HPB23-0604
1709 Jefferson Avenue
Response Narrative—First Submittal Comments

1. ZONING

a. FPL transformers are not permitted in required yards.
Response: FPL Transformers have been shifted to be outside of the required setbacks.

b. Demonstrate compliance with the minimum required yard elevations (future adjusted grade). Future adjusted grade = average of future crown of road and base flood +1′ freeboard).
Response: Future adjusted grade has been updated on A0.01 Data Sheet. Grades within the site plan and site sections have been updated.

c. Contact the Public Works Department for a future crown of road elevation determination.
Response: Future crown of road elevation has been obtained from the Public Works comments.

d. Per Section 7.1.2.2(c)(2)(A), a minimum height of 12′ shall be provided as measured from base flood elevation plus minimum freeboard (9.00′ NGVD) to the bottom of the slab above. The section on sheet A5.01 is measured from the garage level (7.00′ NGVD). Please correct.
Response: Height graphic has been adjusted. We are seeking a 1′-10″ WAIVER, and proposing to provide 10′-2″ of clearance where 12′ is required.

e. Summer kitchens are not allowable height encroachments.
Response: Summer kitchen has been removed from the roof.

2. DEFICIENCIES IN PRESENTATION

a. Provide shaded FAR diagrams per floor for both of the entire buildings. Unit FAR diagram is not acceptable.
Response: FAR diagrams have been provided for each floor for each building.

b. Provide a larger scale site plan. If landscaping is shown on the site plan, it should match the landscape plans. Text on site plan is illegible, mirrored, upside down etc.
Response: Site Plan scale has been enlarged.

c. Provide grade elevations throughout the site on the site plan.
Response: Grade elevations have been added showing compliance with future adjusted grade as requested.

d. Fences within required yards shall be measured from grade. Indicate fence/wall heights in site plan.
Response: Site sections show fences measured from grade.

e. Provide larger scale elevation drawings. Indicate proposed finishes and materials on elevation drawings.
Response: Larger scale elevations have been provided. Proposed finishes have been added.

f. The rendered and line drawn elevations are not consistent.
Response: Line elevations and rendered elevations are updated to match.

g. Provide dimensioned floor by floor, floor plans of both of the entire buildings. Single unit floor plans are not acceptable.
Response: Dimensions have bene provided for each floor of each building.

h. Dimension parking spaces.
Response: Dimensions have been added to the parking spaces.

i. The proposed buildings are not drawn in in the context elevation drawings.
Response: Proposed elevations have been added to contextual elevations.

HPB23-0604
1709 Jefferson Avenue
Response Narrative—First Submittal Comments

j. Provide color photos of all proposed exterior materials and finishes.
Response: Materials legend has been added.

k. Provide shaded Lot Coverage diagram with legend. Only what is counted as Lot Coverage should have a color.
Response: Lot coverage sheet has been updated as requested.

l. Provide details of the proposed metal screenwork.
Response: Materials legend has been added to clarify the material screen.

m. The renderings and rendered elevations do not show the "porches" along Jefferson Av.
Response: Renderings and rendered elevations have added the porch along Jefferson.

n. The renderings and rendered elevations show 5 separate roof projections per building but the plans show that two sets of stairs per building are next to each other.
Response: Plans, Elevations, and Renderings have all been updated to match.

o. Provide details of proposed driveway gate.
Response: Front Gate elevations have been provided on Sheet A5.02.

p. Provide a pedestrian level rendering from Jefferson Avenue.
Response: Additional Rendering has been added on Sheet A1.23.

q. The balcony railings are barely visible in the renderings.
Response: Quality of renderings have been increased to be able to see the glass railings.

r. The rendered elevation drawings are blurry.
Response: Quality of rendered elevations has been increased.

3. DESIGN/APPROPRIATENESS COMMENTS (Recommendations)

a. Staff recommends that the driveway be reduced to the minimum required width (18'-0").
Response: Driveway has been reduced to 19' width, as units have an additional 5' "driveway", so 19' +5' provides the typical 24' backup required for perpendicular parking.

b. Staff recommends that shade trees be provided within the courtyard/driveway. This may be accomplished by reducing the driveway width, shifting the southern building to the south property line etc.
Response: Groundcover is proposed. A balcony cantilevers over the planter below limiting the use of shade tres.

c. Staff recommends that individual pedestrian entrances from the sidewalk be provided for the units facing 17th Street.
Response: Additional pedestrian entrances have been added.

d. Staff believes that the interior courtyard elevations are more successful at breaking down the scale of the buildings, as the roof level encroachments have been setback, there are significant recesses between the units and the amount of dark colored painting/cladding is less. Staff recommends that the applicant explore "flipping" the facades.
Response: Front elevations have been updated to break down the vertical elements to a more pedestrian scale and reworked the banding of the balconies for a more cohesive façade.

e. Staff recommends that the stair and projection be located within the center of each unit.
Response: Relocating the stair limits the useability of the interior floor plans, but the façade has been redesigned to break down the vertical elements to a more pedestrian scale and reworked the banding of the balconies for a more cohesive façade.

HPB23-0604
1709 Jefferson Avenue
Response Narrative—First Submittal Comments

f. Staff recommends that the stair/elevator bulkhead of the westernmost units be shifted to the south side of the units to not be located on the Jefferson Avenue facades.
   Response: Relocating the stair limits the useability of the interior floor plans, but the façade has been redesigned to break down the vertical elements to a more pedestrian scale and reworked the banding of the balconies for a more cohesive façade.
g. Staff recommends that the vertical emphasis of the facades be reduced to the greatest extent possible.
   Response: Front elevations have been updated to break down the vertical elements to a more pedestrian scale and reworked the banding of the balconies for a more cohesive façade.
h. Staff recommends that a lighter paint/material finish color be selected for the trim and metal work.
   Response: Proposed colors for the trim work has been lightened up.

4. Planning Landscape Review

a. Palms proposed as street trees are not permitted but may be planted in addition to the required number of street trees. Revise plans and landscape legend to accommodate shortfall of street trees.
   Response: Please see updated landscape plans.
b. Provide Tree survey by professional land surveyor. Tree survey shall provide the accurate location, identification and graphic representation of all existing trees inclusive of the canopy dripline.
   Response: Please see updated landscape plans.
c. Front Yard/Rear Yard tree requirements not applicable to the RM-1 zoning district, where 28 lot trees are required as outlined in 4.2.3, table A.
   Response: Please see updated landscape plans.