



# MIAMI BEACH

## PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

### HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD STAFF REPORT

FROM: Richard G. Lorber, AICP, LEED AP  
Acting Planning Director *WHL for RGL*

DATE: March 12, 2013 Meeting

RE: Historic Preservation File No. 1844  
**6701 Collins Avenue – Deauville Beach Resort**

---

The applicant, Deauville Associates, LLC., is requesting modifications to a previously issued Certificate of Appropriateness for the for the partial demolition, partial reconstruction, alteration, renovation and rehabilitation of an existing hotel complex, as well as the construction of a new 21-story residential structure. Specifically, the applicant is requesting revisions to the previously approved new residential building, modification of the south retail portion of the property to allow for additional parking and a 12-unit rooftop addition above the existing Deauville Hotel.

#### **LEGAL DESCRIPTION:**

Lot 44 of Block 1 of the amended plat of second ocean front subdivision, according to the plat thereof as recorded in plat book 28 at page 28 of the public records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

#### **SITE DATA:**

Zoning -	RM-3 (Residential Multifamily, High Intensity)
Future Land Use Designation -	RM-3 (Residential Multifamily, High Intensity)
Lot Size -	166,616 S.F.
Existing FAR -	319,137 S.F. / 1.92
Proposed FAR -	499,546 S.F. / 3.0 + 20,000 S.F. for amenity areas (Max FAR = 3.0 + 20,000 sf for amenity areas), as represented by the applicant
Existing Height -	164'-6" / 16 stories
Proposed Height -	200 feet / 20 stories
Existing Use/Condition -	Condo-Hotel / Retail
Proposed Use -	Condo-Hotel / Retail

#### **EXISTING STRUCTURE:**

The Deauville name has a long history dating back to 1926. The original 1926 construction was modified in the early 1930's, and totally demolished in 1956. The present Deauville Hotel, constructed in 1956 and designed by noted Miami Beach architect Melvin Grossman, in the Post War Modern (MiMo) style, is designated contributing in the Miami Beach Historic

Properties Database and is located within the proposed North Beach Resort Local Historic District.

One of the most noticeable features of the building is its dramatic porte-cochere, comprised of sweeping intersecting parabolic curves, it creates a defining entry point for this once all inclusive resort. Stepped horizontal planes rise from the street to the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor lobby entrance along the building's façade, providing shelter and a clear pedestrian procession from Collins Avenue. This lobby entrance is one of the 3 (three) main differentiated architectural features of the building.

The 2-story structure to the south of the property contains ground level retail spaces with an enormous two story height ballroom space above, made legendary by the 1960s appearance of the Beatles on the "Ed Sullivan Show". An elongated honey comb pattern of ornamental hollow clay blocks forms a distinctive screening mechanism for the ballroom façade on Collins Avenue. The hotel portion of the project rises 15 stories at the north of the property with continuous horizontal windows and projecting concrete eyebrows. For a more detailed analysis, see the attached Historic Resources Report.

#### **THE PROJECT:**

The applicant has submitted plans entitled "Deauville Hotel Beach Resort", as prepared by Kobi Karp Architecture, Interior Design, Planning, dated, February 2013.

The applicant is seeking approval for modifications to the previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness for partial demolition, partial reconstruction, alteration, renovation and rehabilitation of an existing hotel complex, as well as the construction of a new 21-story residential structure. These modifications include the following:

1. The previously approved 150-unit residential tower is now proposed as a 412-room hotel. This revision results in the tower becoming 16'-11" narrower than the previously approved plan.
2. The original historic Napoleon Ballroom, previously approved for total demolition to accommodate additional parking, is now proposed to be substantially retained and reconstructed.
3. The applicant is proposing to remove and modify the south retail portion of the property including the demolition of the areas below the main lobby, ballroom and theater, in order to construct 124 new parking spaces.
4. The revised application proposes minor demolition of the northernmost architectural element along Collins Avenue to enable a direct entrance to the parking area and to restore the vehicular entrance configuration to its original configuration, in which cars will enter the hotel and travel north to south.
5. Further, the revised application includes a new 12-unit rooftop addition proposed to be located on the roof of the existing second floor ballroom located toward the northeast portion of the property, south of the existing Deauville Hotel tower.

### **HISTORY**

On November 20, 2012, the Historic Preservation Board reviewed a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed modifications. At this meeting, the Board voted to continue the application to a future meeting. Specifically, the Board requested the applicant provide additional documentation with regards to the existing condition of the historic hotel, and further details for the proposed modifications for the north and south elevations.

On January 15, 2013, the Historic Preservation Board reviewed a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed modifications. At this meeting, the Board voted to continue the application to the March 12, 2013 meeting. Specifically, the Board requested the applicant provide additional documentation with regards to the existing condition of the historic hotel, and further details for the proposed modifications for the north and south elevations, and traffic study.

### **COMPLIANCE WITH ZONING CODE:**

The application, as proposed, is inconsistent with the following requirements of the City Code; consequently, variances from the Zoning Board of Adjustment may be required.

1. Details of the associated parking garage, not presented with this application, must be provided to ensure compliance with the city's parking requirements, or a parking impact fee will be required.
2. A variance may be required for the size, location, and number of signs.

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.

### **ACCESSIBILITY COMPLIANCE:**

Additional information will be required for a complete review for compliance with the Florida Building Code 2001 Edition, section 11 (Florida Accessibility Code for Building Construction). These and all accessibility matters shall require final review and verification by the Building Department prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.

### **PRELIMINARY CONCURRENCY DETERMINATION:**

In accordance with Chapter 122 of the Code of the City of Miami Beach, the Transportation and Concurrency Management Division has conducted a preliminary concurrency evaluation and determined that the project does not meet the City's concurrency requirements and level-of-service standards. However, the City's concurrency requirements can be achieved and satisfied through payment of mitigation fees or by entering into an enforceable development agreement with the City. The Transportation and Concurrency Management Division will make the determination of the project's fair-share mitigation cost.

A final concurrency determination shall be conducted prior to the issuance of a Building Permit. Mitigation fees and concurrency administrative costs shall be paid prior to the project receiving any Building Permit. Without exception, all concurrency fees shall be paid prior to the issuance of a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy or Certificate of Occupancy.

### **COMPLIANCE WITH CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CRITERIA:**

A decision on an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness shall be based upon the following:

- I. Evaluation of the compatibility of the physical alteration or improvement with surrounding properties and where applicable, compliance with the following criteria pursuant to Section 118-564(a)(1) of the Miami Beach Code (it is recommended that the listed criteria be found Satisfied, Not Satisfied or Not Applicable, as so noted):
  - a. The Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings as revised from time to time.  
**Satisfied**
  - b. Other guidelines/policies/plans adopted or approved by Resolution or Ordinance by the City Commission.  
**Satisfied**
- II. In determining whether a particular application is compatible with surrounding properties, the Board shall consider the following criteria pursuant to Section 118-564(a)(2) of the Miami Beach Code (it is recommended that the listed criteria be found Satisfied, Not Satisfied or Not Applicable, as so noted):
  - a. Exterior architectural features.  
**Satisfied**
  - b. General design, scale, massing and arrangement.  
**Satisfied**
  - c. Texture and material and color.  
**Not Satisfied; Staff Analysis**  
**Exterior surface color samples have not been submitted.**
  - d. The relationship of a, b, c, above, to other structures and features of the district.  
**Satisfied**
  - e. The purpose for which the district was created.  
**Satisfied**
  - f. The relationship of the size, design and siting of any new or reconstructed structure to the landscape of the district.  
**Satisfied**
  - g. An historic resources report, containing all available data and historic documentation regarding the building, site or feature.  
**Satisfied**
  - h. The original architectural design or any subsequent modifications that have acquired significance.  
**Satisfied**

- III. The examination of architectural drawings for consistency with the criteria pursuant to Section 118-564(a)(3) of the Miami Beach Code and stated below, with regard to the aesthetics, appearances, safety, and function of any new or existing structure, public interior space and physical attributes of the project in relation to the site, adjacent structures and properties, and surrounding community. The criteria referenced above are as follows (it is recommended that the listed criteria be found Satisfied, Not Satisfied or Not Applicable, as so noted):
- a. 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.  
**Not Satisfied; See Staff Analysis and Condition 1.**  
**Staff will require additional time to fully evaluate the traffic study.**
  - b. 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.  
**Not Satisfied; See Zoning Analysis**
  - c. The color, design, surface finishes and selection of landscape materials and architectural elements of the exterior of all buildings and structures and primary public interior areas for developments requiring a building permit in areas of the city identified in section 118-503.  
**Not Satisfied; see Staff Analysis and II a. above**
  - d. The proposed structure, and/or additions to an existing structure is appropriate to and compatible with the environment and adjacent structures, and enhances the appearance of the surrounding properties, or the purposes for which the district was created.  
**Satisfied**
  - e. The design and layout of the proposed site plan, as well as all new and existing buildings and public interior spaces 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 preserving historic character of the neighborhood and district, contiguous and adjacent buildings and lands, pedestrian sight lines and view corridors.  
**Satisfied**
  - f. 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 any driveways and parking spaces are usable, safely and conveniently arranged and have a minimal impact on pedestrian circulation throughout the site. Access to the site from adjacent roads shall be designed so as to interfere as little as possible with vehicular traffic flow on these roads and pedestrian movement

onto and within the site, as well as permit both pedestrians and vehicles a safe ingress and egress to the site.

**Not Satisfied; See Staff Analysis and III a above.**

- g. 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 and consistent with a City master plan, where applicable.

**Satisfied**

- h. Landscape and paving materials shall be reviewed to ensure an adequate relationship with and enhancement of the overall site plan design.

**Satisfied**

- i. 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**

- j. Any proposed new structure shall have 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**

- k. All buildings shall have, to the greatest extent possible, space in that part of the ground floor fronting a sidewalk, 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 sidewalk street, or streets shall have residential or commercial spaces, or shall have the appearance of being a residential or commercial space or shall have an architectural treatment which shall buffer the appearance of a parking structure from the surrounding area and is integrated with the overall appearance of the project.

**Satisfied**

- l. All buildings shall have an appropriate and fully integrated rooftop architectural treatment which substantially screens all mechanical equipment, stairs and elevator towers.

**Satisfied**

- m. Any 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).

**Satisfied**

- n. All portions of a project fronting a street or sidewalk shall incorporate an amount of transparency at the first level necessary to achieve pedestrian compatibility.

**Satisfied**

- o. 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.

**Satisfied**

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR DEMOLITION EVALUATION CRITERIA:**

Section 118-564 (f)(4) of the Land Development Regulations of the Miami Beach Code provides criteria by which the Historic Preservation Board evaluates requests for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition. The following is an analysis of the request based upon these criteria:

- 1. The Building, Structure, Improvement, or Site is designated on either a national or state level as a part of an Historic Preservation District or as a Historic Architectural Landmark or Site, or is designated pursuant to Division 4, Article X, Chapter 118 of the Miami Beach Code as a Historic Building, Historic Structure or Historic Site, Historic Improvement, Historic Landscape Feature, historic interior or the Structure is of such historic/architectural interest or quality that it would reasonably meet national, state or local criteria for such designation.

**Satisfied**

**The existing structure is designated as part of the proposed North Shore Resort Local Historic District; the building is designated as a "Contributing" structure in the historic district.**

- 2. The Building, Structure, Improvement, or Site is of such design, craftsmanship, or material that it could be reproduced only with great difficulty and/or expense.

**Satisfied**

**The existing structure would be difficult and inordinately expensive to reproduce.**

- 3. The Building, Structure, Improvement, or Site is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the country, or the region, or is a distinctive example of an architectural or design style which contributes to the character of the district.

**Satisfied**

**The subject structure is a distinctive example of the Post War Modern design style which contributes to the character of the district.**

- 4. The building, structure, improvement, or site is a contributing building, structure, improvement, site or landscape feature rather than a noncontributing building, structure, improvement, site or landscape feature in a historic district as defined in section 114-1, or is an architecturally significant feature of a public area of the interior of a historic or contributing building.

**Satisfied**

**The subject structure is designated as a contributing building in the Miami Beach Historic Properties Database.**

- 5. Retention of the Building, Structure, Improvement, Landscape Feature or Site promotes the general welfare of the City by providing an opportunity for study of local history, architecture, and design or by developing an understanding of the importance and value of a particular culture and heritage.

**Satisfied**

**The retention of the subject structure is critical to developing an understanding of the Post War Modern architectural style.**

6. If the proposed demolition is for the purpose of constructing a parking garage, the Board shall consider it if the parking garage is designed in a manner that is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, U.S. Department of the Interior (1983), as amended, and/or the design review guidelines for that particular district.

**Not Applicable**

**The demolition proposed in the subject application is not for the purpose of constructing a parking garage.**

7. In the event an applicant or property owner proposes the total demolition of a contributing structure, historic structure or architecturally significant feature, there shall be definite plans presented to the board for the reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is approved and carried out.

**Not Applicable**

**The applicant is not proposing totally demolish the existing building**

8. The Dade County Unsafe Structures Board has ordered the demolition of a Structure without option.

**Not Applicable**

**The Dade County Unsafe Structures Board has not ordered the demolition of any part of the subject building.**

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

On December 9, 2003, the Historic Preservation Board reviewed and approved a Certificate of Appropriateness for the partial demolition, partial reconstruction, alteration, renovation and rehabilitation of an existing hotel complex, as well as the construction of a new 21 story residential structure.

The applicant is now seeking modifications to the previously approved design including modifications to the tower addition, the reconfiguration of the previously approved parking area located at the south end of the property which includes the modification of the retail portion and partial recreation of the Napoleon ballroom, minor demolition of the northernmost architectural element along Collins Avenue to enable a direct entrance to the parking area and a new 12-unit rooftop addition proposed to be located on the roof of the existing second floor ballroom located toward the northeast portion of the property, south of the existing historic Deauville Hotel tower.

It is very important to note that the Historic Preservation Board had previously approved a proposal for the total demolition of the main Napoleon ballroom (not to be confused with the north ballroom) for the purpose of replacing it with a parking garage. This enormous ballroom is a highly significant amenity space for the hotel, both in terms of historical events and grandeur of space. In the 1960s the Beatles appeared here on the "Ed Sullivan Show", which was broadcast from the Napoleon Ballroom. The proposed modifications, however, substantially reverse the earlier proposal by relocating the parking to the ground floor level, where it will occupy a part of the currently oversized retail spaces as well as former back of house areas and the no longer used poolside cabanas beneath the original pre-function



area. The applicant is now proposing to retain approximately three-quarters of the original ballroom space and to demolish approximately one-quarter of the ballroom as well as the pre-function space to allow for the parking to be constructed on the ground level along with the foundations for the new south tower addition. Upon completion of the new parking garage and foundations for the new south tower approximately 80% of the original Napoleon Ballroom will be restored as well as the pre-function area to its east.

It is further important to note that in 2003, when the North Beach Resort Historic District was reviewed for historic designation, the Board also reviewed and adopted a series of 'Special Review Guidelines' for this historic district which specifically address the unique challenges of a severe parking shortage in the area. Among other provisions, these guidelines address the potential need for on-site parking for hotels along Collins Avenue. Specifically, the adopted Guidelines allow for the consideration of historic buildings located within the district to be adapted to provide on-site parking where structurally and architecturally feasible and appropriate, which may include the conversion of lower levels of the building into parking areas as well as access to such garages from the street through limited demolition of primary facades. Staff is very pleased that the applicant has found a way to provide the critically needed on-site parking, while preserving/reconstructing the majority of this historic ballroom space as well as minimally impacting the Collins Avenue facades of the hotel. The legacy of the Napoleon Ballroom in this regard, as the venue for Frank Sinatra, President John F. Kennedy, the Beatles, and so many others of fame, is probably unsurpassed in South Florida history, and may once again become a great promotional calling card for the hotel.

Additionally, the applicant is proposing minor demolition of the northernmost architectural element along the Collins Avenue elevation in order to enable a direct entrance into the parking garage on the north side of the building. Staff has no objection to the demolition proposed as it will be minimal and occurs only along the retail portion of the building at street level. Staff commends the applicant's proposal to restore the vehicular entrance configuration to the main lobby of the hotel to its original configuration. This proposed modification will allow cars to enter the hotel and travel north rather than traveling in a south direction, alleviating what is now a confusing and dangerous condition.

In response to staff and Board member concerns, the applicant has refined the design for the rooftop addition, as well as provided additional photographic images of the existing interior spaces within the historic hotel. Staff is generally satisfied with the revised plan for the roof-top addition, which has been further studied and refined taking into consideration the incorporation of an angled plan which maximizes the dramatic ocean views and further differentiate itself from the historic architecture.

Further, is now proposing to remove all existing non-original individual through-the-wall air condition units to be replaced with a central air conditioning system. Additionally, the applicant is proposing to replace all existing windows with impact resistant windows to match the historic configuration. These proposals constitute a significant improvement in restoring the historic tower.

With regard to requested modifications for the new south tower addition, staff is especially pleased with the applicant's desire to change the proposed use from residential condominiums to hotel units. This proposed change of use will result in smaller units and will enable the footprint of the tower to become approximately 17-feet more slender. Staff is

highly supportive of this modification, and believes that the more slender tower will be a substantial as well as graceful refinement of the previously approved design, and also will allow for more expansive ocean views from the original hotel tower to the north. Staff would recommend, however, that the proposed glazing be consistent in color rather than two colors and the minimum tint required by the energy and turtle codes.

Further, in response to concerns expressed by staff and Board Members the applicant has further studied and detailed the proposed modifications along north elevation and south elevations. Staff would note at the November 20, 2012 Historic Preservation Board meeting, several neighbors to the north expressed serious concerns with the activities taking place at the north side of the Deauville property, including valet service and receiving which will all occur within this corridor. Staff would note that the applicant has met with the neighbors to the north and that additional design development including larger scale drawings showing the proposed modifications have been submitted for the Boards review. Staff would also note that there is currently an undeveloped vacant lot between the hotels and the neighbors to the north, and that when this vacant lot is developed this corner will not be visible.

Additionally, since the January 15, 2013 meeting the applicant has further evaluated how the northwest corner of the building will be structurally supported after demolition occurs in this area for the entrance to the proposed parking garage. Additional details will be required for the shoring and bracing prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Further, the applicant is proposing significant improvements to the first floor at the southwest corner including returning the stucco grid pattern. While this area will not be visible once a new building is constructed to the south, staff is pleased with the additional design development along this elevation at this time and has no objection to the proposal.

Further, staff is pleased with the additional study and refinement of the south end of the eastern portion of the site, and supportive of the very positive modifications for the pedestal portion of the hotel facing the ocean to the east portion of the property, including the introduction of substantial glazing at the 2<sup>nd</sup> level which will provide extraordinary views from the interior of the space and will significantly activate the newly constructed Beachwalk with easily accessible and convenient cabanas at grade level. Staff would strongly recommend, however, that all non-original railings, including the existing aluminum pickets in the pool deck area be removed and replaced with railings which are more consistent with the original Post War Modern design of the hotel.

Additionally, staff would note that there is a significant vehicular circulation challenge at the entrance to the property where two parabolic arches land at the south end of the entrance drive. The existing arches are insufficiently spaced to accommodate the increased width of modern vehicles; hence the corners of the original arch have been shaved off to reduce the massing in an effort to reduce vehicular collisions with the arch. Consequently, the applicant is proposing to demolish the western most arch and associated barrel roof in order to swing the arch slightly westward to create sufficient width for the two drive aisles and to reconstruct the barrel roof to its original design. In response to concerns expressed by staff at the January 15, 2013 meeting, the applicant has provided additional documentation and detail drawings for the proposed modification. As such, staff has no objection and believes this is an acceptable solution.

Finally, it is important to note that the previously approved project provided for the construction of 150 residential units whereas, the current proposed project includes the construction of 412 hotel units. At the January 15, 2013 meeting, the Historic Preservation Board expressed serious concerns with regard to the substantial increase in intensity in conjunction with the proposed reconfiguration of the driveway circulation pattern and offsite valet parking garage. Although a traffic study was not required as part of the initial application, the Board requested that the applicant provide a traffic study to be performed by a traffic engineer to be returned to the Board for further review. The traffic study was performed by Joaquin E. Vargas, P.E., *Traf Tech ENGINEERING* and submitted to Planning Department transportation staff on Monday March 4, 2013. Although staff has not had adequate time to fully review the study, a preliminary review has resulted in the following concerns:

- The study indicates that Thursday was the day of the week selected to conduct morning and afternoon peak hours. Friday would have been a better day to do the counts. The preferred afternoon peak hour would be 5:00 to 7:00.
- A study methodology hasn't been submitted and approved by the City. The traffic engineer preparing the study is required to submit a written methodology based on the results of a meeting with staff prior to initiating the work. The methodology specifies not only the parameters to follow to conduct the study but also it's a very detail scope of work. Attached is an example methodology.
- The study doesn't adequately address the proposed circulation and impacts onto the adjacent street system in accordance to the site plan. The plan shows, in addition to the main driveway on 67<sup>th</sup> and Collins, a driveway to the south of 67<sup>th</sup> and Collins (one-way entrance and one-way exit), as well as traffic entering the site through a one-way driveway provided to the north of the intersection of 67<sup>th</sup> and Collins. Only the analysis for the driveway on 67<sup>th</sup> and Collins was provided as part of the traffic report.
- Driveway at 67<sup>th</sup> and Collins. In a meeting with FDOT it was indicated that the study needs to look into better defining the entrance of vehicles from Collins perhaps by narrowing the existing width of the driveway entrance to make the pedestrian crossing safer as the driveway intersects the sidewalk. That condition also applies for the exiting portion of the driveway heading north onto Collins. If the driveway was left as is, there is the high probability that it could be used as a two-lane driveway creating a hazard condition for pedestrians using the sidewalk on Collins in front of the site.
- Turning templates need to be provided for each of the proposed driveways to assess adequacy of turning movements by vehicles entering and exiting the site.
- Sight distance analysis at each of the driveways on Collins should also be provided.
- The driveway traffic assignment (figure 4) should be modified to indicate a more realistic split of 90% on Collins and 10% on Indian Creek.
- A queuing analysis for each of the driveways on Collins was not provided.

- FDOT is intending to do a highway improvement project on Collins in front of the Deauville Hotel. The traffic study needs to review the parameters of the FDOT project and discuss/assess any potential traffic impacts generated by the Deauville Hotel proposed modifications.

Since, staff has not had sufficient time to fully evaluate this traffic study, we strongly recommend this aspect of the project be continued for the Board's review and consideration at a later meeting.

In summary, the overall proposed work shall have a substantially positive impact on the enhanced utilization of this extremely large oceanfront site.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

In view of the foregoing analysis, staff recommends the application be approved, subject to the following conditions, which address the inconsistencies with the aforementioned Certificate of Appropriateness criteria:

1. A revised traffic study shall be submitted and returned to the Board for review and approval at a later date.
2. Revised elevation, site plan and floor plan drawings shall be submitted; at a minimum, such drawings shall incorporate the following:
  - a. The glazing proposed for the new tower shall be one consistent color and shall be the minimum tint required by the energy and turtle codes, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff.
  - b. The original lobby of the hotel shall be restored to its original design to the greatest extent possible, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff.
  - c. All non-original railings, including the existing aluminum pickets be removed and replaced with railings which are more consistent with the original Post War Modern design of the hotel, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff.
  - d. All individual through-the-wall air conditioners shall be removed and replaced by a central air condition system, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff.
  - e. The final design and details of the proposed rooftop addition shall be developed, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff.
3. A revised landscape plan, prepared by a Professional Landscape Architect, registered in the State of Florida, and corresponding site plan, shall be submitted to and approved by staff. The species type, quantity, dimensions, spacing, location and overall height of all plant material shall be clearly delineated and subject to the review and approval of staff. At a minimum, such plan shall incorporate the following:

- a. All pool deck modifications and details shall be submitted, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff.
  - b. All exterior walkways and driveways shall consist of decorative pavers, set in sand or other equally semi-pervious material, subject to the review and approval of staff.
  - c. All landscape areas abutting driveways and parking areas shall be defined by decorative bollards.
  - d. A fully automatic irrigation system with 100% coverage and an automatic rain sensor in order to render the system inoperative in the event of rain. Right-of-way areas shall also be incorporated as part of the irrigation system.
  - e. The landscape plan shall satisfy all requirements as specified in Chapter 33 of the Miami-Dade County Code. A landscape table shall be provided on final landscape plans addressing all minimum quantity and native requirements, subject to the review and approval of staff.
  - f. The location of backflow preventor, siamese pipes or FPL boxes, if any, and how they are screened with landscape material from the right-of-way, shall be indicated on the plans and shall be subject to the review and approval of staff.
4. All building signage shall be consistent in type, composed of flush mounted, non-plastic, individual letters and shall require a separate permit.
5. The final exterior surface color scheme, including color samples, shall be subject to the review and approval of staff and shall require a separate permit.
6. A traffic mitigation plan, which addresses all roadway Level of Service (LOS) deficiencies relative to the concurrency requirements of the City Code, if required, shall be submitted prior to the issuance of a Building Permit and the final building plans shall meet all other requirements of the Land Development Regulations of the City Code.
7. Manufacturers drawings and Dade County product approval numbers for all new windows, doors and glass shall be required, prior to the issuance of a building permit.
8. All roof-top fixtures, air-conditioning units and mechanical devices shall be clearly noted on a revised roof plan and shall be screened from view, in a manner to be approved by staff. Any rooftop mechanical equipment and screening not drawn on the plans and elevations approved by the Board shall require later Board approval.
9. Revised drawings, with corresponding color photographs that are separate from the construction documents, drawn to scale and clearly documenting the existing conditions of the subject building, shall be submitted. Such drawings and photographs shall include all four elevations and interior floor plans of the building, as well as a site plan.

10. An historic analysis of the existing structure, inclusive of a photographic and written description of the history and evolution of the original building on site, shall be submitted to and approved by staff, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit; such historic analysis shall be displayed prominently within the public area of the structure, in a location to be determined by staff.
11. All new and altered elements, spaces and areas shall meet the requirements of the Florida Accessibility Code (FAC).
12. The project shall comply with any landscaping or other sidewalk/street improvement standards as may be prescribed by a relevant Urban Design Master Plan approved prior to the completion of the project and the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.
13. The applicant may be required to submit a separate analysis for water and sewer requirements, at the discretion of the Public Works Director, or designee. Based on a preliminary review of the proposed project, the following may be required by the Public Works Department:
  - a. Remove/replace sidewalks, curbs and gutters on all street frontages, if applicable.
  - b. Mill/resurface asphalt in rear alley along property, if applicable.
  - c. Provide underground utility service connections and on-site transformer location, if necessary.
  - d. Provide back-flow prevention devices on all water services.
  - e. Provide on-site, self-contained storm water drainage for the proposed development.
  - f. Meet water/sewer concurrency requirements including a hydraulic water model analysis and gravity sewer system capacity analysis as determined by the Department and the required upgrades to water and sewer mains servicing this project.
  - g. Payment of City utility impact fees for water meters/services.
  - h. Provide flood barrier ramps to underground parking or minimum slab elevation to be at highest adjacent crown road elevation plus 8".
  - i. Right-of-way permit must be obtained from Public Works.
  - j. All right-of-way encroachments must be removed.
  - k. All planting/landscaping in the public right-of-way must be approved by the Public Works and Parks Departments.
14. A drawn plan and written procedure for the proposed demolition shall be prepared and submitted by a Professional Structural Engineer, registered in the State of

Florida, which fully ensures the protection of the public safety, as well as the protection of the existing structure on the subject site and all existing structures adjacent to the subject site during the course of demolition.

15. The Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition shall only remain in effect for the period of time that there is an active Certificate of Appropriateness for the associated new construction on the subject property.
16. The Final Order shall be recorded in the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.
17. The Final Order is not severable, and if any provision or condition hereof is held void or unconstitutional in a final decision by a court of competent jurisdiction, the order shall be returned to the Board for reconsideration as to whether the order meets the criteria for approval absent the stricken provision or condition, and/or it is appropriate to modify the remaining conditions or impose new conditions.
18. The conditions of approval herein are binding on the applicant, the property's owners, operators, and all successors in interest and assigns.
19. Nothing in this order authorizes a violation of the City Code or other applicable law, nor allows a relaxation of any requirement or standard set forth in the City Code.