

MIAMI BEACH

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Staff Report & Recommendation

Design Review Board

TO: DRB Chairperson and Members

DATE: June 7, 2016

FROM: Thomas R. Mooney, AICP
Planning Director

SUBJECT: Design Review File No. 23247

4300/4400 Chase Avenue—Alexander Muss Park Pavilion Renovation

The applicant, the City of Miami Beach, is requesting Design Review Approval for renovations to an existing City park including the demolition of an existing pavilion and restroom facilities in order to construct a new facility and play areas.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with conditions

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

Lots 7 through 13 of Block 2 of "Nursery Subdivision", according to Plat thereof, recorded in Plat Book 23, at Page 66, Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

HISTORY:

On April 5, 2016, the item was continued to the June 7, 2016, Design Review Board meeting.

SITE DATA:

Zoning: GU, Government
Future Land Use: ROS, Recreation
Open Space
Lot Size: ±65,993 SF
Grade: +4.25' NGVD
Flood: +7.0' NGVD
Difference: +2.75' NGVD

Adjusted Grade: +5.63' NGVD
Finished Floor Elevation: +9.0' NGVD

Surrounding Properties:

East: Single family homes
North: One-story 1967 residence
South: One-story 1939 residence
West: Biscayne Waterway

THE PROJECT:

The applicant has submitted revised plans entitled "Pavilion, Muss Park", as prepared by project team **Douglas Wood Associates, Inc.** dated, signed and sealed May 04, 2016.

The proposed project includes renovations to an existing City park including the demolition of an existing pavilion and restroom facilities in order to construct a new facility and play areas.

COMPLIANCE WITH ZONING CODE:

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

- Chainlink fences are prohibited in the required front yard, and any required yard facing a public right-of-way or waterway.
- The development regulations in the GU government use district may be waived by a five-sevenths vote of the City Commission. At the May 11, 2016, the City Commission passed an ordinance waiving the parking component for the new facility.

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.

CONSISTENCY WITH COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:

A preliminary review of the project indicates that the proposed **recreational use** appears to be **consistent** with the ROS designation of the Future Land Use Map of the 2025 Comprehensive Plan. The main permitted uses in the ROS, Recreation Open Space Element are recreation and open space facilities.

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 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
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).

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.

Not Applicable

STAFF ANALYSIS:

DESIGN REVIEW

Alexander Muss Park is a City-owned park that offers afterschool and summer recreational programs for young children. Currently, there are approximately 147 children enrolled in the City's summer recreational programming at Muss Park. The Park currently contains an existing open-air pavillion with enclosed bathrooms, a tot lot and an open, greenspace area.

The park was last renovated in 2005. The Park currently does not offer a fully enclosed indoor facility for program participants; as such, during periods of inclement weather, alternative accommodations must be provided. Buses are continually on standby in order to relocate children to another City facility during inclement weather. The scope of this proposal includes the demolition of the existing pavilion, and the construction of a new 4,000SF pavilion-structure that can accommodate 120 children and includes two ADA-accessible restrooms, a new office and reception area, storage, and mechanical room. The new pavilion will include a permanent air conditioning system and have operable panels/doors that provide full enclosure of the pavilion when needed. The adjacent landscape will be restored and the existing trees will be preserved with the exclusion of a few palms that will be relocated. The new Muss Park Pavilion will provide a dynamic and secure environment for residents and visitors.

The City has since implemented the criterion of setting finish floor elevations above Base Flood Elevation for all new buildings. The proposed pavilion and adjacent tot lot areas will be constructed to elevation of BFE plus applicable 'Freeboard'.

At the April 5, 2015 DRB meeting the Board requested that the applicant address four specific areas:

1. The pavilion be redesigned to contain a large open covered area component.
2. The massing and height along the north property line be substantially lowered, in order to provide greater compatibility and scale to the northern abutting property.
3. The roof line of the pavilion be flipped in order to maximize the view of the greenspace.
4. Landscaping and or some other mitigation be incorporated along the western portion of the site, along or near the sea wall.

The applicant has incorporated changes to address the Board's concerns. The overall design concept, massing, orientation, circulation and programming is consistent with the direction of the City Commission. Staff is supportive of the improvements to the park areas and would recommend approval of the new Muss Park pavilion.

RECOMMENDATION:

In view of the foregoing analysis, staff recommends the application be **approved**, subject to the conditions enumerated in the attached Draft Order, which address the inconsistencies with the aforementioned Design Review criteria and Practical Difficulty and Hardship criteria.

TRM/JGM

F:\PLAN\DRB\DRB16\06-07-2016\JUN16 Staff Reports\DRB 23247 4300 Chase Avenue.JUN16.doc

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
City of Miami Beach, Florida

MEETING DATE: June 7, 2016

FILE NO: 23247

PROPERTY: **4300 Chase Avenue**
Alexander Muss Park Pavilion Renovation

APPLICANT: City of Miami Beach

LEGAL: Lots 7 through 13 of Block 2 of "Nursery Subdivision", according to Plat thereof, recorded in Plat Book 23, at Page 66, Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

IN RE: The Application for Design Review Approval for renovations to an existing City park including the demolition of an existing pavilion and restroom facilities in order to construct a new facility and play areas.

ORDER

The City of Miami Beach Design Review Board makes the following FINDINGS OF FACT, based upon the evidence, information, testimony and materials presented at the public hearing and which are part of the record for this matter:

I. Design Review

- A. The Board has jurisdiction pursuant to Section 118-252(a) of the Miami Beach Code. The property is not located within a designated local historic district and is not a individually designated historic site.
- B. Based on the plans and documents submitted with the application, testimony and information provided by the applicant, and the reasons set forth in the Planning Department Staff Report, the project as submitted is inconsistent with Design Review Criteria 9 in Section 118-251 of the Miami Beach Code.
- C. The project would be consistent with the criteria and requirements of section 118-251 if the following conditions are met:
 - 1. Revised elevation, site plan and floor plan drawings for the proposed new facility at 4300 Chase Avenue shall be submitted to and approved by staff; at a minimum, such drawings shall incorporate the following:
 - a. The final design and details including material sample and color and finish for the proposed standing seam metal roof shall be provided in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Design Review Criteria and/or the directions from the Board

- b. 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.
 - c. A copy of all pages of the recorded Final Order shall be scanned into the plans submitted for building permit, and shall be located immediately after the front cover page of the permit plans.
 - d. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the project Architect shall verify, in writing, that the subject project has been constructed in accordance with the plans approved by the Planning Department for Building Permit.
2. A revised landscape plan, 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. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a tree protection plan for all trees to be retained on site. Such plan shall be subject to the review and approval of staff, and shall include, but not be limited to a sturdy tree protection fence installed at the dripline of the trees prior to any construction.
 - b. In order to identify, protect and preserve mature trees on site, which are suitable for retention and relocation, a Tree Report prepared by a Certified Tree Arborist shall be submitted for the mature trees on site.
 - c. Any tree identified to be in good overall condition shall be retained, and protected in their current location if they are not in conflict with the proposed pavilion, or they shall be relocated on site, if determined feasible, subject to the review and approval of staff. A tree care and watering plan also prepared by a Certified Arborist shall be submitted prior to the issuance of a Building Permit or Tree Removal/Relocation Permit. Subsequent to any approved relocation, a monthly report prepared by a Certified Arborist shall be provided to staff describing the overall tree performance and adjustments to the maintenance plan in order to ensure survivability, such report shall continue for a period of 18 months unless determined otherwise by staff.
 - d. All chainlink fences located in any required yard facing a public right-of-way or waterway shall be removed and replaced with a five foot (5'-0") high picket fence and shall be limited to natural aluminum or silver.
 - e. Final details of all fencing shall be required, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Design Review Criteria and/or the directions from the Board.

- f. Any new exterior handrails and support posts shall incorporate a flat profile. The final design details, dimensions material and color of all exterior handrails shall be made part of the building permit plans and shall be subject to the review and approval of staff.
- g. Existing trees to be retained on site shall be protected from all types of construction disturbance. Root cutting, storage of soil or construction materials, movement of heavy vehicles, change in drainage patterns, and wash of concrete or other materials shall be prohibited.
- h. Street trees shall be required within the swale at the front of the property if not in conflict with existing utilities, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by the Public Works Department.
- i. Any existing plant material within the public right-of-way may be required to be removed, as the discretion of the Public Works Department.
- j. 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.
- k. The utilization of root barriers and/or Silva Cells, as applicable, shall be clearly delineated on the revised landscape plan.
- l. The applicant shall verify, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, the exact location of all backflow preventors and all other related devices and fixtures. The location of backflow preventors, Siamese pipes or other related devices and fixtures, if any, and how they are screened with landscape material from the right-of-way, shall be clearly indicated on the site and landscape plans, and shall be subject to the review and approval of staff.
- m. The applicant shall verify, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, the exact location of all applicable FPL transformers or vault rooms. The location of any exterior transformers and how they are screened with landscape material from the right of wall shall be clearly indicated on the site and landscape plans and shall be subject to the review and approval of staff.
- n. **Prior** to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the Landscape Architect or the project architect shall verify, in writing, that the project is consistent with the site and landscape plans approved by the Planning Department for Building Permit.

In accordance with Section 118-262, the applicant, or the city manager on behalf of the city administration, or an affected person, Miami Design Preservation League or Dade Heritage Trust may seek review of any order of the Design Review Board by the City Commission, except that orders granting or denying a request for rehearing shall not be reviewed by the Commission.

II. Variance(s)

- A. No variance(s) were filed as part of this application.

III. General Terms and Conditions applying to both 'I. Design Review Approval and 'II. Variances' noted above.

- A. A Construction Parking and Traffic Management Plan (CPTMP) shall be approved by the Parking Director pursuant to Chapter 106, Article II, Division 3 of the City Code, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.
- B. The final building plans shall meet all other requirements of the Land Development Regulations of the City Code.
- C. The Final Order shall be recorded in the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.
- D. Satisfaction of all conditions is required for the Planning Department to give its approval on a Certificate of Occupancy; a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy or Partial Certificate of Occupancy may also be conditionally granted Planning Departmental approval.
- E. 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.
- F. The conditions of approval herein are binding on the applicant, the property's owners, operators, and all successors in interest and assigns.
- G. 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.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, based upon the foregoing findings of fact, the evidence, information, testimony and materials presented at the public hearing, which are part of the record for this matter, and the staff report and analysis, which are adopted herein, including the staff recommendations, which were amended and adopted by the Board, that the **application** is GRANTED for the above-referenced project subject to those certain conditions specified in Paragraph I, II, III of the Findings of Fact, to which the applicant has agreed.

PROVIDED, the applicant shall build substantially in accordance with the revised plans, entitled "Pavilion, Muss Park", as prepared by project team **Douglas Wood Associates, Inc.** dated, signed and sealed May 4, 2016, and as approved by the Design Review Board, as determined by staff.

When requesting a building permit, the plans submitted to the Building Department for permit shall be consistent with the plans approved by the Board, modified in accordance with the conditions set forth in this Order. No building permit may be issued unless and until all conditions of approval that must be satisfied prior to permit issuance, as set forth in this Order,

have been met.

The issuance of the approval does not relieve the applicant from obtaining all other required Municipal, County and/or State reviews and permits, including final zoning approval. If adequate handicapped access is not provided on the Board-approved plans, this approval does not mean that such handicapped access is not required. When requesting a building permit, the plans submitted to the Building Department for permit shall be consistent with the plans approved by the Board, modified in accordance with the conditions set forth in this Order.

If the Full Building Permit for the project is not issued within eighteen (18) months of the meeting date at which the original approval was granted, the application will expire and become null and void, unless the applicant makes an application to the Board for an extension of time, in accordance with the requirements and procedures of Chapter 118 of the City Code; the granting of any such extension of time shall be at the discretion of the Board. If the Full Building Permit for the project should expire for any reason (including but not limited to construction not commencing and continuing, with required inspections, in accordance with the applicable Building Code), the application will expire and become null and void.

In accordance with Chapter 118 of the City Code, the violation of any conditions and safeguards that are a part of this Order shall be deemed a violation of the land development regulations of the City Code. Failure to comply with this **Order** shall subject the application to Chapter 118 of the City Code, for revocation or modification of the application.

Dated this _____ day of _____, 20_____.

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
THE CITY OF MIAMI BEACH, FLORIDA

BY: _____
DEBORAH J. TACKETT
DESIGN AND PRESERVATION MANAGER
FOR THE CHAIR

STATE OF FLORIDA)
)SS
COUNTY OF MIAMI-DADE)

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this _____ day of _____ 20____ by Deborah J. Tackett, Design and Preservation Manager, Planning Department, City of Miami Beach, Florida, a Florida Municipal Corporation, on behalf of the Corporation. He is personally known to me.

NOTARY PUBLIC

Miami-Dade County, Florida

My commission expires: _____

Approved As To Form:

City Attorney's Office: _____ ()

Filed with the Clerk of the Design Review Board on _____ ()

F:\PLAN\SDRB\DRB16\06-07-2016\JUN16 Final Orders\DRFT DRB 23247 4300 Chase.JUN16.FO.docx