

MIAMI BEACH

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Staff Report & Recommendation

Design Review Board

TO: DRB Chairperson and Members

DATE: June 1, 2021

FROM: Thomas R. Mooney, AICP
Planning Director

SUBJECT: DRB21-0655
4747 North Bay Road

DRB21-0655, 4747 North Bay Road. An application has been filed requesting exterior and interior design modifications to a previously approved Design Review Approval for the construction of a new two-story residence to replace an existing pre-1942 architecturally significant home.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

Lot 8 and the south half of Lot 7 , Block 3 of Nautilus Subdivision of the Miami Beach Bay Shore Co., According to the Plat Thereof, as Recorded in Plat Book 8 at Page 95, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

BACKGROUND

On December 4, 2018, the Design Review Board (DRB) reviewed and approved an application for the construction of a new two-story residence but denied the rear setback variance to construct a pool and deck at a higher elevation than allowed, pursuant to File No. DRB18-0332.

On June 4, 2019, the Design Review Board reviewed and approved an application for a new pool and associated deck in the rear yard, pursuant to file no DRB19-0375. The application also included approval of the following variances:

1. A variance to exceed by 3'-0" the maximum elevation of 6.56' NGVD within the required rear yard in order to construct a pool and raised lawn up to 9.56' NGVD.
2. A variance to exceed by 2.3' the maximum elevation allowed of 8.5' NGVD for allowable encroachments in required yards in order to construct steps within the rear and side yard up to 10.8' NGVD.
3. A variance to exceed by 3'-0" the maximum allowed height of 7'-0" for fences in order to construct stair railings and fencing along the raised lawn located in the rear yard up to 10'-0" as measured from grade of 4.0' NGVD.

SITE DATA:

Zoning: RS-4
Future Land Use: RS
Lot Size: 9,000 SF
Lot Coverage:
 Approved: 2,155.5 SF / 23.9%
 Proposed: 2,575 SF / 28.61%
 Maximum: 2,700 SF / 30%
Unit size:
 Approved: 3,983.5 SF / 44.2%
 Proposed: 4,463 SF / 49.58%
 Maximum: 4,500 SF / 50%
2nd Floor Volume to 1st: **70% | 1,805/2575**
Height:
 Approved: 24'-0" flat roof

Proposed: 24'-0" flat roof
Maximum: 24'-0" flat roof
Grade: +4.0' NGVD
Base Flood: +8.00' NGVD
Adjusted Grade: +6.0' NGVD
30" (+2.5') Above Grade: +6.5' NGVD
First Floor Elevation: +13.00' NGVD (BFE +5')
SURROUNDING PROPERTIES:
North: Two-story 1930 residence
South: Two-story 1933 residence
West: Two-story 1929 residence
East: One-story 1956 residence

THE PROJECT:

The applicant has submitted plans entitled "4747 Residence" as originally designed by **Domo Architecture + Design** and revised by **Ames International Architecture**, signed, sealed, and dated April 05, 2021.

The applicant is proposing exterior and interior modifications to a previously approved Design Review Approval.

COMPLIANCE WITH ZONING CODE:

A preliminary review of the project indicates that the application, as proposed, appears to be inconsistent with the following sections of the City Code:

- The height of the area under the main structure (understory) shall not exceed the maximum floor to ceiling clearance of 7'-6" from the lowest level slab provided.
- All areas, except for the garage area and required stairs and or elevators, under the first habitable floor of the structure shall consist of non-air-conditioned space and shall not be subdivided into rooms.
- The proposed roof deck shall not exceed 25% of the enclosed floor below.
- The proposed spaces identified as storage on ground floor shall be substantially open with louvers.
- The proposed stair bulkhead on roof top shall be removed. Stair bulkheads are not allowable height encroachments.
- The proposed roof top trellis shall not exceed 20 percent of the enclosed floor area immediately below.

The above noted comments shall not be considered final zoning review or approval. These and all zoning matters shall require final review and verification by the Zoning Administrator prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.

COMPLIANCE WITH DESIGN REVIEW CRITERIA:

Design Review encompasses the examination of architectural drawings for consistency with the criteria stated below with regard to the aesthetics, appearances, safety, and function of the structure or proposed structures in relation to the site, adjacent structures and surrounding community. Staff recommends that the following criteria are found to be satisfied, not satisfied or not applicable, as hereto indicated:

1. The existing and proposed conditions of the lot, including but not necessarily limited to topography, vegetation, trees, drainage, and waterways.
Satisfied
2. The location of all existing and proposed buildings, drives, parking spaces, walkways, means of ingress and egress, drainage facilities, utility services, landscaping structures, signs, and lighting and screening devices.
Satisfied
3. The dimensions of all buildings, structures, setbacks, parking spaces, floor area ratio, height, lot coverage and any other information that may be reasonably necessary to determine compliance with the requirements of the underlying zoning district, and any applicable overlays, for a particular application or project.
Satisfied
4. The color, design, selection of landscape materials and architectural elements of Exterior Building surfaces and primary public interior areas for Developments requiring a Building Permit in areas of the City identified in section 118-252.
Satisfied
5. The proposed site plan, and the location, appearance and design of new and existing Buildings and Structures are in conformity with the standards of this Ordinance and other applicable ordinances, architectural and design guidelines as adopted and amended periodically by the Design Review Board and Historic Preservation Boards, and all pertinent master plans.
Satisfied
6. The proposed Structure, and/or additions or modifications to an existing structure, indicates a sensitivity to and is compatible with the environment and adjacent Structures, and enhances the appearance of the surrounding properties.
Satisfied
7. The design and layout of the proposed site plan, as well as all new and existing buildings shall be reviewed so as to provide an efficient arrangement of land uses. Particular attention shall be given to safety, crime prevention and fire protection,

relationship to the surrounding neighborhood, impact on contiguous and adjacent Buildings and lands, pedestrian sight lines and view corridors.

Satisfied

8. Pedestrian and vehicular traffic movement within and adjacent to the site shall be reviewed to ensure that clearly defined, segregated pedestrian access to the site and all buildings is provided for and that all parking spaces are usable and are safely and conveniently arranged; pedestrian furniture and bike racks shall be considered. Access to the Site from adjacent roads shall be designed so as to interfere as little as possible with traffic flow on these roads and to permit vehicles a rapid and safe ingress and egress to the Site.

Satisfied

9. Lighting shall be reviewed to ensure safe movement of persons and vehicles and reflection on public property for security purposes and to minimize glare and reflection on adjacent properties. Lighting shall be reviewed to assure that it enhances the appearance of structures at night.

Not Satisfied; a lighting plan has not been submitted.

10. Landscape and paving materials shall be reviewed to ensure an adequate relationship with and enhancement of the overall Site Plan design.

Satisfied

11. Buffering materials shall be reviewed to ensure that headlights of vehicles, noise, and light from structures are adequately shielded from public view, adjacent properties and pedestrian areas.

Satisfied

12. The proposed structure has an orientation and massing which is sensitive to and compatible with the building site and surrounding area and which creates or maintains important view corridor(s).

Satisfied

13. The building has, where feasible, space in that part of the ground floor fronting a street or streets which is to be occupied for residential or commercial uses; likewise, the upper floors of the pedestal portion of the proposed building fronting a street, or streets shall have residential or commercial spaces, shall have the appearance of being a residential or commercial space or shall have an architectural treatment which shall buffer the appearance of the parking structure from the surrounding area and is integrated with the overall appearance of the project.

Satisfied

14. The building shall have an appropriate and fully integrated rooftop architectural treatment which substantially screens all mechanical equipment, stairs and elevator towers.

Not Satisfied; the proposed stair bulkhead is not an allowable encroachment.

15. An addition on a building site shall be designed, sited and massed in a manner which is sensitive to and compatible with the existing improvement(s).
Not Applicable
16. All portions of a project fronting a street or sidewalk shall incorporate an architecturally appropriate amount of transparency at the first level in order to achieve pedestrian compatibility and adequate visual interest.
Satisfied
17. The location, design, screening and buffering of all required service bays, delivery bays, trash and refuse receptacles, as well as trash rooms shall be arranged so as to have a minimal impact on adjacent properties.
Not Applicable
18. In addition to the foregoing criteria, subsection [118-]104(6)(t) of the city Code shall apply to the design review board's review of any proposal to place, construct, modify or maintain a wireless communications facility or other over the air radio transmission or radio reception facility in the public rights-of-way.
Not Applicable
19. The structure and site complies with the sea level rise and resiliency review criteria in Chapter 133, Article II, as applicable.
Not Satisfied; see below

COMPLIANCE WITH SEA LEVEL RISE AND RESILIENCY REVIEW CRITERIA

Section 133-50(a) of the Land Development establishes review criteria for sea level rise and resiliency that must be considered as part of the review process for board orders. The following is an analysis of the request based upon these criteria:

1. A recycling or salvage plan for partial or total demolition shall be provided.
Not Satisfied; Applicant will provide a recycle/salvage plan for demolition at time of permitting.
2. Windows that are proposed to be replaced shall be hurricane proof impact windows.
Satisfied
3. Where feasible and appropriate, passive cooling systems, such as operable windows, shall be provided.
Satisfied
4. Resilient landscaping (salt tolerant, highly water-absorbent, native or Florida friendly plants) shall be provided, in accordance with Chapter 126 of the City Code.
Satisfied
5. The project applicant shall consider the adopted sea level rise projections in the Southeast Florida Regional Climate Action Plan, as may be revised from time-to-time by the Southeast Florida Regional Climate Change Compact. The applicant shall also

specifically study the land elevation of the subject property and the elevation of surrounding properties.

Satisfied

6. The ground floor, driveways, and garage ramping for new construction shall be adaptable to the raising of public rights-of-ways and adjacent land and shall provide sufficient height and space to ensure that the entry ways and exits can be modified to accommodate a higher street height of up to three (3) additional feet in height.

Satisfied

7. In all new projects, all critical mechanical and electrical systems shall be located above base flood elevation. Due to flooding concerns, all redevelopment projects shall, whenever practicable, and economically reasonable, move all critical mechanical and electrical systems to a location above base flood elevation.

Satisfied

8. Existing buildings shall be, where reasonably feasible and economically appropriate, elevated up to base flood elevation, plus City of Miami Beach Freeboard.

Not Applicable

9. When habitable space is located below the base flood elevation plus City of Miami Beach Freeboard, wet or dry flood proofing systems will be provided in accordance with Chapter of 54 of the City Code.

Not Applicable

10. In all new projects, water retention systems shall be provided.

Not Satisfied

11. Cool pavement materials or porous pavement materials shall be utilized.

Not Satisfied

12. The project design shall minimize the potential for a project causing a heat island effect on site.

Not Satisfied

STAFF ANALYSIS

DESIGN REVIEW

The applicant is proposing exterior and interior modifications to a previously approved new two-story residence that will replace a pre-1942 architecturally significant residence. The approved residence is an elevated two-story structure with a design floor elevation of BFE + maximum freeboard, or 13.00' NGVD.

The applicant is proposing modifications to the floor plans and elevations. The understory level has been modified to incorporate louvered storage spaces for areas that were once walled berms; the area of the first and second floor plans have increased and a new rooftop deck with a trellis is proposed. Additionally, the elevations have also been modified to accommodate the changes in plan, specifically the removal of a first floor balcony on the east

interior side elevation to allow for air-conditioned space now clad with coral stone; and minor tweaks along the front and rear elevations that maintain the essence of the previous design, including materiality. Staff is generally supportive of the design changes and recommends the following:

- Refinement of the front elevation at the second floor by increasing the depth/projection of the concrete frame to further recess the glazing walls and screen, and strengthen the impact of the frame with more depth and shadow; for the glazing walls and screening to be further recessed.
- Reduction of side driveways to 10' in order to reduce the extent of pavement on site.

RECOMMENDATION:

In view of the foregoing analysis, staff recommends the application be **approved** with conditions, subject to the conditions enumerated in the attached Draft Order, which address the inconsistencies with the aforementioned Design Review criteria, Sea Level Rise criteria and Practical Difficulty and Hardship criteria.