

June 17, 2022

**1<sup>st</sup> Application date 03.29.22**  
**1311 15 TER.**  
**Miami Beach, FL 33139**  
**No.: DRB22-0825**

**DRB ADMIN REVIEW • Fail**  
**PLANNING LANDSCAPE REVIEW • Fail**

### COMMENTS & RESPONSES

1. APPLICATION COMPLETENESS
2. ARCHITECTURAL REPRESENTATION
  - a. Please clarify variance request #1 on the letter of intent. What parking size dimension is being requested to be waived?  
**R. Updated see LOI & Sheet A-1.0**
  - b. As indicated on the checklist item #4: please identify and describe hardships related to the two variances being requested.  
**R. See documents attached w/ correction.**
  - c. As per checklist item #7, please provide School Concurrency application for Transmittal  
**R. Actually doesn't need this requirement because existing building has more units than the new building proposed. This was verifying with Planning Department Miami Beach.**
  - d. Property Survey must be signed and sealed.  
**R. Added see SURVEY.**
  - e. Basic Zoning data / table was not provided.  
**R. See sheet A-1.0**
  - f. Checklist item #9(h): Site plan / Ground floor plan with dimensions was not provided.  
**R. Corrected. See sheet A-1.0**
  - g. Checklist item #9 (l, j and k): Color pictures of the project site, existing structure, interior space and context pictures of surrounding properties were not provided.  
**R. Updated. See sheets A-0.2, A-0.4 & A-0.5**
  - h. Checklist item #9(l and m) : Existing condition drawing and demolition plans were not provided.  
**R. See sheets A-0.2 & A-0.3**
  - i. Checklist item #10 (a): Existing trees need to be documented by the land surveyor as part of the property survey.  
**R. Corrected. See Survey.**
  - j. Checklist item #11: Building card for the property was not provided (it is available in microfiche)  
**R. It doesn't have.**
  - k. Checklist item #21: Neighborhood context study not provided.  
**R. See sheet A-0.4 & A-0.5**

l. Provide Cost Estimate in LOI or under separate cover

**R. See documents attached.**

m. Add "FINAL SUBMITTAL" and DRB File No. to front cover title for heightened clarity.

**R. Corrected. See cover sheet**

n. Final submittal drawings need to be DATED, SIGNED AND SEALED.

**R. All drawings are dated, signed & sealed**

o. FAR drawings must be at a larger scale – no more than 2 or 3 floor plans per sheet.

**R. Corrected. See A-1.1**

p. Lot coverage diagram is too small.

**R. Corrected. See A-1.1**

q. Text and dimensions are too small. Must be formatted to be legible when printed at 11x17 size.

**R. Architectural set.**

r. A traffic review will be required as more than 4 units are proposed.

s. Application will have to address these comments and resubmit for first submittal for September. It is insufficient for review at this time and cannot be placed on the July agenda.

**R. It'll be submitted 06.17.22**

### 3. DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS

a. Cross sections should better reflect areas for planting proposed above grade on building facades and roof amenity area. Please identify as such on cross sections.

**R. See landscape plans.**

b. The proposed vertical louver system at the ground level should be softened to provide more transparency, perhaps in a similar design language as applied to railings.

**R. See sheets A-4.0 to A-4.3 & A-5.0**

c. Explore two similar tone of paint colors for added interest particular as it relates to the north, east and west elevations.

**R. See sheet A-5.0**

d. Renderings should reflect and be consistent with the proposed landscape plan, inclusive of the required canopy shade / street trees in the front yard.

**R. Corrected. See sheet A-5.0**

e. Additional green roof area should be considered along the front elevation facing the street.

**R. Proposed updated. See sheets A-4.0 to A-4.3 & A-5.0**

### 4. LANDSCAPE COMMENTS:

a. Tree survey prepared by a Certified Surveyor was not provided.

**R– Tree Survey has been provided and Sheet L1 "Tree Disposition" in LA set has been updated to reflect.**

b. Provide a Tree Report prepared by a Certified Arborist for tree #7 and 5 currently scheduled for removal on Tree Disposition Plan / sheet L1

**R. Refer to arborist report for updated tree imagery and descriptions and Sheet L1 "Tree Disposition" in LA set has been updated to reflect.**

c. Proposed concrete paver area to the north of parking should be significantly reduced in order to increase green space while providing the absolute minimum area that would be required in order to provide pedestrian access.

**R. Updated on both architecture and landscape plans and using gravel to facilitate additional percolation.**

d. Washingtonia robusta, Ligustrum lucidum, Waxeaf Privet, Green Island Ficus, Burle Marx Philodendron, and Wart Fern are NOT native species. Please correct and update Landscape Legend as necessary.

**R. All has been updated with corrections and according to a more advanced set per comment "e" below.**

e. Landscape plan and plants list should be further developed to clearly specify quantity and specifications for shade trees, palms, and large shrubs.

**R. All updated information has been added to indicate a further developed landscape plan for ease of approval. Refer to additional plan sheets marked with small letter "a".**

f. Palm trees may not be able to count towards satisfying minimum canopy shade tree requirements. Please clarify how is the street tree requirement being satisfied. Street trees placed in private property should be identified as such.

**R. Yes, street trees will have to be added on private property as the public sidewalk does not allow enough room and should yield to public pedestrian circulation especially as it relates to ADA requirements. All has been updated and shown for clarity.**

g. Provide a detailed cross section inclusive of irrigation, and specifications for the proposed green wall located within the front façade of the property. Plant species shall be identified, and a maintenance plan shall also be provided.

**R. This was an architectural feature that has been removed. Refer to updated architectural drawings.**

h. Please clarify and identify on plan: would the green strips on driveway be natural sod or artificial grass?

**R. Due to the required slope on the drive, we are currently proposing artificial turf with added drainage weep holes below. Turf can be secured and will reduce possible erosion problems that real turf may pose.**

i. Landscape plans for any planting on the building above grade shall be provided.

**R. Plans have been added to show each floor with planting as requested.**

These comments have been provided as a preliminary review of the documents and plans submitted and are subject to additions and/or deletions pending further review.