16 they want up, to the maximum FAR?

17 MS. LUBIN: Absolutely.

18 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Or do they have to
19 preserve the historic character?

20 MS. LUBIN: They have to preserve the
21 historic character of it, but they can add as much
22 area as what is allowed by Code.

23 MR. AIZENSTAT: Within the envelope.

24 MS. LUBIN: The difference -- yeah, the
25 difference is that they -- no, but they can do an

1 addition. You can put as much on a historic home as
2 you can on a home that's not designated as historic.
3 The difference is, there's an extra --

4 MR. SIEMON: But you've got to get a
5 certificate of appropriateness.

6 MS. LUBIN: Right, and there's an additional
7 layer of review. They have to go in front of the
8 Historic Preservation Board, and a lot of times they,
9 you know, say, "Well, no, you can't do that, you have
10 to set it back," you know, and so it's -- it
11 actually, although architects are not happy,
12 sometimes, when they go before the Preservation
13 Board, because it's more bureaucracy, they help.
14 They end up with a better end result.

15 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: They don't want that.
16 It's like a --

17 MR. KORGE: A more harmonious design, that's
18 commensurate with the character of a historic home.

19 MS. LUBIN: That's right.

20 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay, but let's say I
21 wanted to --

22 MS. LUBIN: That's right. Very good.

23 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: -- add a second story to
24 that. Can I do that?

25 MR. SACKMAN: To that existing --

1 MS. LUBIN: You can do it, but it would have
2 to be towards the back, so that piece is retained, or
3 to the side or something.

4 MR. SACKMAN: Do an addition to the
5 right-hand side or --

6 MS. LUBIN: You would have to -- You could
7 do an addition to it that's a two-story addition to a
8 single story, but it would have to be done in such a
9 way that that integrity of that piece is retained.

10 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: I could add -- where
11 the chimney is, I could add a two-story addition?

12 MR. STEFFENS: No.

13 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Why? Because the
14 chimney is there?

15 MR. STEFFENS: Because it would affect the
16 integrity of that --

17 MS. LUBIN: Right, the chimney is a
18 character-defining piece, so --

19 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay. But let's say
20 that chimney wasn't there, that was just a plain
21 wall.

22 MS. LUBIN: You could possibly put a
23 two-story addition. What they really look at is the
24 front facade of the building.

25 MR. SACKMAN: There's a home on Coral Way,

1 on the north side of Coral Way, where -- that's
2 historic, where an addition is being built on the
3 west side. I assume that was well received and --

4 MS. LUBIN: Yeah.

5 MR. SACKMAN: -- appears to be coming out
6 very nice.

7 MS. LUBIN: And there's a home on Granada
8 that was a tiny little one-story, or maybe a
9 two-story home, that has a huge addition in the back
10 of it, that maxed out on FAR --

11 MR. HERSH: That little --

12 MS. LUBIN: -- and it's really wonderful,
13 but now it's maxed out, and now you can see the
14 historic piece and there's a courtyard in the back of
15 it, so that --

16 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Yeah, I just wanted to
17 understand how the historic works.

18 MS. KEON: Do you look at, then, the
19 relationship of all of those elements, just like that
20 one, that part to the, like, entryway part to
21 whatever? I mean --

22 MS. LUBIN: We do. We look at that, and we
23 also require the applicants, if they're doing a large
24 addition, to provide -- and we also go out and
25 photograph the houses on either side and across the

1 street so that they know within a context --

2 MS. KEON: Is there a mathematical
3 correlation between those numbers? I mean, is it a
4 half, is it a third? I mean, is there any -- there's
5 nothing to it that balances that?

6 MS. LUBIN: No, there's no formula that we
7 go by. There may be a formula, but we don't go by
8 it.

9 MS. KEON: Well, you know --

10 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: I think part of the
11 problem, or not problem, but one of the things we
12 have to balance -- I know, in my neighborhood,
13 there's a house on a corner that's clearly larger
14 than the rest of the neighborhood, but you know what?
15 It replaced a house that was totally delapidated, you
16 know, so this house is a little bigger than
17 everything else, but to me, it was an enhancement of
18 my neighborhood, because it took a rundown house that
19 had no architectural significance and it's replaced
20 it with, yes, a larger than the neighborhood style
21 house, but it's a nice house. So, you know, some of
22 what we're doing involves some balancing, because you
23 don't want to disincentivize the replacement of those
24 small, not architecturally significant houses that
25 exist in the North Gables.

1 There's several on Alhambra proper that we
2 would be well served if those houses were knocked
3 down and replaced by either a single house on two
4 lots or, you know, bigger houses.

5 MS. LUBIN: Uh-huh.

6 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: So that's part of the
7 balancing that we need to do.

8 MR. KORGE: Unfortunately, we haven't given
9 Charlie a whole lot of guidance.

10 MS. KEON: Can I ask you -- I mean, I know I
11 brought up this mapping study that was done before,
12 that Michael had some concerns about. Have you
13 looked at this?

14 MR. SIEMON: Oh, yes, ma'am.

15 MS. KEON: And what do you think of it?

16 MR. SIEMON: Oh, I think it's a useful piece
17 of information, but we've focused -- we've not
18 focused on building typologies as much as elements,
19 because as we --

20 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Wait, define that.
21 That's Greek to me.

22 MR. SIEMON: Okay, let's go to the next
23 slide.

24 We took these things and we sat down --
25 these are just some other -- we started drawing these

1 sketches from what we saw in those pictures, to try
2 to understand, what are the elements that make things
3 good, bad or indifferent, whether it's the nature of
4 the roofing, where the garage is located to the
5 front, and all we did was go through, over and over,
6 taking the element of where's the garage, where's the
7 front door, what's the nature of the roof, is it all
8 single height, is it multiple height -- those are
9 elements that make up the character -- to see if we
10 could find things that were variable, that produced
11 differing results, more or less acceptable results,
12 and for example, one of the ones that we
13 identified is -- there's a whole series of slides
14 here, and they're just here to tell you that we --
15 that we went through all kinds -- we modeled, okay,
16 what's the difference if someone takes -- forget the
17 landscape for a minute, if someone acquires these
18 three lots and builds this home to the maximum FAR,
19 what does that do to this street, compared to, move
20 the building up, move the parking -- the garage back.

21 We concluded that there is a correlation
22 from where the garage is, that when the garage is
23 equal to or behind the facade, it is superior.

24 MS. KEON: But that's what they do. That's
25 what --

1 MR. SIEMON: I understand, but they call it
2 a building -- they called it a specific building.
3 But we're not significantly -- we draw, I think,
4 different regulatory conclusions, maybe, than they
5 do, but we identify those things, and we just looked,
6 and every one of these represents a different -- this
7 one is set back further. It's the same building as
8 this one, but it's set back further, and what you
9 start and you get -- and then we put shadows on
10 these, to see what they're really doing, and we just
11 broke them down to what are the elements, and what
12 this was intended to be was an inventory of
13 elements -- go back one -- of things -- These things
14 help a lot.

15 There are very few buildings that have this
16 kind of carport, that aren't very attractive, in this
17 community, because it gives air and light.

18 MR. HERSH: They've all been enclosed.

19 MR. SIEMON: Yeah, they've been closed, but
20 where it's open, it changes the whole character. But
21 we penalize them, because if you put something above
22 this, that's useful, you have to count it, a half of
23 it, as FAR, but it's --

24 MR. STEFFENS: They count it as a whole.

25 MR. SIEMON: It doesn't make any sense as

1 all.

2 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: You count that carport
3 the same as an enclosed garage, which to me means
4 you're encouraging the enclosed garage.

5 MR. SIEMON: Exactly, so -- but I'm not
6 trying to make any -- what I'm trying to say is, this
7 is what we did. We started looking at, what are the
8 elements? This is a roof structure, whatever its
9 angle, that mitigates a heck of a lot, and -- next.

10 I mean, we just went through, looking at
11 everything, I mean, and we went over and over again.
12 Some of them are for homes, some are -- We did this
13 one. You saw this slide. Nobody said anything. I
14 asked if anybody owned it. I tried to make this
15 something that I would like to buy, and I couldn't.
16 There was just nothing I could do. First off, it has
17 the garage sitting here. Welcome to the automobile
18 world. The pedestrian and human environment is in
19 here, it's completely alien to it.

20 So, anyway, what we did is to identify,
21 well -- we looked at these elements to try to figure
22 out, okay, if there are things that have a positive
23 impact and things that have a negative impact, what
24 are they, so that we can start to identify, what's
25 the problem? The garage in front is --

1 MR. SACKMAN: A problem.

2 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: A problem.

3 MR. SIEMON: -- inconsistent with the
4 historic character and ought not to be allowed. The
5 FAR rules that drive where it is are nuts, and we
6 need to reconsider it.

7 Now, don't go past that. We also -- just
8 show them, so you know, because most of you -- many
9 of you were not here.

10 Go the next slide.

11 We went and then dropped these suckers on
12 real subdivisions, over and over again, to find out
13 where are the variables, et cetera, and that's what
14 really drove our first set of regulations that we
15 produced for you, and before we take a break, I just
16 want to go through one series of slides, Matt, and
17 those are the little slides I did last night.

18 And I just want to take you through what I
19 think is a part of the dynamic.

20 MR. BARNES: What's the number?

21 MR. SIEMON: I'm trying to find it, and I am
22 not finding it. It's right after the -- it's Slide
23 Number 77, and just bear with me. This is
24 Dick-and-Jane stuff for you, but I think it's
25 something we've got to deal with. It's a 75-foot by

1 a hundred-foot lot --

2 MS. HERNANDEZ: Right.

3 MR. SIEMON: -- and these are the required
4 setbacks, minimum setbacks.

5 Now, there is a theoretical building
6 envelope. You have the right to place buildings in
7 this envelope, anywheres in this envelope. You can't
8 fill it up, because we have some FAR limitations and
9 some other things.

10 MS. KEON: Can you show us a picture that
11 if -- depending on what the FAR limitations are, how
12 big the box could be?

13 MR. SIEMON: If you'll just let me go to the
14 next set, theoretical.

15 This is the maximum coverage that's
16 permitted. You can only put so much building on this
17 lot, and this is the maximum amount of coverage.
18 It's not the maximum FAR, because you can still put
19 additional space up there, but if you want to cover
20 the space, the ground level, this is the maximum you
21 can do, and what you see is, this is why in many
22 cases that point five -- that five-foot setback is
23 not a problem. But in some cases, you take this
24 building, and turn it, so that the length here, which
25 is 60 feet, goes from here to here. Then you get a

1 different building.

2 Now, in the bargain, you get wider setbacks.
3 So for those who want -- are talking about, "We need
4 to have wider setbacks," you need to understand that
5 you start losing back yard, which in a family
6 structure is desirable, and all of a sudden, you're
7 moving this towards the homes, which you raised as a
8 concern.

9 So that this is coverage. So, no matter
10 what your FAR is, this is the amount of land area you
11 can exploit, and of course, you can adjust it in any
12 way. I can only illustrate this on the next slide.

13 That's the portion, the maximum FAR, out of
14 that. This is the whole box. Blue and red is the
15 theoretical. The red is what you are actually
16 permitted on a 7,500-square-foot lot with .48 for the
17 first five and .35 for the -- and I used the old, not
18 the new, just to keep apples to apples.

19 Next, please.

20 That's the portion -- go back one. That's
21 the portion of the theoretical building envelope that
22 you didn't use, but we shouldn't lose sight of that,
23 because this red box could be back here.

24 MR. AIZENSTAT: Right.

25 MR. SIEMON: I wanted to try to make sure we

1 all understand the basic vocabulary of what we're
2 trying to deal with.

3 Go back, Matt. Don't jump so quickly. This
4 is -- I took away the box, just so you could see it.

5 Okay, now, this is maximum coverage and
6 maximum FAR. Now, there's a tension here between, if
7 you want to extend your coverage to the maximum, if
8 you don't have square footage for a full second
9 floor, and so there's a tension that goes between.
10 Now, each designer ought to figure out what he's
11 going to use, but that's the volume of residence
12 which is permitted, if you use maximum coverage.

13 MS. KEON: So it's not the volume. You
14 could go higher.

15 MR. SIEMON: It's -- Well, when I say
16 volume, I use standard 12-foot ceilings for
17 everything -- 12-foot floors for everything, just
18 for -- I have to do apples to apples to make it --

19 MS. KEON: Okay.

20 MR. SIEMON: Okay, next.

21 Now, I've moved in the setback, gone from
22 seven and a half feet to 10 feet. The building is
23 creeping backwards. 15 feet, I think, is the next.
24 Again, it's creeping backwards, and finally, I think
25 -- and then I've added -- this is actually 20 feet.

1 It shows -- seven, six -- no, this is 15 feet, I'm
2 sorry -- shows the shadow at 15 feet is still into
3 the property adjacent to it, but not too far, and
4 frankly, given the design of the structures, we
5 frankly have not seen, in the modeling we've done,
6 the shadows be a significant problem.

7 MS. LUBIN: What did you use as your height?

8 MR. SIEMON: We're using a total of 34 feet
9 when we put a roof structure on it. This example
10 doesn't have --

11 MS. LUBIN: Doesn't have a roof, but --

12 MR. SIEMON: -- a roof structure. This is
13 24-foot-tall --

14 MS. LUBIN: Right.

15 MR. SIEMON: -- module that doesn't have a
16 roof structure with that, but you know, the roof
17 structure, unless it's really a bad job, doesn't
18 throw a shadow that's particularly problematic, and
19 then, I don't know if there's one more --

20 Again, this is with more and more side
21 yards -- again, though, now we have the shadow almost
22 confined to the property, and the back yard is
23 limited, and I don't know if there's anything -- and
24 then, if you pull something out, you have the ability
25 to move it around within this building envelope, and

1 so the variables here are your coverage -- your
2 setback, your coverage, your FAR, and then where you
3 put them within that box, and if you take those and
4 then the elements that we talked about previously,
5 that we identified, we at least have identified some
6 things that could be a part of a management structure
7 to try to achieve buildings that have some likely
8 compatibility.

9 But in the abstract, it doesn't matter,
10 because it can be a great building here, but when it
11 sets on this street, on this lot, what really matters
12 is, where is it, how does it relate to its neighbors,
13 which is the next part of what we're going to talk
14 about, but before we get there, we're going to take a
15 break, so that Charlie's voice, which is going now,
16 can rest.

17 MR. RIEL: A ten-minute break?

18 (Thereupon, a recess was taken, during which
19 Mr. Salman arrived.)

20 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Can we start again?

21 MR. RIEL: Charlie, go ahead.

22 MR. SIEMON: Okay. The next, I want to talk
23 to you about -- some of you all are familiar with
24 this, but some have not had an opportunity, so I want
25 to take you through it.

1 And, Matt, if you could go to 99, I'll try
2 to explain this context. I've mentioned it before.
3 New or expanded homes subject to a professional --
4 this is what we originally proposed -- discretionary
5 professional staff approval. Discretionary staff
6 approval addresses compatibility of proposed homes --
7 and this is the key part -- in the context of the
8 character of a particular address.

9 Historically, the Board of Architects have,
10 in some cases, looked at context; in other cases, the
11 examination has not been particularly rigorous. In
12 part, that's because of what gets submitted to them.
13 There are no standards identifying what's the area of
14 analysis, what information is going to be provided,
15 and there's not a uniform outcome of that. But we
16 think all these elements, as I said, don't make any
17 sense until you look at how it fits into a particular
18 area.

19 Now, there is a contextual review in regard
20 to --

21 MR. HERSH: Can I just --

22 MR. SIEMON: What?

23 MR. HERSH: I would disagree with that. I
24 think the board -- that's the main and only thing --
25 not the -- the main thing that we look at, is

1 context, so I would -- I mean, since I -- for the
2 last two years that I've been on it, but --

3 MR. SIEMON: Our review of a lot of files,
4 the information that was provided, doesn't
5 demonstrate that there was information presented and
6 considered. We've gone to meetings, watched them.
7 We've also gone and looked at the results, and quite
8 frankly, we think some of the things that people are
9 talking about are not just the buildings, but the
10 place the building is in.

11 Now, maybe it wasn't built in the manner
12 that it was designed, but regardless, in --

13 MR. HERSH: I still would disagree with you.

14 MR. SIEMON: I understand. But in the
15 context of what the law requires, that your exercise
16 of discretion needs to be guided by specific
17 standards, that your discretion needs to be fettered
18 by standards, and the subject matters to be addressed
19 need to be identified, we believe that you can
20 improve the process by ensuring that there is a
21 defined contextual analysis, what's to be reviewed,
22 et cetera, and ultimately --

23 Next slide.

24 MR. AIZENSTAT: If I may.

25 MR. SIEMON: Yeah.

1 MR. AIZENSTAT: What about giving greater
2 powers to the Board, itself, of Architects, for
3 instance?

4 MR. SIEMON: Well --

5 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: The powers are there. I
6 think what Charlie is suggesting is that if our
7 regulations do not require the applicant to submit
8 contextual data, the board is handicapped and that it
9 doesn't have the information it needs to make that.

10 MR. AIZENSTAT: What type of data do you
11 need?

12 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: That's what he's going
13 to tell us.

14 MR. HERSH: But we do get that.

15 MS. LUBIN: I think the board, though,
16 sometimes doesn't want to say, "You can't do that,"
17 because it's allowed by the zoning.

18 MR. SIEMON: Exactly.

19 MS. LUBIN: For instance, I think the
20 Board --

21 MR. AIZENSTAT: Right. That's why I'm
22 asking if they should have more power.

23 MS. LUBIN: Right. The Board may not -- and
24 I don't allow the Preservation Board to say, "You
25 know what, you can't build that big of an addition."

1 I mean, I just think that that's improper, that
2 people should be able to build whatever square
3 footage that's allowed by Code.

4 I do say, "But you're going to have to do it
5 in a certain way," and you can tell them where it
6 should go, and (inaudible). So I think that the
7 Board has the power.

8 MR. HERSH: I think that within a --

9 MS. LUBIN: Right?

10 MR. HERSH: Yeah. I think one of the things
11 that we were speaking about during the break was,
12 first of all, sometimes we don't -- we make a
13 mistake, something gets by that maybe shouldn't
14 have. But, you know, I think, you know, we do try
15 to -- we do require massing sketches, and we do look
16 at -- I think that's a --

17 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: That's a requirement,
18 contextual photographs.

19 MR. HERSH: But also, sometimes we get the
20 project a little bit late. Sometimes it would be
21 better if they came in before the official
22 preliminaries and showed us some --

23 MS. LUBIN: Sketches.

24 MR. HERSH: Some massing sketches.

25 MS. LUBIN: Well, that's required by the

1 Preservation Ordinance.

2 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: I'm sorry, but I think
3 you guys are talking, again, to this lawyer,
4 "contextual" in two different senses. You're talking
5 on the lot; he's talking in the neighborhood.

6 MR. HERSH: Oh, no.

7 MR. SACKMAN: Oh, no.

8 MR. HERSH: Oh, no. Oh, no.

9 MR. SACKMAN: Right now, and for the last --

10 MR. HERSH: Oh, no.

11 MR. SACKMAN: -- the better part of this
12 year, we have been, on the majority of new homes and
13 major renovations, receiving, at the request of
14 Staff -- I don't know that it's a legal requirement,
15 but it's the suggested regimen.

16 MR. HERSH: And sometimes we send people
17 back and we ask them to bring more stuff.

18 MR. SACKMAN: So what we have is a series
19 of photographs, to take one of those blocks, from
20 block to block. We'll have submitted to us a
21 photograph of each one of the homes on that block, as
22 well as the south side -- the opposite side of the
23 street.

24 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: How about the back?

25 MR. HERSH: That's --

1 MR. AIZENSTAT: That was my question,
2 because I think that you should also have all four
3 sides of that property.

4 MR. SACKMAN: We get a -- we get photographs
5 of the lot itself. Sometimes there's an existing
6 house that's being torn down, so it may not, you
7 know, show relationship to some of the other existing
8 homes. We get a copy of a survey, obviously, that
9 shows where the existing house or where the lot is.
10 But again, it may not show the setbacks.

11 Maybe having access to the aerial
12 photographs that we saw earlier might give us some
13 more, you know, context, but that's helped us
14 tremendously in evaluating, because I was telling
15 somebody in the break here, if you're coming -- if
16 you, as an applicant, come in -- comes in with a
17 34-foot-high, two-story home, and you're sitting on
18 an entire block of one-story homes, I don't think
19 until recently we've even, as you said, felt
20 comfortable suggesting that you couldn't build that.

21 MS. HERNANDEZ: Why?

22 MR. SACKMAN: Why? Because I don't think we
23 thought our board had the power, and I guess -- but
24 what I'm seeing now is, we are going to be given some
25 more tooth. We've never had that. We have to

1 approve -- I believe, have to approve a project if it
2 meets the FAR and the setback requirements. But now
3 we're looking at that differently.

4 MR. HERSH: Yeah, I mean, we --

5 MS. HERNANDEZ: No, it's some of the
6 criteria, but you have a whole host of criteria that
7 you're there for.

8 MR. HERSH: We do. We're very -- Like, for
9 example, you saw --

10 MS. LUBIN: Including the context of the
11 neighborhood.

12 MS. HERNANDEZ: Right. Right.

13 MR. HERSH: The photograph that he showed of
14 the two lots with the big house, and the little teeny
15 houses --

16 MR. SACKMAN: The sketch.

17 MR. HERSH: The sketch. Right, the sketch.
18 You know, you could add 20 percent to that FAR and
19 you could break up the massing, and it would be
20 successful, but if you put it -- I don't even know if
21 it's a thing about, so much, bringing down the FAR
22 five percent or six percent. I don't think that does
23 anything.

24 MR. AIZENSTAT: On a big lot. But it does
25 on a -- it hampers quite a bit on a small lot, on a

1 5,000-square-foot lot.

2 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: But what --

3 MR. HERSH: How much? How many -- how much
4 would it be?

5 MR. AIZENSTAT: A bedroom.

6 MR. HERSH: I know, but you could do a
7 design where you could make that work, or you could
8 do a design where it doesn't work.

9 MR. AIZENSTAT: But --

10 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: You know, what bothers
11 me is, I've heard -- every single architect that has
12 spoken to this Board has said the same thing: It
13 isn't the FAR, it's the design. So how do we address
14 that?

15 MS. KEON: Well, you know, this particular
16 document that we had here, that we talked about, that
17 somebody told me was too formulaic, does that. It
18 deals with design, and I still -- despite what anyone
19 says with regard to it being formulaic, I still think
20 it's the best thing we've seen put in front of us.

21 MR. KORGE: Which document are you referring
22 to?

23 MS. KEON: This is that massing study that
24 was done some time ago.

25 MR. KORGE: Oh, yeah.

1 MS. KEON: You know, by very, very
2 respectable architects, and it deals with exactly,
3 exactly the thing that you all just said --

4 MS. HERNANDEZ: Did we have that here?

5 MS. LUBIN: It was done by (inaudible).

6 MS. KEON: -- and it talks about the
7 elements that you see in the North Gables that make
8 those homes what they are, the design elements, where
9 the varying heights in the roof and the different
10 setbacks and things -- I think it does that. And,
11 you know, despite where it may have come from, how
12 long ago it came, irregardless of anything to do with
13 the history of this document, I think this document
14 has value, and I think that you should take it, and
15 it truly should be looked at, so that you have design
16 elements that are objective, that you can -- you can
17 make judgments against, as opposed to it just being,
18 "Well, I think," because I think -- "I think," I
19 don't think, works.

20 MR. HERSH: But somebody could take those
21 same elements and use it in a terrible way --

22 MR. SACKMAN: Exactly.

23 MR. HERSH: -- and it wouldn't work. It
24 doesn't work.

25 MS. LUBIN: Actually, that study, I agree

1 with you, is quite good, but I know of architects
2 that have designed bad homes --

3 MS. KEON: Right.

4 MS. LUBIN: -- to illustrate that that will
5 not --

6 MS. KEON: Okay, right. So that's why I'm
7 saying to you --

8 MS. LUBIN: -- will not --

9 MS. HERNANDEZ: Prevent.

10 MS. LUBIN: -- prevent a bad design.

11 MS. KEON: Okay, but it isn't -- nobody is
12 asking you to take this document and enact it as it
13 sits, but to take it as a basis on which to go
14 forward with, I think it's still the best basis --

15 MS. HERNANDEZ: That we've got.

16 MS. KEON: -- that I have seen, and I
17 have -- granted, I've been here not a long time, but
18 I think it is still the best basic document to begin
19 to work from, because it addresses the height issues
20 that are -- that everyone has raised concerns about.
21 It addresses, you know, the design elements and what
22 is existing and what you want to move towards. I
23 think it is the best basis we have to move forward,
24 and at least it's something to work from, because
25 now, I have to see anybody come up with anything to

1 work from, and, you know, I will defer to you as the
2 architect on a number of these things, but --

3 MR. STEFFENS: There's one right there.

4 MS. KEON: Also -- and the Board of
5 Architects. I mean, you know, on some of these --
6 you know, because you can, you know, so look at those
7 things and say -- you know, and know that you're not
8 going to ever prevent anything from ever happening.
9 Somebody can still -- whatever, but, you know, to the
10 best of your abilities as professionals in that
11 field, with your expertise, you know the elements of
12 this that need to be affected to make it work better.

13 MS. HERNANDEZ: Right.

14 MS. KEON: And, you know, I don't understand
15 why we don't do that. I mean, that's the direction
16 he needs to give us something concrete to work with,
17 and to look into more.

18 MR. KORGE: It's not going to be changes in
19 FAR and setbacks that are going to make the big
20 difference.

21 MS. KEON: No. Well, some -- no.

22 MR. KORGE: It's not.

23 MS. KEON: No --

24 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Well, one of the things
25 that he's shown us is that if you increase the FAR on

1 the sides, you're going to decrease it on the back,
2 which is where a family wants their open space. You
3 want to be able to put in a pool or a swing set or a
4 backyard barbecue, depending on the size of your lot.

5 MS. KEON: Right.

6 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: And if you, you know,
7 move it in this way and you push the house back, then
8 you're taking away quality of life for the owner of
9 that property.

10 MS. KEON: Right. So how can we do that,
11 you know, and -- whatever.

12 MR. STEFFENS: The opposite of that is, if
13 you tell me you're going to take away five percent of
14 my FAR, I'm going to give that space to my client.
15 I'm going to put it in his back yard. I'm not going
16 to put it someplace else.

17 MR. KORGE: Right.

18 MR. STEFFENS: So taking away five percent
19 of the FAR is not necessarily, in any way, going to
20 affect how the house is affecting the rest of the
21 neighborhood.

22 MR. KORGE: It's not addressing the problem.
23 Exactly.

24 MS. KEON: But it's saying to you that, you
25 know, you have to step back that second story, you

1 can't do this, you can't do that. Those are the
2 things that will make a difference.

3 MS. HERNANDEZ: Right.

4 MR. STEFFENS: Right.

5 MS. KEON: And that's what this document
6 addresses.

7 MR. HERSH: I think the height is a big
8 issue. The height is a very big issue.

9 MS. KEON: And this also talks about
10 bringing it down, you know, it's to bring it back to
11 the height in here. It addresses all the issues that
12 we --

13 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay --

14 MS. KEON: -- I think, that we have talked
15 about.

16 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Can you explain why --
17 what you think is the problem with height, and why?

18 MR. HERSH: Well, you know, 34 feet --

19 MS. LUBIN: For two stories.

20 MR. HERSH: -- which is what's allowed, is
21 really big, particularly in North Gables.

22 MR. KORGE: On 50-foot lots.

23 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Like what is a normal
24 two-story house, the older houses that are
25 historical --

1 (Simultaneous voices)

2 MR. HERSH: You can do two stories, 12 feet,
3 is 24 feet, and you can do things with the roof so it
4 doesn't -- and also, I think it was a good thing to
5 maybe bring back some flat roofs.

6 MS. LUBIN: Right, and that's -- I don't
7 understand why that wasn't allowed, because
8 historically, on the older homes, it's wonderful to
9 have the pitched roofs plus a combination with the
10 flat roofs, or just a flat roof home.

11 MR. AIZENSTAT: Well, in the Gables, you had
12 always carried that line all the way, didn't you, on
13 a pitch, so you weren't able to have a pitch and a
14 flat?

15 MS. LUBIN: Flat roofs are not allowed,
16 unless you have a flat roof already.

17 MR. HERSH: You're not allowed to have them.

18 MR. SIEMON: No flat roofs, not now. They
19 were --

20 MS. LUBIN: Yes, they were.

21 MR. SIEMON: -- historically, and that's
22 always a pretty nice --

23 MR. HERSH: But that had a lot to do with
24 the height, because --

25 MR. STEFFENS: You can have flat roofs.

1 MR. HERSH: Well, you can --

2 MR. STEFFENS: In a U or an L of the
3 building.

4 MR. HERSH: You can have -- there's a
5 couple --

6 MS. LUBIN: Right. What is that?

7 MR. SACKMAN: But not visible from the
8 street.

9 MR. STEFFENS: Yeah, not visible.

10 MR. HERSH: Yeah, that wall also is
11 a good -- I think it's a hell of a good feature.

12 MS. LUBIN: But I think that that was done
13 at some point when they had those flashings that are
14 not wonderful --

15 MR. HERSH: Right.

16 MS. LUBIN: -- on flat roofs, and so it was
17 a reaction to something that was bad that came out --

18 MR. SACKMAN: You know, the single --

19 MS. LUBIN: -- in the '60s, you know,
20 those --

21 MR. SACKMAN: That little row of --

22 MS. LUBIN: So I think that that was a
23 reaction, and most of the Zoning Code is a reaction
24 to something that came up.

25 MS. KEON: So I think that --

1 MR. SACKMAN: That's why we're here.

2 MS. KEON: Right.

3 MR. HERSH: And some of the height is --

4 MS. KEON: That's why I think you can go
5 back and look at it, because this particular document
6 looks at what the original was.

7 MS. LUBIN: That's right.

8 MS. KEON: It looks at what the original
9 was. It looks at what the modifications are and how
10 it has negatively affected the aesthetics.

11 MR. SACKMAN: Do you think you could put
12 that in words? Is that what you're trying to
13 accomplish?

14 MS. KEON: It is.

15 MR. SACKMAN: And be interpreted?

16 MS. KEON: Yes.

17 MR. SACKMAN: It would give us some latitude
18 to interpret it?

19 MS. KEON: Yes. Have you seen this
20 document?

21 MR. SACKMAN: I haven't seen it recently. I
22 may have seen it years ago, but --

23 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: I think that was done
24 like in the '90s, late '90s.

25 MS. LUBIN: That was done --

1 MR. HERSH: I think there's another
2 thing --

3 MR. RIEL: '99.

4 MR. HERSH: The other thing is breaking down
5 of the massing, like Charlie was talking about some
6 of the houses that were very successful that had the
7 different -- the massing was broken up.

8 MS. KEON: That's what that does. So --

9 MR. HERSH: And a lot of problems you have
10 is, you get these boxes. They're just, you know --

11 MS. KEON: That's what they said here.

12 MR. AIZENSTAT: You want to stay away from
13 those boxes.

14 MR. HERSH: Right, because you know what
15 happens, the box goes up 12 feet, 12 feet, you're at
16 24, then you do a giant roof, to get to 34.

17 MR. AIZENSTAT: What are the heights that
18 are in our surrounding cities? Do we know what the
19 heights are for those? I think the City of Miami is
20 24, if I'm not mistaken.

21 MR. SALMAN: No, 25.

22 MR. AIZENSTAT: 25?

23 MR. SACKMAN: 25 to the average --

24 MR. SALMAN: The mid point of the gable.

25 MR. SACKMAN: From the eve to the ridge, in

1 between.

2 MR. AIZENSTAT: What would that be,
3 overall?

4 MR. SACKMAN: Well, it depends.

5 MR. AIZENSTAT: Roughly?

6 MR. STEFFENS: It could be three or four
7 feet higher.

8 MR. SIEMON: Usually they're limited to 10
9 feet, so that's probably the maximum height.

10 MR. AIZENSTAT: So, 24, 25 -- maybe 30?

11 MR. SALMAN: To the mid point of the roof.

12 (Simultaneous voices)

13 MR. SIEMON: Yeah, but usually there's a
14 limit on the total height of the gable, so it's --
15 the height above the mid point is, in many
16 regulations, limited to five feet.

17 MS. LUBIN: I think something else that you
18 said about the -- when it comes to the Board of
19 Architects might be important, because we require a
20 pre-application interview --

21 MR. AIZENSTAT: "We" meaning?

22 MS. LUBIN: Meaning the Historic
23 Preservation.

24 MR. AIZENSTAT: Okay.

25 MS. LUBIN: So if you're doing an addition

1 or a new home within a district, they need to come in
2 to see us, and they meet with Staff, and hopefully
3 it's prior to them -- to the client having spent a
4 whole lot of money on architectural drawings, so that
5 you get and you see them when they're just doing
6 sketches. So we meet with them, you know, for
7 however long it takes, and then they go back, and
8 they come back with a finalized drawing so that they
9 can go forward to the Board of Architects.

10 MR. HERSH: Right.

11 MS. LUBIN: Which, when you see stuff on
12 historic homes, it's a little bit more thought out,
13 because they've met with us already.

14 MR. HERSH: Sure.

15 MS. LUBIN: And maybe that's something that
16 they can meet with Staff on -- not that you don't
17 have a whole lot to do -- prior to going to the Board
18 of Architects.

19 MR. HERSH: But I wouldn't mind seeing those
20 as a regular --

21 MR. SACKMAN: But we get, on average, in
22 excess of a hundred --

23 MS. LUBIN: See, that's the problem.

24 MR. SACKMAN: -- projects. Tomorrow
25 morning, we'll have a hundred and -- how many? Do

1 you know how many, today?

2 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: 114.

3 MR. SACKMAN: 114.

4 MR. AIZENSTAT: 114?

5 MR. SACKMAN: We go from 8:00 a.m. till,
6 last week, one o'clock.

7 MR. STEFFENS: Yeah, but how many of
8 those are --

9 MR. SACKMAN: Volunteers.

10 How many what?

11 MR. HERSH: Half.

12 MR. STEFFENS: How many of those are
13 chain-link fences and how many are about their
14 houses?

15 MR. HERSH: Half.

16 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: No, they don't review
17 chain-link fences.

18 MR. STEFFENS: Oh, no?

19 MR. SACKMAN: No, but they're everything,
20 from bulkheads --

21 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: Picket fences.

22 MS. HERNANDEZ: To commercial developments,
23 to single-family --

24 MR. SACKMAN: Right, to paint colors and
25 driveways, but --

1 MR. STEFFENS: There's a lot of stuff that
2 could be --

3 MR. SACKMAN: Too many things. This is a
4 housekeeping issue, but there's some issues that we,
5 as a board, have problems with, that, you know, I
6 think will be relieved if and when we get a City
7 Architect that will deal with all of that.

8 MR. AIZENSTAT: Right, that was one of the
9 issues, going in --

10 MR. SACKMAN: But to sit and have an
11 interview with a homeowner for, I don't know --

12 MS. LUBIN: You don't do that.

13 MR. SACKMAN: No, but you see, that's part
14 of --

15 MS. LUBIN: A staff person could do that and
16 write a recommendation or something, if they hire
17 someone, the City Architect.

18 (Simultaneous voices)

19 MR. AIZENSTAT: That is going to be
20 implemented. That's what we're looking to do.

21 MS. HERNANDEZ: Okay, but the court reporter
22 can only take one person at a time, and we want to
23 take all the thoughts.

24 MR. HERSH: Well, I think the most
25 significant thing that we're going to see is the

1 massing. So I wouldn't want a staff person to see
2 that. I would rather somebody come in and --

3 MR. LUBIN: He would rather have --

4 MR. HERSH: -- sketches.

5 MR. SACKMAN: No offense to the present --

6 MR. HERSH: Right, right. That's just -- I
7 would rather -- I mean, that's the most -- that's the
8 number one thing, because what happens, somebody will
9 spend tons of money, tons of time --

10 MS. LUBIN: Well, that's a problem.

11 MR. HERSH: -- and they'll make a decision,
12 a very early decision, like, for example, seeking the
13 parking half, instead of full. That creates a wall
14 that does all kinds of things. They come to us and
15 that decision has already been made, and if they came
16 to us very conceptual, a very conceptual stage --

17 MR. SIEMON: The program that we have in my
18 home city of Boca Raton, we don't have to go. There
19 are two things to tell you -- and you are confronted
20 by part of that. One is, the CAB clearly has
21 authority, written authority and standards, that
22 allows them to say no. It's appealable to the
23 Council if they do that, but if they find it's not
24 compatible --

25 MS. HERNANDEZ: Right, they just say --

1 MR. SIEMON: -- they have the power to say,
2 and it's clearly articulated in the Code, and the
3 findings they've got to make are clearly articulated.

4 So, if you represent an applicant, as we do
5 a lot, we go to them. They'll do preliminaries.
6 They're not required. We never -- we don't represent
7 a client that we don't take a preliminary to them,
8 and we don't spend a ton of money before them. We
9 tell all our clients, "Don't turn the architect
10 loose. Let's get a massing sketch of where we're
11 going. Let's get a landscape plan, because that's
12 going to be part of the finished product," and we go
13 see them, and they talk and tell us what they think.

14 MS. LUBIN: That's interesting. That's not
15 allowed now, in Coral Gables.

16 MR. AIZENSTAT: On a single-family house?

17 MS. LUBIN: You wouldn't be allowed to do
18 that.

19 MR. SIEMON: On anything.

20 MS. LUBIN: On anything.

21 MR. SIEMON: Anything that's got to go to
22 the CAB.

23 MS. LUBIN: They are --

24 MR. SIEMON: We mostly do it. We don't do
25 many single-family homes. We mostly do retail and

1 other things.

2 (Simultaneous voices)

3 MS. HERNANDEZ: Okay, we're losing
4 everybody. All these valuable comments are lost for
5 history. One at a time, please.

6 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: We're going to have to
7 raise hands, like in school.

8 MR. RIEL: Just in reference to height, I
9 can tell you, Miami Beach is 25 to 37 feet, Miami
10 Shores is 30 feet, and Key Biscayne is 35 feet.

11 MR. SACKMAN: But, Eric, I don't know that
12 all municipalities --

13 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Wait.

14 MR. SACKMAN: You may know, but --

15 MR. RIEL: Well, I'm just saying -- I'm
16 sorry.

17 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: One person. He's got
18 the floor.

19 MR. SACKMAN: Are they measured the same
20 way? Like City of Miami, like Javier and I were --
21 They measure differently, perhaps, than other
22 municipalities, I don't know.

23 MR. RIEL: This is just at first look at the
24 regulations.

25 MR. SACKMAN: Okay.

1 MS. KEON: Yeah, but Key Biscayne is,
2 because they're in a flood zone. I mean, you have
3 areas of the Gables that are down along like Sunrise
4 Harbor and that, that you would have to allow
5 additional height to, because of --

6 MR. RIEL: I was just -- You all asked me
7 what the numbers were, and I was replying.

8 MS. KEON: Yeah, but, you know, out of
9 context, that doesn't tell you what you want to
10 know. You know, you want to know that in a non-
11 flood zone, in an area comparable to this, what is
12 the -- you know, the height, because I'm sure, you
13 know, like Tahiti Beach, it's going to be higher. At
14 Sunrise Harbor, there is additional height given
15 because they're in a flood zone. So --

16 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Charlie, could we have a
17 standard where we say, let's say, if it's more
18 than --

19 Mr. Sackman, what was it you were saying?

20 MR. SACKMAN: I'm sorry?

21 MS. KEON: 26 feet.

22 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: 26 feet, was what you
23 guys were saying was the normal thing?

24 MR. SACKMAN: 24, 25.

25 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: So if we could have a

1 standard that to go over 26 feet, you had to meet
2 some -- something like this flood criteria or
3 something, to be -- so that it would be discretionary
4 and you would have to see anything over 26 feet, do
5 something like that.

6 MR. SIEMON: Yes.

7 MS. KEON: And then you take into
8 consideration what it should be like within the flood
9 zone, in those -- what are those, overlays, or how do
10 you -- what is that? They're just exceptions?

11 MR. SIEMON: Well, it's done all kinds of
12 ways.

13 MS. KEON: Okay, well, however.

14 MR. SIEMON: It's usually done in the
15 definition of height, and what height says is, you
16 measure it from the finished grade or the crown of
17 the road in front, some reference point, but in the
18 flood zone, it's measured from the datum level.

19 MS. KEON: Right.

20 MR. SIEMON: That's usually how it's done,
21 but I mean --

22 MS. KEON: Okay. So we could do that.

23 MR. SIEMON: Yeah.

24 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay, Charlie, what
25 you're suggesting --

1 MR. KORGE: Couldn't you regulate it by lot
2 size?

3 MR. SIEMON: The height?

4 MR. KORGE: Yeah.

5 MR. SIEMON: You could.

6 MR. KORGE: Well, is that typical or
7 atypical.

8 MR. SIEMON: No, I would say it's atypical,
9 but it's atypical because in most communities, height
10 is not nearly as sensitive an issue as it is in this
11 older neighborhood.

12 MS. HERNANDEZ: Right.

13 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: But isn't the answer --

14 MR. SIEMON: So if it's not typical -- just
15 because it's not typical doesn't mean it's not
16 appropriate to do it by lot size.

17 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: But wait. Isn't the
18 answer to say, if you go over 26 feet, then the Board
19 of Architects has discretion to allow you to exceed
20 it, based on the houses next to you --

21 MS. HERNANDEZ: Context.

22 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: -- the flood zone you're
23 in, a whole variety of things, you know, laundry list
24 of things, where --

25 MS. HERNANDEZ: It's the context argument.

1 MS. KEON: I think that should be a given,
2 so you don't see it.

3 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: I'm sorry, say it again?

4 MS. KEON: The flood zone should be a given,
5 because you don't need to see those. They have to be
6 built -- I mean, they --

7 MS. LUBIN: It's a requirement.

8 MS. KEON: I think for insurance purposes
9 and for all kinds of things, they have to be --
10 they're required to do that, but I think --

11 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: When you measure --

12 MR. SIEMON: Well, some communities -- I
13 mean, just for the record, some communities don't.

14 MS. KEON: Oh, really?

15 MR. SIEMON: Some communities, they
16 simply --

17 MR. KORGE: You get a one-story home.

18 MR. SIEMON: You know, you're stuck with
19 one-and-half-story homes.

20 MR. KORGE: Yeah.

21 MR. SIEMON: You know, you can get there,
22 but you've got to have the windows coming out the
23 gable and --

24 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay, another --

25 MR. SIEMON: Dormers.

1 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Along the same lines, if
2 you're going to have a solid wall, couldn't we say
3 you cannot have a solid wall, you know, along a
4 five-foot setback, without some criteria being
5 satisfied?

6 MR. AIZENSTAT: Such as a step-back or
7 something?

8 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: A step-back or windows
9 or something. I mean, isn't that one of the biggest
10 complaints, is when someone puts a wall next to your
11 house, so that you're looking at a blank wall?

12 MR. SACKMAN: Can I raise my hand?

13 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: I'm sorry, yes.

14 MR. SACKMAN: As a member of the board, we
15 look at those elevations relative to the adjacent
16 neighbors on either side, if you're talking about a
17 side setback, and we have added windows, probably
18 every -- tomorrow, we'll probably add windows where
19 they weren't intended to be, so that they break up
20 that mass.

21 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Do you require -- do you
22 need something in the regulations to make you feel
23 better about it?

24 MR. SACKMAN: I don't think so, no.

25 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: You're okay, the way you

1 are?

2 MR. SACKMAN: I think.

3 Martha -- I mean, that's not been --

4 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: No.

5 MR. SACKMAN: We don't get that opposition.
6 We get opposition over, why is somebody building the
7 maximum, you know, width and setbacks, and it's all
8 how you can tweak that, and the better architects
9 have no problem, you know, meeting our needs and our
10 likes, and I'm not blaming it on my profession, but
11 it's often driven by -- you know, by the client and
12 some other conditions, but we just need more -- and I
13 think I'm beginning -- I think sensing we're getting
14 more ability to enforce those things.

15 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: The other question I had
16 is, of what composes FAR, we have identified the
17 up-front garage as something we want to get rid of.

18 Is there anything else that you -- I guess
19 four architects that are sitting here with us, and
20 Dona and Martha are kind of architects by now -- that
21 you have identified compose FAR, or are half counted,
22 or encourage or discourage, that we should be looking
23 at, besides -- I know that Michael and I have talked
24 about maybe saying the carport is zero FAR.

25 MR. SACKMAN: You're talking just

1 specifically the FAR now?

2 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Specifically -- well, I
3 don't really know what I'm talking about.

4 MS. LUBIN: There are things in the Zoning
5 Code that are not counted towards FAR --

6 MS. HERNANDEZ: Right.

7 MS. LUBIN: -- that can sometimes be
8 detrimental to the massing.

9 MS. HERNANDEZ: Right.

10 MR. AIZENSTAT: Such as?

11 MS. KEON: Well, if there is a courtyard
12 that isn't counted in the FAR, but yet they enclose
13 that courtyard with an eight-foot wall, it still
14 isn't counted.

15 MS. LUBIN: And it --

16 MS. KEON: And it makes it --

17 MR. HERSH: It just has as much impact.

18 MS. LUBIN: It has as much impact.

19 MS. KEON: And it has just as much impact as
20 if it were, you know, a wall of the house and
21 covered, so --

22 MS. HERNANDEZ: But why are we discouraging
23 that? I mean, personally, I have a historic home, I
24 have three courtyards. They're beautiful.

25 MS. KEON: No, it isn't -- but when you have

1 external courtyards that, you know, are not counted,
2 and they -- they -- they can go to the setback --

3 MS. LUBIN: But they are counted towards the
4 lot coverage.

5 MS. HERNANDEZ: Right.

6 MS. KEON: For lot coverage?

7 MS. LUBIN: They are counted in lot
8 coverage.

9 MS. HERNANDEZ: Yeah.

10 MS. LUBIN: And so you can't have so many of
11 them that it eats up all of your lot.

12 MS. HERNANDEZ: I have a big lot.

13 MS. KEON: You have a big lot, but in the
14 smaller ones --

15 MS. LUBIN: Covered porches, screened
16 porches?

17 MR. STEFFENS: Screened porches count.

18 MS. LUBIN: Half.

19 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: On the 45.

20 MR. STEFFENS: But unscreened porches don't
21 count.

22 MS. LUBIN: I mean, there's all kinds of --

23 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: Right.

24 MS. LUBIN: So maybe --

25 MS. KEON: But that's -- I mean, that's

1 why -- that document addresses all of those things.

2 MR. SACKMAN: This is very helpful.

3 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay, but let's focus
4 on that. What have we identified as things that
5 don't count towards FAR, and should we allow it to
6 continue that way, should we tweak it?

7 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: Presently, what's not
8 counted --

9 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Or half counted.

10 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: Okay, not counted are
11 covered terraces, breezeways, gazebos, anything
12 that's covered, open on all sides, are not counted.

13 Half is garages that do not have a story
14 above it, or screened porches are counted in half.
15 Basically, the rest, we just count it all.

16 MR. STEFFENS: Garages are not --

17 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: Counted, only half.

18 And if there's --

19 MR. STEFFENS: And carports are counted as
20 half.

21 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: Counted half, if it's
22 on the side.

23 MR. HERSH: (Inaudible).

24 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: No, the Code doesn't
25 say that. You can have a second-story -- a two-story

1 carport and you still count the carport underneath
2 half, because there's nothing in the Code about
3 having another story over it, only on garages.

4 MR. HERSH: If you put a room over the
5 garage --

6 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: Then it counts twice.

7 MR. HERSH: Yeah, twice.

8 MS. LUBIN: That's wrong.

9 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: I think there's
10 something wrong with that.

11 MR. HERSH: You know, maybe if it's a larger
12 house, if we'd get to look at it earlier, I think
13 that would help.

14 MS. HERNANDEZ: I think that's what you're
15 saying. You need to see these --

16 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay, but let's focus
17 again on the garage/carport issue. Is there a
18 consensus that carports should be favored over
19 garages? Is that something that we've identified as
20 something we want to do, or not?

21 MR. SACKMAN: Well, I -- no.

22 MS. KEON: I think it's the issue of
23 placement of that garage and the carport.

24 MR. HERSH: Like, for example, if we're
25 looking at a garage, if we get to it early, we can

1 maybe stop the garage door facing the street. But
2 what happens is, once they make the decision for the
3 garage door to face the street -- and garage doors
4 facing the street is problematic.

5 MS. LUBIN: I grew up in a community where
6 it wasn't allowed.

7 MR. STEFFENS: But this is primarily a small
8 lot issue.

9 MR. SACKMAN: Right, right, right.

10 MS. LUBIN: Right.

11 MR. SIEMON: We're in the north end.

12 MR. SACKMAN: The north end.

13 MR. STEFFENS: This is not a big lot issue
14 that we're talking with now.

15 MS. LUBIN: That's right.

16 MR. STEFFENS: So we're really going to be
17 dealing with garages facing the street.

18 MR. SACKMAN: Or carports.

19 MR. HERSH: Right.

20 MS. LUBIN: Well, you can face them -- you
21 can put them in back, the way that they were done in
22 the '20s or '30s, although no one will actually ever
23 back up that distance, because you can't -- it's
24 difficult, but you can also -- even on the smaller
25 lots, can't you put them slightly behind, just like

1 the garage?

2 MR. HERSH: Yeah, we might ask somebody to
3 do that.

4 MR. SACKMAN: Slightly back.

5 MR. HERSH: We might ask them to do that.

6 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Why does that house -- I
7 was told that that one yellow house we looked at had
8 the garage protruding forward --

9 MR. SACKMAN: Right.

10 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: -- because it was --
11 that gave them better FAR than if it was recessed.

12 MS. LUBIN: That counts as -- that would
13 count as half, right?

14 MR. STEFFENS: No, it would -- It gave them
15 better FAR, because there was nothing above it.

16 MS. LUBIN: Right.

17 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: Right.

18 MS. HERNANDEZ: Right.

19 MR. STEFFENS: Not because it was forward or
20 backwards.

21 MR. HERSH: The reason we want people not to
22 put the garage up front is because when you put the
23 garage up front, you're making a statement out of a
24 garage.

25 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Yeah.

1 MR. HERSH: So put the garage in the back.

2 MR. SACKMAN: Or recess it from the front of
3 the house.

4 MR. HERSH: And maybe all new houses, we
5 should see the massing --

6 MS. LUBIN: Well, they can just do the
7 incentives. You can do an incentive by putting the
8 garage in the back, not even a requirement.

9 MR. HERSH: Right.

10 MS. LUBIN: As far as carports over garages,
11 I think now there is an incentive to do a carport,
12 because it counts as -- you have to have either a
13 carport or a garage.

14 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: Or a breezeway. There
15 are three things, garage, carports and breezeways.

16 MS. LUBIN: What's a breezeway?

17 MS. KEON: What's a breezeway, as opposed to
18 a carport?

19 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: There's not a
20 definition in the Code, but from what I've looked,
21 it's a covered area that takes you from one place to
22 another.

23 MS. LUBIN: But does that count to store a
24 car in it?

25 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: It does not count on

1 the FA -- on the floor area.

2 MR. SACKMAN: Do you mean, does it --

3 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Right, but to meet the
4 requirement to have a car.

5 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: But it does meet -- the
6 parking, off-street parking --

7 MR. SACKMAN: Okay.

8 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: -- requirement, and it
9 doesn't have the size --

10 MR. SACKMAN: Requirement.

11 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: -- requirement that the
12 carport and garage have.

13 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: So the breezeway does
14 meet that requirement, does meet the --

15 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: You can have a house --

16 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: You can have a
17 breezeway.

18 (Simultaneous voices)

19 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: You can have a house
20 with a breezeway without a garage or a carport?

21 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: Yeah.

22 MS. KEON: So why don't we deal with that
23 issue?

24 MR. SACKMAN: But it serves the purpose of a
25 carport.

1 MS. HERNANDEZ: Okay, one at a time.

2 MS. KEON: They're saying that that
3 breezeway thing doesn't work. It's used, what, to
4 meet the carport requirement -- the --

5 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: The off-street parking.

6 MS. KEON: The off-street parking, but it
7 really doesn't --

8 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: I mean, you can store a
9 car, but what kind of car? I mean, I see some
10 breezeways like nine by nine, and it's enough for an
11 off-street parking. As long as we see the word
12 "breezeway," that's all we need.

13 MS. KEON: So it satisfies the requirement,
14 but in practical terms, it doesn't do what you want
15 it to do. So why don't you change that?

16 MS. HERNANDEZ: And why don't we define,
17 then, breezeway?

18 MS. KEON: Yeah, I think you should.

19 MS. HERNANDEZ: Okay.

20 MR. AIZENSTAT: Well, the breezeway does
21 allow you to get rid of that garage in front, if it's
22 placed correctly on that breezeway. Maybe what we
23 need to do is, like you said, define it, but also
24 give dimensions to it, minimum dimensions.

25 MS. KEON: But then it becomes a carport.

1 MR. STEFFENS: Yeah, then it will become a
2 carport.

3 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: And then it's a
4 carport.

5 MS. KEON: Then it becomes a carport.

6 MR. HERSH: How about also giving incentives
7 for doing things like putting the garage all the way
8 in the back?

9 MS. LUBIN: All the way in the back or even
10 (overlapping).

11 MS. KEON: But I think the Code now -- Does
12 the Code allow you to do that now, though?

13 MS. LUBIN: Yeah, absolutely.

14 MR. SIEMON: I think if it's detached,
15 actually, it doesn't count as floor area.

16 MR. KORGE: Are there design problems with
17 breezeways the City is experiencing now?

18 MS. HERNANDEZ: No.

19 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: No.

20 MR. KORGE: Is this an issue that we need to
21 be discussing?

22 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: We actually are seeing
23 breezeways as carports.

24 MR. KORGE: Pardon me?

25 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: We're actually seeing

1 breezeways as carports.

2 MS. HERNANDEZ: Right.

3 MR. AIZENSTAT: Martha, I have a question.

4 Can you put a carport in the back that's detached?

5 MR. SIEMON: Not a carport, a garage.

6 MR. AIZENSTAT: I'm sorry, a garage,

7 that's --

8 MS. LUBIN: Yes.

9 MR. AIZENSTAT: -- detached from a home?

10 MS. LUBIN: Yes, absolutely.

11 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: Yeah.

12 MR. SIEMON: It doesn't have to have a

13 continuous roof on it?

14 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: No.

15 MS. LUBIN: No.

16 MR. AIZENSTAT: I wasn't aware of that.

17 MR. SIEMON: And it doesn't count as FAR, so

18 there is an incentive to do that.

19 MR. HERSH: And you can also --

20 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: What doesn't count, the

21 detached garage? No, it does count.

22 MR. HERSH: But also, there --

23 MS. LUBIN: But not toward the main house.

24 MS. KEON: On the FAR?

25 (Simultaneous voices)

1 MR. AIZENSTAT: Martha, does that count as
2 the auxiliary building, which is a certain percentage
3 of floor area factor?

4 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: Yes.

5 MS. LUBIN: Right.

6 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: There's two things, on
7 auxiliary and on the FAF, floor area factor.

8 MR. AIZENSTAT: So it does go towards that?
9 So you can't have a detached garage and then an
10 auxiliary building.

11 MR. SACKMAN: But you can -- you can have --

12 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: Yeah, you can have it.
13 It doesn't say how many auxiliary structures you can
14 have.

15 MR. AIZENSTAT: As long as you fall within
16 the percentage for their total square footage.

17 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: That's right.

18 MR. HERSH: But you could do a detached
19 garage in the back with a second floor space that's
20 usable and have a breezeway, tying it to the main
21 building, and that would be to Code.

22 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: Yeah.

23 MR. SACKMAN: Can I ask --

24 MR. SIEMON: It would chew up a lot of FAR.

25 MR. HERSH: It would chew up a lot of FAR,

1 and take away the massing out of the front and put it
2 in the back.

3 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay, but can we give an
4 incentive so that it doesn't chew up a lot of FAR for
5 those carports and breezeways, if you think that
6 that's favorable?

7 MS. LUBIN: The concern I have on -- I'm
8 speaking as a single person that comes home a lot at
9 night, alone, and I would not want to come -- well,
10 you know, I mean --

11 MR. SACKMAN: I know. I wasn't --

12 MS. LUBIN: -- I wouldn't want to drive into
13 a breezeway or a carport. I like to have the garage
14 there so I can drive in, close the garage door --

15 MR. SACKMAN: Security.

16 MS. LUBIN: For security. So I mean, there
17 are issues people need.

18 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: But isn't that a choice,
19 Dona?

20 MS. LUBIN: It is a choice.

21 MR. SACKMAN: What, going home single?

22 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: So you say, "I want that
23 security."

24 MS. LUBIN: So you give up FAR for that?

25 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: "So I give up FAR to

1 have that security."

2 MS. LUBIN: I don't have a problem with
3 that.

4 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: But isn't FAR part of
5 the visual aspect --

6 MS. LUBIN: Yeah. No, I --

7 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: -- and haven't we
8 decided that a carport visually creates more light
9 and air than a garage?

10 MS. HERNANDEZ: Okay, but -- and I
11 apologize, but that's also going to come up and hit
12 smack into our truck ordinance, which you'll be
13 seeing in September.

14 MS. LUBIN: Oh, that's true.

15 MS. HERNANDEZ: Okay?

16 MR. SACKMAN: Why?

17 MS. HERNANDEZ: A lot of our rules and
18 regulations, they -- even though they seem to be
19 dysfunctional, they actually do work in harmony, one
20 with the other. So just bear in mind that when you
21 do away with one thing, it actually has an impact on
22 several other regulations that the City has in place.

23 MR. STEFFENS: So, if you have a carport,
24 you can't have a truck?

25 MS. HERNANDEZ: Oh, you can, but you're

1 ticketed.

2 MR. STEFFENS: So you could put doors on
3 the front of your carport?

4 MS. HERNANDEZ: Yes, you could.

5 MR. SIEMON: But what's a truck?

6 MS. HERNANDEZ: Well, a truck, as defined in
7 the City's Zoning Code, is a very simple vehicle,
8 not the Hummer.

9 MR. SACKMAN: Can I ask a question of both
10 boards? Gables Gazette, about two months ago, had a
11 photograph of a house on Alhambra and --

12 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Cortez.

13 MR. SACKMAN: -- off of Granada, right, that
14 received a lot of criticism from some people, and I
15 think a lot of architects -- or somebody came to your
16 Board, I think I was present, who was the architect
17 and the owner.

18 MR. AIZENSTAT: Right.

19 MR. SACKMAN: Is there a consensus that that
20 house, with its breezeways or whatever those -- that
21 courtyard may be called, is that considered
22 appropriate for the Gables? There's an issue with
23 the adjacent house, I think to the east. It's two
24 and half -- it's one of those 1926 homes, so I think
25 it's very close to the adjacent neighbor, but through

1 no fault of the new builder.

2 Is there some feelings about that house?

3 No?

4 MR. AIZENSTAT: I like that design.

5 MR. SACKMAN: And I think members of the
6 board did, or at least those who spoke up about it.
7 But I think, for some reason, that was on the cover
8 of the Gazette and was considered a --

9 MR. STEFFENS: Well, you know that --

10 MR. HERSH: Monster.

11 MR. SACKMAN: -- a monster house.

12 MR. STEFFENS: Any kind of corner lot,
13 especially if it's a small corner lot, is a major
14 problem, because you're giving away a substantial
15 portion of your land to setbacks.

16 MR. SACKMAN: Correct.

17 MR. STEFFENS: You have a very small
18 envelope to work with on those pieces of property.

19 That house isn't any different, I would
20 predict, than almost every other house that's been
21 built on a corner in the last 25 years. I think
22 what's different about that house is the way they
23 articulated the open space part of that house.

24 MR. AIZENSTAT: Right.

25 MR. STEFFENS: But if you look at other

1 houses that were built on those kind of lots, I'm
2 sure they were pushed up to the property line on the
3 other two sides --

4 MR. SACKMAN: Right.

5 MR. STEFFENS: -- because they almost have
6 to be, on a corner lot.

7 MS. KEON: How is it that they dealt with
8 the open space and that makes it different?

9 MR. STEFFENS: They built a lot of structure
10 around their open space.

11 MS. KEON: What does that mean? What is
12 that?

13 MR. STEFFENS: Arcades, loggias --

14 MR. SACKMAN: They contained it.

15 MR. STEFFENS: -- things like that.

16 MS. KEON: They enclosed it, sort of?

17 MR. SACKMAN: No, not --

18 MR. STEFFENS: Not enclosed. It's open, but
19 it's structure. It's not grass, it's structure.

20 MS. KEON: Oh.

21 MR. SACKMAN: Visually, it may appear more
22 enclosed, but in fact, it's --

23 MS. KEON: It's not.

24 MR. SACKMAN: It's as open as any other
25 homes with garages, and I think it's an excellent,

1 you know, solution.

2 MR. STEFFENS: It's a problem with corner
3 lots. Corner lots are a major problem.

4 MS. HERNANDEZ: Okay.

5 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay.

6 MS. HERNANDEZ: Where are we?

7 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: I think --

8 MR. SIEMON: What would you recommend as a
9 solution?

10 MR. STEFFENS: On corner lots? Take off the
11 side setback.

12 MS. LUBIN: What do you mean?

13 MR. SIEMON: How about the alternative --

14 MR. STEFFENS: Just take off the street
15 side --

16 MR. SACKMAN: The street side.

17 MR. STEFFENS: Street side setback.

18 MR. SIEMON: How about the alternative of
19 two 15-foot -- you know, reduce the front yard to
20 15.

21 MR. STEFFENS: See, I think the front yard
22 is more important, because it's contiguous with all
23 the other houses on the street. I think the side
24 setback, if you relax the side setback and it comes
25 closer to the sidewalk, who cares about that?

1 MS. KEON: But then it affects the
2 continuity of the street --

3 MR. KORGE: Of the other street.

4 MS. KEON: -- that it runs along.

5 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: But -- at least, I live
6 in the Old Gables part, okay, and in most of that
7 part, the houses face the main streets, and what's on
8 the side, even on the corner lots, is somebody else's
9 side yard. It's not somebody's front yard --

10 MR. STEFFENS: You have to have your
11 house --

12 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: It's not a square. You
13 know, your front is here, and this is your side, and
14 if you --

15 MR. SIEMON: They're right behind you.

16 MR. SACKMAN: Yeah.

17 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: And if you reduce the
18 side yard, it's just -- you know, a side yard is a
19 side yard. It's not -- you're not facing somebody
20 else's visual front, and it just doesn't hurt you
21 that way.

22 MR. STEFFENS: And you have to have your
23 address on the short side of your lot.

24 MS. KEON: Right.

25 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: Right.

1 MR. STEFFENS: So --

2 (Simultaneous voices)

3 MR. AIZENSTAT: Martha, let me ask you a
4 question, please. How does the -- One of the things
5 that I've been noticing, since we're on the issue of
6 corner lots, has been the treatment of walls on
7 corner lots. Can you just explain a little bit as to
8 your heights that are required on a corner lot, as to
9 how to run your wall?

10 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: It's the same, anywhere
11 you put it, four feet, unless there's a driveway, or
12 your wall's adjacent to your neighbor's property and
13 they have a driveway within 15 feet.

14 MR. AIZENSTAT: Right.

15 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: There's a triangle of
16 visibility. Then the wall goes down to three feet.
17 Otherwise, it's four feet.

18 MR. AIZENSTAT: I'd like for you to take a
19 look at a property, because I saw a property that
20 just didn't make sense to me, the way they did the
21 wall height. They did a six -- probably a six-foot
22 height, on a side.

23 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: You're allowed
24 six-feet-high piers, and then you also -- No?

25 MR. AIZENSTAT: The entire wall. It didn't

1 make sense to me. That's why I'm asking, because I
2 thought it was a terrible (inaudible).

3 MR. STEFFENS: Was it on a sloping site?

4 MR. AIZENSTAT: No. It's next door to me.

5 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: Does it have railing on
6 top?

7 MR. AIZENSTAT: No. It's solid. I was very
8 surprised.

9 (Simultaneous voices)

10 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Charlie, do you have any
11 specific questions, or can you run with what we've
12 done?

13 MR. SIEMON: I just want to make -- I guess
14 I want to try to summarize a little bit what we've
15 (inaudible). I do want to -- I mean, what they're
16 now doing, if you look at this map --

17 Hit the thing. I think it shows it. No.
18 If this is the parcel of land that we're concerned
19 about -- next slide, next hit. Next slide.

20 This is the unit of analysis, and I think
21 Dennis has started using that as the framework since
22 we put this up, instead of a distance. I think that
23 it's been suggested that we should add -- and I think
24 it makes sense -- some information relative to these
25 back yards, and so I propose -- I take away from our

1 conversation here that the unit analysis ought to
2 incorporate that. So that's the framework.

3 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Not necessarily the
4 whole back yard, but at least, you know, the three
5 lots, the three --

6 MR. SIEMON: Those three lots, just these
7 three lots right here. In this example, it's --

8 MR. AIZENSTAT: That's what I brought up.

9 MR. SIEMON: -- three lots.

10 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Yeah.

11 MR. SIEMON: There's one that touches
12 corner to corner, two that touch corner to corner,
13 and this was the back.

14 MR. HERSH: Absolutely.

15 MR. SIEMON: The information ought to be
16 required for that.

17 MR. HERSH: I agree.

18 MR. SIEMON: And we're going to -- we want
19 to regularize the input side of it, for two reasons.
20 One, you start getting consistent information. Also,
21 pretty soon, the community figures out what they want
22 to -- what will get them to the front of the line and
23 to get into the process.

24 I think that I take away from this, as well,
25 that the opportunity, if not the requirement, for a

1 preliminary review of massing in Old Gables makes
2 sense --

3 MS. LUBIN: That would be great.

4 MR. SIEMON: -- and I think that, in the
5 long run, if you have a City Architect, as we've
6 recommended you do, who can manage that process to
7 make it efficient, take some of these routine things
8 off your docket, and then you can participate in
9 these other things, I think that is a worthy addition
10 to what we have been generally working on.

11 I think that we are going to try to identify
12 a palette of design elements that you all are
13 authorized to direct them to implement, where
14 necessary, to ensure compatibility.

15 MR. SACKMAN: These are aesthetic elements?

16 MR. SIEMON: Elements, out of the typology
17 model. I mean, not the assembled typologies, but the
18 individual elements.

19 MR. STEFFENS: I don't think it's aesthetic
20 elements.

21 MR. SIEMON: They're design elements.

22 MS. HERNANDEZ: It's combinations, design,
23 aesthetic --

24 MR. SIEMON: And --

25 MR. HERSH: Yeah, but I'd rather just get

1 a --

2 MR. STEFFENS: It's more of a massing
3 element.

4 MR. SIEMON: Well, but I think that, for
5 example, all the discussion about the parking garage
6 and the carport, et cetera, those elements can have a
7 major impact on the effect of it, and if it's
8 addressed at the early part of the phase, early part
9 of the process, I think, could go along way towards
10 the unidentified problem we have. I think what
11 happens is, we get too far down the line before we
12 start talking about this.

13 So that's what I'm telling you, I'm going to
14 have to wrestle with how to pull those things in
15 place. We did some very similar things, Michael, you
16 remember, and we looked at -- we went to the front
17 facades. I think there's a consensus that garages
18 should not be the front of the structure, that
19 they're -- if you have a garage that's up close to
20 the front facade, it really ought to be a carport,
21 with a garage in the back.

22 I still think the best model in this
23 community is the carport that's along the side
24 yard -- the side of the house, and then the rear
25 garage, a detached garage, is probably the best

1 model, because I think the structure of having the
2 outside car parked in that carport, a classic
3 carport, not a modern carport, is still a great model
4 and looks really good.

5 MR. SACKMAN: Can I stop you there?

6 MR. SIEMON: Yeah.

7 MR. SACKMAN: If you do that on a 50-foot
8 lot and you respect your normal setbacks -- you're
9 going to a two-story home, right?

10 MR. SIEMON: Yeah.

11 MR. SACKMAN: So the side opposite the
12 carport, opposite the garage in the back, is going to
13 be a two-story facade --

14 MR. SIEMON: Yeah, but if there's --

15 MR. SACKMAN: -- against the property line
16 and setback.

17 MR. SIEMON: You could build over the
18 carport. No reason not to.

19 MR. SACKMAN: You could, but you don't see
20 that in some of the -- most of the older houses.

21 MR. SIEMON: No, but it would be two
22 stories.

23 MR. AIZENSTAT: Would you not square out a
24 house, if you did that? Wouldn't we be looking at
25 what we're trying to get away from, that other slide

1 that we looked at, that was a square box type home?

2 MS. KEON: Yeah.

3 MR. SIEMON: You might, you might not. I
4 mean, it's --

5 MR. SACKMAN: It's really up to the
6 architect to --

7 MR. SIEMON: But I think that what you --

8 MR. SACKMAN: -- come up with something.

9 MR. SIEMON: What you want to do, then, is
10 give -- what we want to do is give -- digest out of
11 all the stuff that everybody has identified, a
12 palette of elements --

13 MR. SACKMAN: Correct.

14 MR. SIEMON: -- that could be applied to
15 mitigate, and the place to really do that, address
16 that, is at that preliminary.

17 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: The other thing about
18 the preliminary is that the homeowner, at that point,
19 hasn't invested so much money --

20 MS. LUBIN: That's the thing.

21 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: -- that you -- at least
22 me, as a homeowner, if I've done my whole
23 architectural plan, and you now tell me to change it,
24 I'm going to fight you tooth and nail.

25 MR. KEON: Right.

1 MS. LUBIN: Right.

2 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: But if I am at the
3 sketch level --

4 (Simultaneous voices)

5 MR. AIZENSTAT: I would not think that
6 people actually go and do a complete set of drawings.

7 MR. HERSH: Oh, yes, they do.

8 MS. HERNANDEZ: Oh, yes, they do.

9 MR. HERSH: Absolutely.

10 MS. LUBIN: Absolutely.

11 MR. SALMAN: A question to Martha. Don't
12 you have to submit a preliminary before you actually
13 do the plans?

14 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: If it's more than
15 25,000.

16 MR. AIZENSTAT: \$25,000?

17 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: Dollars.

18 MR. HERSH: \$25,000 is a complete set of
19 drawings sometimes.

20 MS. KEON: And nobody wants to say it's more
21 than \$25,000, because they don't want you.

22 MR. AIZENSTAT: Excuse my language, but
23 that's ignorant.

24 MR. HERSH: Yes, that's true.

25 MR. AIZENSTAT: For somebody to go and spend

1 on a full set of plans before going to the Board of
2 Architects --

3 MS. HERNANDEZ: Well, it may not necessarily
4 be ignorance, and you know, without referencing the
5 architects here, because they're professionals, there
6 are many architects out there that will convince a
7 property owner and say, "Well, if I just do this set,
8 it's going to cost you X, but if I do all of this,"
9 and then they leave it to the property owner to
10 engage in a debate, a fight, with the City, the
11 Building & Zoning Department, the City Manager's
12 Office, the City Attorney's Office.

13 So, you know, it depends on the sell that
14 the property owner is getting, and the architect that
15 they're hiring, in many, many instances.

16 MR. KORGE: Well, how do we avoid that
17 problem?

18 MS. HERNANDEZ: Fine the architect.

19 MR. SIEMON: Well, it's also complicated by
20 the fact that there's not clear regulatory authority
21 for them to say no.

22 MR. SACKMAN: Exactly.

23 MS. LUBIN: That's it.

24 MR. AIZENSTAT: Well, one of the things that
25 I would think is --

1 MR. SIEMON: Or to say, "Change it."

2 MS. HERNANDEZ: Right.

3 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: But to me -- to me --

4 MR. SIEMON: And that's the hammer that
5 drives them back to the original process, to come in,
6 in preliminary, and make sure they're going to
7 succeed.

8 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Now, see, to me, that's
9 the key to the preliminary. I, as a property owner,
10 want to know, up front, that what my architect is
11 designing and I'm paying for is buildable.

12 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yeah. Now, in the
13 application, when somebody goes before the Board of
14 Architects, there's a sheet of guidelines and
15 requirements.

16 MR. SACKMAN: Submittal requirements?

17 MR. AIZENSTAT: Exactly. On that, it
18 states, for example, photographs --

19 MR. SACKMAN: Exactly.

20 MR. AIZENSTAT: -- an accompanying fee of so
21 much, and so forth. Does it state, preliminary
22 drawings? Does it state, full set of drawings?

23 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: It says both. If it's
24 more than 25,000, you must go to preliminary. They
25 cannot go for final.

1 MR. AIZENSTAT: So you do spell it out, is
2 what I'm saying.

3 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: Yeah.

4 MS. HERNANDEZ: Oh, yeah.

5 MR. SACKMAN: But, as Burton had said
6 before, what will happen, an architect will be
7 retained, and he'll do what will maybe be 90 percent
8 what we call working drawings or contract documents,
9 submit them as a preliminary packet, and then come
10 back seven days later for a final.

11 MS. HERNANDEZ: Uh-huh.

12 MS. LUBIN: It happens all the time.

13 MR. SACKMAN: Assuming he -- because, as was
14 explained before, you know, maybe his fee is based on
15 doing a set of drawings for permit. He's just
16 submitting them a week early for preliminary, hoping
17 and suspecting he'll get through, and we make some
18 minor comments, and, you know, we're torn. You know,
19 we say, "Really, you ought to have this portion of
20 the house over there, and this over there," and we
21 don't really -- I, speaking for myself, don't sense
22 that we have that authority, at that point, but we do
23 and we should, you know, make those changes, and I
24 think coming in, even before a preliminary, for a
25 good-sized home --

1 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: What about if we say
2 that, you know, you cannot come in for a final
3 approval until X amount of time has elapsed from your
4 preliminary?

5 MR. HERSH: No.

6 MR. SACKMAN: Well, I don't know that
7 that's --

8 MR. AIZENSTAT: I don't know if you need
9 that.

10 MR. SACKMAN: It's just the mentality.

11 MR. HERSH: If we can get something
12 conceptual, I think that's the best.

13 MS. KEON: Yeah.

14 MR. SACKMAN: But even in these -- if I can
15 even take that house back there. If we're doing --
16 if somebody is doing an addition to the back of that
17 purple plot, and they want to go to the five-foot
18 rear setback, they'll come in with a preliminary --

19 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Right.

20 MR. SACKMAN: -- almost entirely complete
21 set of drawings that could have and probably would
22 have a tremendous impact on the rear neighbors of
23 those three lots on the bottom.

24 MS. HERNANDEZ: Uh-huh.

25 MR. SIEMON: We're talking here about a

1 concept of early intervention.

2 MS. HERNANDEZ: Right.

3 MS. KEON: You can write --

4 MR. SACKMAN: Yes, but --

5 MS. KEON: You can write regulations that do
6 that, right?

7 MR. SIEMON: Yes.

8 MS. KEON: (Inaudible).

9 MR. SACKMAN: But the only way, I think, to
10 accomplish that is for us to -- and I know this is
11 another issue, but to get rid of the bulkheads and
12 the paver, you know --

13 MR. SIEMON: I'm your biggest champion of
14 that.

15 MR. SACKMAN: Okay.

16 MR. HERSH: Thank you.

17 MR. SIEMON: I promise you.

18 MR. SACKMAN: And Staff has, you know, their
19 work cut out for them, and we have ours, tomorrow
20 morning, and we -- and the other thing I think that
21 we've changed, just recently, is the amount of --
22 when we look at certain projects. So we're getting,
23 you know, our big Downtown CBD projects, you know,
24 maybe at twelve o'clock, you know, at noon, and we're
25 getting a little anxious and looking at our clocks,

1 and we're spending as much time on that person's, you
2 know --

3 MR. SIEMON: Yeah.

4 MR. SACKMAN: -- two-story garage addition
5 as we might spend on a bigger project.

6 MR. HERSH: We spent 40 minutes on a
7 little --

8 MR. SACKMAN: Because you're usually dealing
9 with -- I don't want to -- maybe a less qualified
10 architect, maybe a less informed client --

11 MS. HERNANDEZ: Right.

12 MR. SACKMAN: -- that doesn't know the
13 system, you know, it's a mom and pop. When you get a
14 Mort Guilford or a Zeke Guilford and a major
15 developer come in --

16 MS. HERNANDEZ: It's his birthday. He's
17 gone.

18 MS. LUBIN: He's gone.

19 MR. SACKMAN: They know -- No, I'm
20 speaking --

21 MS. HERNANDEZ: Good of him.

22 MR. SACKMAN: That architectural firm and
23 that developer knows the system and they're doing,
24 you know, obviously, a better project, or at least a
25 better presentation.

1 MR. HERSH: Right now, on a major project,
2 we don't even see it until after it's through DRC 1
3 and DRC 2.

4 MS. HERNANDEZ: Uh-huh, and do you -- Is
5 that something that you think is good or bad?

6 MR. HERSH: I think that's bad, because what
7 if somebody designs something and it goes through the
8 DRC process, they've completely gone through it, and
9 then there's some blunder in their design?

10 MS. LUBIN: You're not the only architect to
11 say that.

12 MS. HERNANDEZ: Well, then, we need to
13 tweak that.

14 MR. AIZENSTAT: Right.

15 MR. SIEMON: I think the historic -- the
16 success of the historic preservation program, of
17 their preliminary, really shows. It ought to show to
18 the community that this is a good way to do business.

19 MR. SACKMAN: For new business. For new
20 projects.

21 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: It just makes economic
22 sense.

23 MR. SIEMON: Right.

24 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: You don't fight it as
25 hard if you don't have a lot of money invested, you

1 know.

2 MR. SACKMAN: Exactly.

3 MS. LUBIN: That's right.

4 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: You're more willing to
5 change before you've got the money invested than
6 after you have all the money and all the approvals
7 and everything else. "Come on, you guys, let me get
8 away with this."

9 MS. SIEMON: I also assume that --

10 MS. LUBIN: And we encourage the property
11 owners, with regard to this, also.

12 MR. SIEMON: -- on a substantive basis,
13 that there is a consensus that we ought to reduce the
14 height --

15 MS. KEON: Yes.

16 (Simultaneous voices)

17 MR. SIEMON: -- as the standard.

18 MS. HERNANDEZ: Right.

19 MR. SIEMON: And have ways that you can earn
20 up --

21 MS. KEON: Yes.

22 MR. AIZENSTAT: Bonuses.

23 MS. HERNANDEZ: Correct.

24 MR. SIEMON: -- to the 34 feet that we have
25 today. I think there was a fairly strong consensus

1 about that.

2 MS. LUBIN: Do you think that --

3 (Simultaneous voices)

4 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: I wouldn't call it an
5 earn-up. I would call it more of a -- I don't want
6 to use the word variance, but a need-based standard,
7 not that you can earn up with design or whatever,
8 like we have in other situations --

9 MS. HERNANDEZ: A special exception?

10 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: A special exception for
11 a flood zone or some unusual feature, but, you know,
12 not the idea of earning up to the 34.

13 MR. STEFFENS: But, Cristina, are we talking
14 about the North Gables versus the South Gables, the
15 old versus new?

16 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: We're just talking
17 SF 1. I started the --

18 MR. AIZENSTAT: Right now, we're just
19 talking about north.

20 MR. STEFFENS: If we're talking about SF 1,
21 there's no flood zone issues. So I think, in SF 1,
22 we just need to talk about a basic height. We need
23 to say, okay, there's a height that we think is
24 acceptable in this area, 27 feet, 25 feet, 24 feet,
25 whatever it is, and maybe there's -- maybe there's

1 some kind of special exception, but I don't know why
2 we would have a special exception in that area,
3 because it's a --

4 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Yeah, I know that, so,
5 see there?

6 MS. KEON: But in the Old Gables -- Isn't
7 Sunrise Harbor in the Old Gables?

8 MR. STEFFENS: Is what?

9 MS. KEON: Sunrise Harbor --

10 MS. HERNANDEZ: Sunrise Harbor, north of
11 Cocoplum Circle? No, that's south.

12 MR. STEFFENS: No, that's in Section 1.
13 That's in Section 1.

14 MR. AIZENSTAT: Section 1.

15 MR. STEFFENS: I'm sorry, Section -- That's
16 in your other section.

17 MS. KEON: No, it's north of Cocoplum.

18 MR. STEFFENS: Yeah, but it's not included
19 in the -- it's not included in the Old Gables
20 section.

21 MR. SIEMON: No, east of --

22 MS. HERNANDEZ: It's east of the Highway.

23 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Can you put that --

24 MS. HERNANDEZ: It's east of the Highway,
25 Pat.

1 (Simultaneous voices)

2 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Can you put that slide
3 that said SF 1?

4 (Simultaneous voices)

5 MR. SIEMON: Can I follow up on Michael's
6 comment, while we're getting that graphic?

7 MS. HERNANDEZ: Okay, the mumbling --
8 please, please, please, please.

9 MR. SIEMON: You know, it's --

10 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Wait, wait, wait.

11 MR. STEFFENS: You're mumbling.

12 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Mr. Siemon.

13 MR. SIEMON: It's relatively -- I mean, we
14 should -- if the consensus is that we should reduce
15 height --

16 MS. KEON: That's in the old -- that is.

17 MR. STEFFENS: No.

18 MS. KEON: Oh, I'm sorry. Okay, yes.

19 MR. SIEMON: If the consensus is that 34
20 feet is too high in Old Gables, and I suspect that it
21 is --

22 MS. HERNANDEZ: Right.

23 MR. SIEMON: -- on a pretty uniform basis --

24 MS. HERNANDEZ: Right.

25 MR. SIEMON: -- you've got a first-floor

1 height of -- what do you want? Who's going to
2 build -- do higher than 12 feet?

3 MR. STEFFENS: 12 feet with structural?

4 MR. SIEMON: Yeah.

5 MR. STEFFENS: Architects.

6 MS. KEON: I think, in that particular
7 document, it says 26.

8 MR. SIEMON: 10 feet, and then five feet
9 from the mid point of the gable.

10 MS. HERNANDEZ: So that's --

11 MR. SIEMON: 27 feet.

12 MS. HERNANDEZ: -- 27.

13 MR. AIZENSTAT: I was going to actually say
14 27.

15 MR. STEFFENS: 27 from the mid point.

16 MR. SIEMON: Isn't that what we're talking
17 about?

18 MR. STEFFENS: So that gives you a little
19 bit of flexibility?

20 MS. LUBIN: And you can have, if you want, a
21 two-story volume, which I have in my home, a
22 two-story volume living room. It counts twice on
23 FAR, so it's taken out of that --

24 (Simultaneous voices)

25 MS. LUBIN: -- so it doesn't limit

1 people from designing regulars.

2 MR. AIZENSTAT: I'd like -- I think 27 is
3 good.

4 MS. HERNANDEZ: Okay.

5 MR. SIEMON: Okay.

6 (Simultaneous voices)

7 MR. HERSH: 27 to the mid point.

8 MR. SIEMON: 27 to the mid point of the
9 gable, and I heard some interest in examining flat
10 roofs, perhaps as a portion of the roof structure,
11 not as an exclusive treatment.

12 MR. AIZENSTAT: Why --

13 MR. STEFFENS: You know --

14 MR. AIZENSTAT: Why was it taken away,
15 originally? Does anybody know that?

16 MS. HERNANDEZ: I think Dona was saying
17 that --

18 MS. LUBIN: I think it was because it was a
19 cheap type of flat roof. There's probably a better
20 way to say that, but --

21 MR. SACKMAN: Yeah, I don't think that's an
22 architectural term.

23 MS. KEON: It was cheesy-looking.

24 MS. LUBIN: That's a much better way to say
25 it.

1 MR. SALMAN: If I may --

2 MS. LUBIN: Where the flashing was on
3 display.

4 MR. SALMAN: -- my problem with the flat
5 roof is not the flat roof. It's how it was treated
6 along its edge.

7 MS. LUBIN: Right, right, right.

8 MS. HERNANDEZ: Right.

9 MR. SALMAN: As long as it's contained
10 within a decorative parapet --

11 MS. LUBIN: If there's a parapet --

12 MR. SACKMAN: A parapet.

13 MS. LUBIN: There needs to be parapet.

14 MR. SALMAN: -- then you don't have a
15 problem.

16 MS. LUBIN: Then there's no problem.

17 MR. SALMAN: Then I don't see a problem.

18 MR. SACKMAN: That's the language to use.

19 MR. SALMAN: That's what's made it
20 acceptable in the North Gables and some of the
21 historic areas.

22 MS. LUBIN: Right.

23 MR. STEFFENS: Is that a decorative parapet
24 without the flashing on top of it?

25 MR. SALMAN: I would suggest, yes, that it's

1 a decorative parapet without flashing. It's the
2 flashing that makes it objectionable.

3 MS. LUBIN: That's right. That's exactly
4 right.

5 MR. SALMAN: So it's a roll-top or a flat
6 or --

7 MR. SIEMON: How tall a parapet?

8 MR. SALMAN: I'd say --

9 MS. LUBIN: 18.

10 MR. SACKMAN: Enough to contain the water on
11 it.

12 MS. LUBIN: 18.

13 MR. SALMAN: No, minimum, minimum --

14 MR. STEFFENS: 18.

15 MR. SALMAN: 18 to two feet.

16 MS. LUBIN: That's what's in there now.

17 MR. SIEMON: 18 minimum?

18 MS. SALAZAR-BLANCO: Minimum.

19 MR. HERSH: Yes, that's the current Code.

20 MR. SIEMON: And maximum?

21 MR. STEFFENS: Whatever you want up there.

22 MS. HERNANDEZ: 23.

23 MR. SACKMAN: No, I don't think that's --

24 MR. SIEMON: 27 feet.

25 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Feet?

1 MS. HERNANDEZ: No, not feet.

2 MR. SACKMAN: If it's got windows --

3 MR. SIEMON: No, I mean, to the top, the top
4 of it is 27.

5 MS. LUBIN: Yeah.

6 MR. SIEMON: Where do you want to measure
7 the height of the flat roof, from the top of the
8 parapet or from the top of the tie beam?

9 MS. LUBIN: What do you mean?

10 MR. SACKMAN: I think top of the parapet,
11 because people will take advantage.

12 MS. HERNANDEZ: Yeah.

13 MR. SIEMON: Okay. Then we're all right.

14 MS. HERNANDEZ: Okay.

15 MR. SIEMON: Then we're fine.

16 MR. HERSH: And as far as percentage of the
17 flat roofs, you know, there are some places in the
18 newer section where a completely flat-roofed home,
19 well designed, could add to the diversity of a
20 neighborhood and could look very nice, whereas
21 probably it wouldn't work in North Gables.

22 MR. SIEMON: Well, we're only -- right now,
23 we're talking about -- we're only talking about
24 north. I assume, though, that -- Is there concern
25 about the 34 feet in the SF 2?

1 MS. HERNANDEZ: Perhaps, in some areas,
2 where Wally lives.
3 Walter? Where is he? What's your area?
4 MR. CARLSON: SF 1.
5 MS. HERNANDEZ: Your area is SF 1?
6 MR. CARLSON: Yeah.
7 MS. HERNANDEZ: Okay.
8 MS. KEON: What about you?
9 MS. HERNANDEZ: Then no.
10 MS. LUBIN: Well, what about that area
11 that's two -- that little triangle? That's it.
12 MS. HERNANDEZ: That's the cemetery.
13 MS. LUBIN: No, no, no.
14 (Simultaneous voices)
15 MS. LUBIN: There's Old Cutler.
16 MS. KEON: That's really an older part of
17 the Gables, too. That little area right there is an
18 older part of the City.
19 MS. LUBIN: Right. I mean, that's Tibidabo
20 or --
21 MR. SIEMON: I think that this graphic has
22 changed, that this is --
23 MR. STEFFENS: Those are big lots in there.
24 MS. KEON: That should be --
25 (Simultaneous voices)

1 MS. KEON: No, not that little triangle
2 there.

3 MR. STEFFENS: Those are all decent size
4 lots. They're almost -- at least a hundred by a
5 hundred.

6 MS. HERNANDEZ: Not all of them are.

7 MS. LUBIN: Not all of them.

8 MS. HERNANDEZ: Not all of them are. Drive
9 the area.

10 MR. STEFFENS: 85 percent.

11 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: So maybe SF 1 should go
12 down to there.

13 MS. HERNANDEZ: Charlie, you may want to
14 look at --

15 MR. SIEMON: I'm told that the map,
16 Cristina --

17 MS. KEON: Right.

18 MR. SIEMON: -- does go down there.

19 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Uh-huh.

20 MS. HERNANDEZ: Okay.

21 MR. SIEMON: This was the --

22 MR. AIZENSTAT: So it's that triangle part.

23 MR. SIEMON: I didn't regenerate this. I
24 just --

25 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay, good.

1 MR. SIEMON: But I was told that this is the
2 change --

3 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay, we're happy.

4 MR. SIEMON: -- to this mapping for SF 1.

5 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Thank you.

6 MR. RIEL: Next item.

7 MR. SALMAN: Through the Chair -- Another
8 issue that I think that is one that has made a lot of
9 the development that's occurring objectionable is the
10 privacy of the garage door front on the actual
11 facade.

12 MR. HERNANDEZ: Right.

13 MR. SALMAN: It overwhelms the overall
14 facade of the house. It creates confusion. It's not
15 necessarily -- what the owners are trying to project
16 is, well, we're getting in way South Dade, where it's
17 just a row of garage doors.

18 MR. HERSH: Right.

19 MR. SALMAN: And back in the day when
20 architects were a little -- perhaps a little more
21 sensitive to the development of the streetscape and
22 the development of the facade, you wouldn't see
23 that. They would set it back. They'd push it back
24 five feet. And I think that should be something that
25 perhaps the Code requires, that at least it should be

1 five feet behind the average frontage of the facade.

2 MR. HERSH: Unless it's turned.

3 MR. SALMAN: Unless it's turned. If it has
4 to face the street, then -- especially on narrow
5 lots, and we're not talking about a lot, we're
6 talking about five feet. It's just a shift, and
7 perhaps that part of the -- of it is not counted
8 towards the FAR.

9 MS. LUBIN: That alone will go a long way.

10 MR. SIEMON: Let me follow up on that.

11 (Simultaneous voices)

12 MR. KORGE: Would you require that also if
13 it was hidden by a wall?

14 MR. SALMAN: As long as it's not visible
15 from the street.

16 MR. KORGE: Right.

17 MR. SALMAN: But I would require it.

18 MR. KORGE: If it's not visible from the
19 street, you wouldn't require it.

20 MR. SALMAN: If you have enough space on a
21 narrow lot, without having it visible from the
22 street. That would count rear garages. Rear garages
23 are not visible to the street.

24 MR. STEFFENS: Well, that's behind --

25 MR. SALMAN: That's behind the house.

1 MR. STEFFENS: Yeah. That's more than five
2 feet.

3 (Simultaneous voices)

4 MR. SALMAN: What I'm talking about -- what
5 I'm talking about is along the average front of the
6 front facade, so that it doesn't compete with the
7 primary --

8 (Simultaneous voices)

9 MR. STEFFENS: Yeah, but unfortunately, I
10 can think of nice examples where --

11 MR. SALMAN: I can, too.

12 MR. SIEMON: Hold it.

13 MR. SALMAN: And there probably would have
14 been nice --

15 MR. SIEMON: I need some clarity on this
16 point.

17 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Okay.

18 MR. SIEMON: I'm not going to get it that
19 way. Oh, well. It's getting tougher and tougher,
20 but I'm not going to give up. Here's the home --

21 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Eric, we need Richard
22 here.

23 MR. SIEMON: Okay -- Somebody could come to
24 my aid, however. We're talking about putting the
25 garage --

1 MS. HERNANDEZ: You look very charming that
2 way.

3 MR. SIEMON: I don't know.

4 MR. BARNES: Put it up on the chair.

5 MR. RIEL: Why don't you just take the pad
6 off?

7 MS. LUBIN: I don't know if you can take the
8 pad off. Just hold it there.

9 MR. SIEMON: All right.

10 MS. LUBIN: Poor guy.

11 MR. SIEMON: When we were last together, I
12 thought I understood that we said that the garage had
13 to be set back from behind the facade line without
14 regard to where the build-to line or the setback line
15 was.

16 MR. AIZENSTAT: Correct.

17 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Correct.

18 MR. SIEMON: Yeah, I heard that.

19 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Yes.

20 MR. AIZENSTAT: Yes.

21 MR. SIEMON: Now, if this is a carport or a
22 garage, then the second car is going to be parked
23 here. Is that -- I mean, everybody's got two cars.
24 Is that acceptable?

25 MS. HERNANDEZ: We have four cars.

1 MR. STEFFENS: It's going to be parked on
2 the swale, because nobody wants to back out the car
3 to get the other car in there.

4 MS. LUBIN: That's a concern.

5 MR. SIEMON: But I just wanted to -- So, as
6 long as this is --

7 MR. SACKMAN: Set back.

8 MR. SIEMON: -- set back at least five feet
9 from the front facade of the building, regardless of
10 the setback line, that's acceptable?

11 MR. SALMAN: I'm thinking, sometimes you
12 have an L situation, where the front bedroom actually
13 sits in front of the facade, in which case you would
14 take the average --

15 MR. SIEMON: Yeah.

16 MR. SALMAN: -- to make sure that it was
17 behind that.

18 MS. KEON: Oh, well, he said whatever the
19 front setback is.

20 MR. SALMAN: Yeah, well, he's saying
21 whatever, yeah.

22 MS. KEON: I assume he meant beyond the
23 front setback, right?

24 MR. SIEMON: Can the garage, then, be here?

25 MR. STEFFENS: Can the garage be sticking in

1 front of that other mass, because you're taking the
2 average?

3 MS. KEON: No.

4 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: No, no, no.

5 MR. SIEMON: That would be the average,
6 would be here.

7 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: No.

8 MR. SALMAN: It was just an idea.

9 MR. SIEMON: I would suggest to you that
10 when we went through this, every time the garage was
11 behind the principal building facade, it was -- it
12 ranked, when we -- we'd take them and ask our staff
13 to say -- pick A or B, or B or C, just to get
14 independent -- our nonprofessional staff. Every time
15 the garage that was set back was favored, every time.

16 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Yes.

17 MR. SIEMON: And I believe, to the eye, it's
18 favored.

19 MR. SALMAN: In the primary facade.

20 MR. SIEMON: Yeah, primary facade, and
21 that's --

22 MR. HERSH: How about if the garage door
23 doesn't face the street? Then it's a nonissue.

24 MR. SIEMON: Then it's a nonissue, but there
25 are very few lots that that's a --

1 (Simultaneous voices)

2 MR. SIEMON: In the old town that we're
3 dealing with.

4 MR. STEFFENS: Can we have a special
5 exception for that?

6 MR. SIEMON: For what?

7 MS. LUBIN: What, to allow the --

8 MR. STEFFENS: Garage to be --

9 MS. LUBIN: -- garage to come out front?

10 MR. STEFFENS: To be in the same plane as
11 the front of the house?

12 MS. KEON: For what reason?

13 MR. AIZENSTAT: For what reason?

14 MR. STEFFENS: As part of a good design.

15 MR. AIZENSTAT: How do you dictate that,
16 then?

17 MS. HERNANDEZ: Aesthetics, which you
18 rejected. No.

19 MR. SIEMON: Well, we've got -- we've got
20 photos that show the garage or the carport in the
21 same plane as the principal facade of the building.

22 (Simultaneous voices)

23 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: See, to me --

24 MR. SIEMON: Buildings that I think most
25 everybody here likes --

1 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: -- as a non-architect,
2 just as a resident, a carport looks a lot better than
3 a garage. I know it doesn't hide the car, but when
4 you go by and you drive --

5 MS. HERNANDEZ: That's true.

6 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: I live in the Old Gables
7 area. You drive by those houses with carports, and
8 the carport adds a lot to the house.

9 MR. HERSH: It's the door that's not --

10 MR. STEFFENS: Because it could be a
11 patio, a terrace.

12 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Yes.

13 MR. SALMAN: It's the garage door that --

14 MR. HERSH: It's the door.

15 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: It's the door.

16 MR. SIEMON: As long as you don't let it be
17 too big, because then it becomes --

18 MR. RIEL: It becomes a --

19 MR. SIEMON: -- an outdoor storage problem.

20 MR. RIEL: Storage, yeah.

21 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Yeah.

22 MS. HERNANDEZ: We cite that.

23 MR. SIEMON: Yeah.

24 MS. KEON: Yeah, that's cited.

25 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: So keep it small, but

1 keep it there.

2 MR. SACKMAN: But no truck.

3 MS. KEON: And you'll take the elements out
4 of that document?

5 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Actually, I prefer it
6 with no car.

7 MS. HERNANDEZ: Okay, then what's the use?

8 MR. RIEL: Okay, it's 20 after eight.

9 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Let's go. Bye.

10 MR. RIEL: Thank you, everyone.

11 CHAIRWOMAN MORENO: Did you get direction,
12 now?

13 MR. SIEMON: I do have direction.

14 MR. RIEL: Just for --

15 MR. SIEMON: We'll see how it all puts
16 together and whether you all will all like all of the
17 elements of it, but I come away with a much clearer
18 understanding of what we can end up with.

19 MR. RIEL: We'll have a draft in early
20 August --

21 MR. SIEMON: (Inaudible).

22 MR. RIEL: -- if not earlier.

23 MR. SIEMON: I think this was a lot more
24 useful than sitting in a dais setting and trying to
25 struggle through it.

1 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.

2 MR. SIEMON: And, you know, I just want to
3 make sure -- I don't mean any criticism.

4 MR. HERSH: No, I know, but when you came to
5 visit us, we raised that issue.

6 MR. SIEMON: I know, but --

7 MR. HERSH: But that's --

8 MR. SIEMON: I think that the --

9 MS. LUBIN: (Overlapping) -- would be on the
10 Board of Architects.

11 MR. HERSH: And we're --

12 MR. SIEMON: -- ultimate objective is to get
13 a system that really works.

14 MR. SACKMAN: I'd like to invite everybody
15 to the Board of Adjustment tomorrow at 8:00, just to
16 see how we work. Thank you.

17 (Thereupon, the meeting was adjourned at
18 8:15 p.m.)

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE

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

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 11th day of July, 2005.

JOAN L. BAILEY, RDR

