

**PALMER LAKE AREA CHARRETTE
MEETING SUMMARY**

*November 7, 2011 · 3:00 P.M.
Orlando Urra Allapattah Community Center
2257 N.W. North River Drive*

Steering Committee Members Present

Jose Bared, Chair, Brett Bibeau, Vice-Chair, James Kohnstamm, Jordan Monocandilos, Jorge Luis Del Rosal, Ismael Perera, Wendy Sager-Pomerantz, Robert Vinas

Community Members Present

Victor Bared, Christopher Benitez Trish Blasi, Richard Dubin, Rick Eyerdam, Carol Foster, Pedro Garcia, James Holland, Christian Larach, Herminio Menendez

Public Agency Staff Present

Miami-Dade County Sustainability, Planning and Economic Enhancement Department: Gilberto Blanco, Catherine Prince, Josh Rak, Eric Silva, Shailendra Singh, Alex Zizold
City of Miami Planning Department: David Snow

* * *

Eric Silva began the meeting by recognizing the steering committee members in attendance and that a quorum was present.

Mr. Silva then reviewed the changes that were made to the recommendation table following the presentation of the Palmer Lake Area Plan to the Planning Advisory Board (PAB) on September 19, 2011. He went on to describe the purpose of the revisions to three specific items in the area plan report table of recommendations. To incorporate the concerns of speakers that appeared before the PAB those items were revised to include mention of specific policies of the Port of Miami River Sub-element of the Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP) relevant to land use.

Mr. Bared then stated that the desire of the committee was to permit maximum flexibility of use throughout the study area. He also feels that that committee may not be completely aware of the purpose and implications of the CDMP. Mr. Bared then stated that if the committee desired, a recommendation could be made to amend the CDMP. Discussion continued among Jordan Monocandilos, Rick Eyerdam and Mr. Bared regarding the CDMP.

Mr. Silva then distributed copies of the Port of Miami River Sub-element to the committee. Brett Bibeau held up a map and emphasized that only the properties on the waterfront were subject to the provisions of that sub-element. Mr. Bared stated that the committee had determined at an earlier time that the study area should be treated as one area.

Mr. Silva then explained the difference between the uses permitted by zoning and what is designated by the CDMP. Mr. Bibeau then spoke about the uses permitted by IU zoning. Mr. Bared then posed a question to those who do not own property in the area as to why they may be opposed to allowing greater flexibility than what may currently be permitted. Mr. Eyerdam responded by stating that any alternative zoning district would be more restrictive than the existing industrial zoning. After some further discussion between Mr. Bared and Mr. Eyerdam, Mr. Silva pointed out that the only uses not currently permitted are retail and residential.

Richard Dubin stated that he felt the suggestion to allow almost any use would be 'ridiculous' and that such a condition does not exist anywhere else in Miami. Mr. Dubin continued by stating that the marine industrial area has been eroded over the years and that the marine community is opposed to such further erosion. Mr. Bared responded by noting that his company is the largest marine industrial use in the study area. Mr. Bared continued by emphasizing that the charrette process was a unique opportunity for the stakeholders to improve the study area and to realize increased value in their properties; if certain properties were to be limited only to marine industrial uses then incentives should be provided to maintain the viability of those businesses.

Mr. Monocandilos spoke about his experiences with the limitations of marine industrial on his property and that a compromise should be found that would satisfy all the stakeholders and still allow flexibility of uses. Mr. Bared then stated that the charrette process gives an opportunity to re-evaluate the existing planning strategies for the area and to suggest changes. Mr. Eyerdam then suggested that if a property owner were to want to build a retail building they would have difficulty finding financing; Mr. Bared responded that the recommendations of this planning effort should not be limited by such hypothetical situations.

Mr. Bibeau then spoke about the Miami River Commission's advisory role to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) and that the MRC was in favor of all the recommendations of the Palmer Lake Area Plan except the three being discussed presently. He continued by comparing the recommendations that were presented to and voted on by the steering committee at their May 25, 2011 meeting and the revisions made following the September 19, 2011 PAB meeting. Mr. Bibeau then stated that the opposition to non-marine industrial uses was based on the prior planning studies and policies that designate the upper river as a marine industrial area. Mr. Bared then stated the committee had previously voted on the recommendations of the area plan; if Mr. Bibeau disagrees, then he should make that known to the BCC independently. Mr. Bared continued by stating the purpose of today's meeting was to vote again on those recommendations that had been revised so that there was no ambiguity as to the position of the steering committee.

Mr. Monocandilos and Mr. Bibeau then engaged in some discussion regarding the limitations imposed by the comprehensive plan and the uses permitted by the existing industrial zoning. Mr. Bared then made a motion to include a recommendation to allow maximum flexibility of uses and if necessary recommend amending the CDMP to achieve such flexibility. Mr. Silva then discussed the process to amend the CDMP and distributed a list of permitted uses that could be implemented as part of new land development regulations for the Palmer Lake area. Mr. Bared then stated that the entire

study area should be treated in a similar manner and that he was opposed to drawing distinctions between various areas.

James Kohnstamm questioned whether the specific recommendation for 'providing flexibility of use to the maximum extent permitted by the CDMP' was too vague. Mr. Silva responded by stating that even if that specific provision was not present, staff would not support any type of application that was inconsistent with the provisions of the comprehensive plan and if the committee desires to amend the CDMP then a separate recommendation should be made.

Mr. Bared then restated his previous motion to revise the implementation section of the table on page 51. After some discussion with Mr. Bibeau, Mr. Bared stated his motion revising the fourth item in the table to a 'new zoning district applied to the entire study area permitting maximum flexibility of use.' Mr. Bibeau then stated that the MRC had compromised with the previous revisions and was able to unconditionally recommend approval of the area plan; if changes were made, the MRC may no longer support the plan. Mr. Bared then asked staff is there was anything to prevent a property owner from seeking outside counsel in regards to land use or zoning changes. Mr. Silva stated that if a party desired to amend the CDMP regarding the uses along the river, lake or canal, staff would likely not sponsor such an amendment but that would not prevent anyone from taking such an action themselves.

Mr. Monocandilos then asked for a summary of the prior PAB meetings. Mr. Bared responded with his view of those meetings as a PAB member. Wendy Sager-Pomerantz asked if the current wording of the recommendations would be detrimental to a property owner. Mr. Bared responded that his priority is to revitalize a blighted area and the current recommendations could be too limiting. Ms. Sager-Pomerantz then asked if the CDMP would apply whether or not such wording was included in the recommendations. Mr. Bared responded that additional advice was needed regarding the CDMP. Mr. Silva mentioned that Ms. Sager-Pomerantz was correct in noting that the CDMP would apply regardless.

A vote was then taken on Mr. Bared's motion. The motion passed 6-2 to revise the recommendation mentioned above. The other recommendations in the Implementation section were reviewed individually. The committee retained the first item recommendation the establishment of a Community Redevelopment Area. The second recommendation was revised to delete the words 'new uses.' During the discussion of this item Mr. Bared clarified that the recommendations being revised are those that were reviewed by the steering committee at their May 25, 2011 meeting and presented at the September 19, 2011 PAB meeting. The third item regarding street lighting was retained with no changes.

A brief discussion followed regarding the next meeting date.

The meeting was adjourned.

* * *

Next meeting:

*Wednesday January 18, 2012 · 3:00 P.M.
Orlando Urra Allapattah Community Center
2257 N.W. North River Drive*