

MIAMI BEACH

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
Staff Report & Recommendation

Design Review Board

TO: DRB Chairperson and Members

DATE: July 5, 2022

FROM: Thomas R. Mooney, AICP
Planning Director

SUBJECT: **DRB21-0773, 1771 Purdy Avenue**

An application has been filed requesting Design Review Approval for the construction of a new five-story multi-family residential building that includes review of mechanical parking and ~~variances from the required setback and maximum allowable area for a rooftop trellis structure.~~

RECOMMENDATION:

Continuance to a future date.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

The West ½ of Lot 8, Block 16, Island View Subdivision, as recorded in Plat Book 6 at Page 115 of the public records of Miami Dade County, Florida.

HISTORY:

At the May 3, 2022 meeting, this application was continued to a date certain of July 5, 2022, in order to address the concerns expressed by the Board.

SITE DATA:

Zoning: CD-2
Future Land Use: CD-2
Parking District: No. 5
Lot Size: 3,750 SF
Proposed FAR: 2.0 – 7,498 SF
Permitted FAR: 2.0 – 7,500 SF
Height:
Proposed: **55'-0" from BFE**
(64' NGVD)
Highest Projection: +12'-0"
(76'-0" NGVD)

Grade: +4.8' NGVD
Base Flood Elevation: +8.00' NGVD
Difference: 3.2
Ground Floor Elevation: +5'-0" NGVD

SURROUNDING PROPERTIES:

North: 2-story (Stiltsville)
South: 1-story commercial
(Future 5-story mixed-use development)
West: City Park | Maurice Gibb
East: Single Story (Empire Plumbing)

THE PROJECT:

The applicant has submitted plans entitled "1771 Purdy Ave", as designed by **Kobi Karp Architecture and Interior Design**, dated 6-13-2022.

The applicant is requesting to construct a new 5-story multifamily building on a site the contains an existing one-story structure. The ground floor consists of a lobby, mechanical room, elevator, and driveway and parking for a total of six (6) cars, utilizing three (3) parking lifts. Levels 2-4 each contain one unit, and levels for and 5 contain one unit on the two levels. The roof deck contains a small pool and terrace, along with planters, two stair wells and an

elevator.

The applicant previously requested the following variance(s):

1. ~~A variance from the requirements of Section 142-312(b)(3)(e) to provide a rooftop trellis with a zero feet front setback where a 10' setback is required and a side setback of zero feet where 20 feet is required.~~
2. ~~A variance to allow a roof deck and trellis structures with a combined area of 35% of the enclosed floor area immediately one floor below where 20% is the maximum permitted.~~

With the latest submittal, the variance requests have been withdrawn.

COMPLIANCE WITH ZONING CODE:

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

Additional information is required to verify that the landscape plans comply with the requirements of Chapter 126.

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.
Not Satisfied; See Staff Analysis. Additional design detailing of the north and south side elevations is required in order to be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. No details have been provided for the proposed green walls, which will be impossible to install and maintain with zero side setbacks.
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.
Not Satisfied ; See Staff Analysis. No details have been provided for the proposed landscaped north and south building elevations.

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.
Satisfied
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.
Satisfied
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

SECTION 130-38–MECHANICAL AND ROBOTIC PARKING SYSTEMS

Projects proposing to use mechanical parking devices, robotic parking systems and/or vehicle elevators to satisfy accessory off-street parking requirements shall prepare schematic floor plans prior to site plan review by the applicable land use board. Two sets of schematic floor plans shall be required:

- 1. One set of schematic plans sufficient to show the proposed development project with accessory off-street parking requirements satisfied by traditional, non-mechanical means, meeting all aspects of the design standards for parking spaces required in Article III of Chapter 130, and other provisions of these land development regulations, and requiring no variances from these provisions.**

Consistent – A schematic drawing showing the required parking in a traditional, non-mechanical means was submitted showing 6 parking spaces for the project on-site.

- 2. A second set of schematic plans, sufficient to show the same proposed development project, utilizing mechanical parking devices, robotic parking systems and/or vehicle elevators to satisfy accessory off-street parking requirements.**

Consistent – A schematic drawing showing the required parking for the project by traditional and mechanical means was submitted showing 6 spaces.

The non-mechanical schematic drawings have been reviewed by Planning Department staff and they appear to meet the requirements of the design standards of the City Code. Subject to this data being provided, the project may proceed to site plan approval based on the set of plans using mechanical parking.

As part of the conditional use, design review board, or historic preservation board review process for the use of mechanical parking devices, robotic parking systems and/or vehicle elevators under any of the provisions of this section, the following review criteria shall be evaluated when considering each application for the use of mechanical parking systems:

- (a) Whether the scale of the proposed structure is compatible with the existing urban character of the surrounding neighborhood.**

Consistent – The scale of the project is compatible with the surrounding area. The proposed height of approximately 55 feet is compliant of the CD-2 zoning district.

- (b) Whether the proposed use of mechanical parking results in an improvement of design characteristics and compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood.**

Consistent –The proposed use of mechanical parking appears to be compatible with design characteristics and with the surrounding neighborhood allowing the building's parking to be more compact, with more room for a larger lobby.

- (c) Whether the proposed use of mechanical parking does not result in an increase in**

density or intensity over what could be constructed with conventional parking.

Consistent – The proposed use of mechanical parking does not result in an increase in density or intensity over what could be constructed with conventional parking.

- (d) **Whether parking lifts or mechanisms are located inside, within a fully enclosed building, and not visible from exterior view.**

Not Consistent – Additional screening will be required along the eastern side of the property in order to fully screen the mechanical parking.

- (e) **In cases where mechanical parking lifts are used for self-parking in multifamily residential buildings; whether approval is conditioned upon the proper restrictive covenant being provided limiting the use of each lift to the same unit applicant.**

Consistent – The proper restrictive covenant shall be provided prior to the issuance of building permit.

- (f) **In cases where mechanical parking lifts are used for valet parking; whether approval is conditioned upon the proper restrictive covenant being provided stipulating that a valet service or operator must be provided for such parking for so long as the use continues.**

Not Applicable – Valet operation is not proposed.

- (g) **Whether a traffic study has been provided that details the ingress, egress and circulation within the mechanical parking facility, and the technical and staffing requirements necessary to ensure that the proposed mechanical parking system does not cause excessive stacking, waiting, or backups onto the public right-of-way.**

Consistent

- (h) **Whether a proposed operations plan, including hours of operation, number of employees, maintenance requirements, noise specifications, and emergency procedures, has been provided.**

Partially Consistent – An operations plan will be required prior to the issuance of a building permit.

- (i) **In cases where the proposed facility includes accessory uses in addition to the parking garage, whether the accessory uses are in proportion to the facility as a whole, and delivery of merchandise and removal of refuse, and any additional impacts upon the surrounding neighborhood created by the scale and intensity of the proposed accessory uses, are adequately addressed.**

Not Applicable – The sole use of the project is a multifamily building with 4 units

(j) Whether the proximity of the proposed facility to similar size structures and to residential uses creates adverse impacts and how such impacts are mitigated.

Consistent – The proposed project appears to be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and it appears that it would not create any significant adverse impacts to the surrounding commercial uses.

(k) Whether a cumulative effect from the proposed facility with adjacent and nearby structures arises, and how such cumulative effect shall be addressed.

Consistent – No negative impact is anticipated from the cumulative effect from the proposed facility and nearby structures.

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) Whether resilient landscaping (salt tolerant, highly water-absorbent, native or Florida friendly plants) will be provided.
Satisfied
- (5) Whether 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, including a study of land elevation and elevation of surrounding properties were considered.
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.
Satisfied
- (7) Where feasible and appropriate, all critical mechanical and electrical systems shall be located above base flood elevation.
Satisfied

(8) Existing buildings shall be, where reasonably feasible and appropriate, elevated to the base flood elevation.

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.

Satisfied

(10) Where feasible and appropriate, water retention systems shall be provided.

Satisfied

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

Satisfied

(12) The design of each project shall minimize the potential for heat island effects on-site.

Satisfied

ANALYSIS:
DESIGN REVIEW

The applicant is proposing to construct a new 5-story multifamily building on a site that contains an existing one-story structure. The ground floor consists of a lobby, mechanical room, elevator, driveway and parking for a total of six (6) cars, utilizing three (3) parking lifts. Levels 2-4 each contain one unit, and levels 4 and 5 contain one unit on the two levels. The roof deck contains a small pool and terrace, along with planters, two stair wells and an elevator.

On May 3, 2022, this application was presented and reviewed by the Design Review Board. The Board continued the application in order to allow the applicant to address some concerns with the design as follows:

- Reconsider use of dark, black materials.
- Recess the building.
- Modify the trellis as it impacts the undulation of the front façade.
- Revise the south elevation to better relate to the future building (1759 Purdy), specifically at the upper floors where the adjacent building sets back.

The buildings mass has been located along the western side of the site to take advantage of the views across from Maurice Gibb Memorial Park. Due to the commercial nature of the surrounding properties, the north and south side walls are comprised of a stone finish along the property lines with no fenestration. With the exception of the 5th floor, all glazing is located facing east or west.

As these side elevations are flat and extend to a height of over 71 feet from the sidewalk to the top of the stair wells, staff previously noted that further development of these side elevations is required, as they will be visible from the street and neighboring properties. Staff had previously recommended changes in stone color/pattern, or other design elements to break up the continuity of the solid stone mass.

At the May 3rd, 2022 DRB meeting the applicant introduced the concept of landscaped walls along the upper levels of the north and south elevations. Although the living walls concept was received favorably by the Board, no details were provided and the application was continued to the July meeting so that this could be further developed.

Staff would note that with this latest submission, no details have been provided for the landscaped walls, with the exception of a note on the architectural drawings that a 4 inch recess is to be provided in portions of the exterior walls of the north and south elevations. Further, the architectural drawings indicate a vertical orientation for the landscaping and the landscape drawings indicate only a diagram showing a horizontal orientation. No details of the landscaped wall system have been provided, including the depth needed, and incorporation of irrigation.

As the north and south walls are located on the property line, a 4 inch recess is not sufficient to accommodate the installation and maintenance needs for landscaping. Given the large size of these walls (over 70 feet in height), as well as limited areas for inground planting and sun exposure, staff seriously questions the viability of a natural landscape option. Instead, it is again recommended that the project Architect study a permanent design option, utilizing significant changes in plane, deep recesses, variations in surface finishes, and offsetting the upper levels of the structure.

If the Board determines that a natural landscape option should still be further explored, significantly more detail, to address the aforementioned concerns, will be required. In summary, staff recommends that the application be continued to a future date so that full details of the proposed landscaped walls, or an alternative architectural option, can be provided for further review.

RECOMMENDATION:

In view of the foregoing analysis, and inconsistencies with the aforementioned Design Review criteria staff recommends the application be **continued** to a future date. However, should the Board grant approval of the application, staff recommends any approval be subject to the conditions enumerated in the attached Draft Order, which address the inconsistencies with the aforementioned Design Review criteria, Sea Level Rise, and Practical Difficulty and Hardship criteria, as applicable.