

MIAMI BEACH

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
Staff Report & Recommendation

Design Review Board

TO: DRB Chairperson and Members

DATE: June 7, 2022

FROM: Thomas R. Mooney, AICP
Planning Director



SUBJECT: DRB22-0790
4564 North Michigan Ave

An application has been filed requesting Design Review Approval for modifications to an existing architecturally significant pre-1942 single-family home and the construction of a new pool, including a variance from the required front yard setback ~~and from the maximum lot coverage.~~

RECOMMENDATION

Approval of the design.

Approval of the variance.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

Lot 12, Block 21, of Nautilus Ext 3rd, according to the Plot thereof, as recorded in Plot Book 34, at Page 96, of the Public Records of Miami Dade County, Florida.

BACKGROUND:

On May 5, 2022, this application was reviewed and continued by the Board to a date certain of June 7, 2022.

The subject home is formally classified as architecturally significant (DRB22-0799).

SITE DATA:

Zoning: RS-4
Future Land Use: RS
Lot Size: 9,941 SF
Lot Coverage:
Existing: 3,729 SF / 37.5%
Proposed: 4,065 SF / 41.2%
Maximum: 3,976 SF / 50%

Maximum: 28'-0" flat roof / 31'-0"
sloped roof

Unit size:
Existing: 3,729 SF / 37.5%
Proposed: 3,931 SF / 39%
Maximum: 5,964 SF / 60%
Height:
Proposed: ~16' (sloped)
Max: 21' for single story sloped roof

EXISTING PROPERTY:

Year: 1939
Architect: Robert L. Weed
Vacant: No
Demolition: Partial

SURROUNDING PROPERTIES:

East: Single-story 1949 home
North: Single-story 1940 home
South: Single-story 1941 home
West: Single-story 1939 home

THE PROJECT:

The applicant has submitted plans and supplemental renderings entitled "4564 N Michigan Ave Eisler Residence", as designed by **Gelpi Projects**, signed, sealed, and dated March 7, 2022.

The applicant is requesting the following variance(s):

1. A variance of from **Section 142-106(b)(16)** to allow a pool and pool deck within the front yard of the home with a front setback of 7'-6" to the pool deck and 9'-0" to the water's edge, where 20'-0" is required.

It should be noted that it was determined that the advertised variance for lot coverage was not needed, as the city code allows a lot coverage of up to 50% for homes constructed prior to 1965.

PRACTICAL DIFFICULTY AND HARDSHIP CRITERIA

The applicant has submitted plans and documents with the application that staff has concluded satisfy Article 1, Section 2 of the Related Special Acts.

Additionally, staff has concluded that the plans and documents submitted with the application comply with the following hardship criteria, as they relate to the requirements of Section 118-353(d), Miami Beach City Code:

- That special conditions and circumstances exist which are peculiar to the land, structure, or building involved and which are not applicable to other lands, structures, or buildings in the same zoning district;
- That the special conditions and circumstances do not result from the action of the applicant;
- That granting the variance requested will not confer on the applicant any special privilege that is denied by this Ordinance to other lands, buildings, or structures in the same zoning district;
- That literal interpretation of the provisions of this Ordinance would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zoning district under the terms of this Ordinance and would work unnecessary and undue hardship on the applicant;
- That the variance granted is the minimum variance that will make possible the reasonable use of the land, building or structure;
- That the granting of the variance will be in harmony with the general intent and purpose of this Ordinance and that such variance will not be injurious to the area involved or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare; and
- That the granting of this request is consistent with the comprehensive plan and does not reduce the levels of service as set forth in the plan.
- The granting of the variance will result in a structure and site that complies with the

sea level rise and resiliency review criteria in chapter 133, article II, as applicable.

COMPLIANCE WITH ZONING CODE:

A preliminary review of the project indicates that the application, as proposed, appears to be consistent with the City Code, with the exception of the requested variances:

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).
Not Applicable
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.
Not Applicable
14. The building shall have an appropriate and fully integrated rooftop architectural treatment which substantially screens all mechanical equipment, stairs and elevator towers.
Not Applicable

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.
Not Applicable
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
A recycling plan shall be provided as part of the submittal for a demolition/building permit to the building department.
- (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; Not feasible

- (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.

Satisfied

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

Not applicable

- (11) Cool pavement materials or porous pavement materials shall be utilized.

Satisfied

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

Satisfied

STAFF ANALYSIS:

DESIGN REVIEW

The applicant is proposing renovations to an existing single-story home that was originally constructed in 1939, including the addition of an attached cabana onto the northeast corner of the home, as well as a new pool and pool deck within the required front yard. While most of the application could have been approved administratively, the applicant is requesting a variance for the location of the proposed new pool within the required front yard.

This application was reviewed and continued by the Board at the May 5, 2022 meeting, in order to allow the applicant to provide additional information on the canopy additions proposed on the front elevation of the home. In response, the applicant has provided renderings of the proposed scope of work, with a modified roof design that is more in keeping with the architecture of the existing home.

VARIANCE REVIEW

The applicant is requesting the following variance:

1. A variance of from **Section 142-106(b)(16)** to allow a pool and pool deck within the front yard of the home with a front setback of 7'-6" to the pool deck and 9'-0" to the water's edge, where 20'-0" is required.

The city code does provide some flexibility and reduced setback requirements for pool and pool decks for homes that are formally classified as architecturally significant. This includes a minimum 5 foot setback along the rear, interior side and street side setbacks, as well as a 10 foot front setback for corner properties or homes with two fronts. The subject site, however, is an interior lot, and the home was constructed with a 5 foot rear setback, leaving no room to construct a pool in the rear yard, which is the typical location for a pool.

The only option for a pool on the subject site is in the front yard, and the applicant is requesting a variance to construct the pool within the required front yard, with a proposed setback of 7'-6" to the pool deck and 9'-0" to the water's edge. Due to the existing site conditions, which include the retention of an architecturally significant home, constructing a pool on the site in compliance with the code requirements does present practical difficulties which warrant the granting of the requested variance. For this reason, staff is supportive of the requested variance and recommends approval of the application.

RECOMMENDATION:

In view of the foregoing analysis, staff recommends **approval** of the design and variance request, 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.