

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. 23269
5350-5370 North Bay Road – Single Family Home

The applicants, Rex and Carolyn Runzheimer, are requesting Design Review Approval for the construction of a new two-story single family home including a variance to reduce the minimum required front setback to replace an existing pre-1942 architecturally significant two-story home. This application is subject to the approval of a lot split application pending before the Planning Board.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with conditions

Denial of the variance request.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

Lots 9 and 10 of Block 14 of the LaGorce Golf Subdivision, according to Plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book 14, Page 43 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

HISTORY:

December 2, 2014—5370-5380 North Bay Road was reviewed and approved by the Design Review Board for a landscape plan that replaced a pre-1942 single family home, pursuant to DRB File No. 23105.

May 24, 2016—5370-5380 North Bay Road is scheduled to be reviewed and approved by the Planning Board for approval of a lot split application in order to construct a new two-story home, pursuant to PB File No. 2326.

SITE DATA:

Zoning: RS-3
Future Land Use: RS
Lot Size: 25,441.6 SF
Lot Coverage:
Existing: ±3,600 SF / 14.6%
Proposed: 6,225 SF / **24.4%**
Maximum: 7,632.5 SF / 30%
Unit size:
Existing: ±4,431 SF / 17.4%
Proposed: 10,701 SF / **42%**
Maximum: 12,720.8 SF / 50%
2nd Floor Volume to 1st: 69.2%

Height:
Proposed: 28'-0" flat roof*
Maximum: 24'-0" flat roof
***DRB WAIVER**

Grade: +5.26' NGVD
Base Flood Elevation: +8.00' NGVD
Difference: 2.74'
Adjusted Grade: +6.63' NGVD

EXISTING STRUCTURE:

Year Constructed: 1934
Architect: Carlos Schoeppl
Vacant: No
Demolition Proposed: Total

North: Two-story 1934 residence
South: Three-story 2009 residence
West: Biscayne Bay

SURROUNDING PROPERTIES:

East: One-story 1953 residence

THE PROJECT:

The applicants have submitted plans entitled "North Bay Road Residence", as prepared by **Kobi Karp Architecture**, signed, sealed and dated April 13, 2016.

The subject property consists of two adjacent, legally platted lots on the bayside of North Bay Road. The northern parcel is vacant aside from landscaping while the southern parcel contains an existing pre-1942 architecturally significant two-story home. The applicant is proposing to unify the parcels and completely demolish the southern two-story home (5350 NBR) in to construct a new contemporary, two-story residence on the unified site.

The applicants are requesting the following design waiver(s):

1. The height of the proposed structure is **28'-0"** in accordance with Section 142-105(b).

The applicants are requesting the following variance(s):

1. A variance to reduce by 10'-0" the minimum required front setback of 30'-0" for a two-story single-family home in order to construct an attached one-story garage at 20'-0" from the front (east) property line.
 - Variance requested from:

Sec. 142-106. - Setback requirements for a single-family detached dwelling.

The setback requirements for a single-family detached dwelling in the RS-1, RS-2, RS-3, RS-4 single-family residential districts are as follows:

- (1) *Front yards: The minimum front yard setback requirement for these districts shall be 20'0.*
- (b) *Two-story structures shall be setback a minimum of an additional 10'-0" from the required front yard setback line.*

In February of 2016, the setback requirements for single family homes were amended in order to increase the front setback for two-story single family homes. One-story, detached structures have a minimum front setback requirement of 20'-0" but any portion of a two-story home must be setback an additional 10'-0". In this design, the second floor enclosed space is setback 33'-10" from the front property line, but the attached one-story garage portion is proposed at 20'-0", requiring the variance. Additionally, an open staircase leading to the terrace above the garage is also encroaching into the 30'-0" setback. Staff finds that there are no practical difficulties or hardships associated with this variance, since this unified parcel is vacant and contains over 25,000 SF of lot area. Staff finds that the variance request is triggered by the specific design of the home, and therefore, it does not satisfy the criteria for the granting of a variance. For this reason, staff recommends **denial** of the

applicant's request.

COMPLIANCE WITH ZONING CODE:

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

1. The maximum building height is 24'-0" for flat roofed structures and 27'-0" for sloped roofs. In the RS-3 zoning district, the DRB may approve a building height of up to 28'-0" for flat roofs and 31'-0" for sloped roofs, and exception from this provision may be granted **through DRB approval** in accordance with the applicable design review criteria.

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.
Not Satisfied; the applicant is requesting a front setback variance and a waiver from the Board.
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.
Not Satisfied; the applicant is requesting a front setback variance and a waiver from the Board.
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.

Not Satisfied; the applicant is requesting a front setback variance and a waiver from the Board.

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.
Satisfied
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 Satisfied; the applicant is requesting a front setback variance and a waiver from the Board.

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:

In 2014, the Design Review Board approved a landscape plan and improvement plan for 5370 North Bay Road and 5380 North Bay Road, pursuant to DRB File No. 23105. The applicants unified the two parcels in order to create a new landscape garden space for their main residence. The applicants have since purchased the south parcel 5350 North Bay Road.

The applicants are now seeking to abandon the prior DRB approval and once again split the parcels, requiring Planning Board approval, in order to unify 5350 North Bay Road with the "middle" vacant, landscaped garden parcel, 5370 North Bay Road. The subject property consists of two adjacent, legally platted lots on the bayside of North Bay Road, the southern parcel contains an existing pre-1942 architecturally significant two-story home. The applicants are proposing to unify the parcels and completely demolish the southern two-story home (5350 NBR) in order to construct a new contemporary, two-story residence on the unified site.

The maximum building height in the RS-3 zoning district is 24'-0" for flat roofs. However, in the RS-3 zoning district, the DRB may approve a building height of up to 28'-0" for flat roofs.

The architect is seeking 28'-0" for the majority of the new two-story residence. The intent of the waiver was for lots in the RS-3 districts that closely resemble lot sizes in the RS-1 and RS-2 zoning districts. The subject site contains a lot area of nearly 26,000 SF which is slightly under the minimum lot area required for RS-1 lots (30,000 SF) and greatly over the lot area required for RS-2 lots (18,000 SF). Further, the siting of the proposed residence provides for generous setbacks over the minimum requirements and abundant and lush landscaping has been proposed. Overall, staff is supportive of this application and recommends that the design of the replacement home be approved including the waiver.

VARIANCE ANALYSIS:

The applicant is requesting a front setback variance for the attached one-story garage and the stairs leading to the second floor terrace. While detached one-story structures are permitted at the 20'-0" setback line, the Code was recently amended to require all two-story structures—inclusive of all attached one-story portions—to be setback an additional 10'-0" from the front property line. There's only one portion of the site that does not comply with the required setback and its one enclosed parking space within the three-story garage and the second floor terrace located above. The proposed home can be redesigned to comply with the setback requirements since this is a double lot with available area to relocate the garage; therefore the request does not satisfy the Practical Difficulty and Hardship Criteria.

RECOMMENDATION:

In view of the foregoing analysis, staff recommends the application be **denied** as it pertains to the variance request and the design, including the waiver, 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, as applicable.

TRM/JGM/LC

F:\PLAN\DRB\DRB16\06-07-2016\JUN16 Staff Reports\DRB 23269 5350-70 No Bay Rd.JUN16.doc

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
City of Miami Beach, Florida**

MEETING DATE: June 7, 2016

FILE NO.: 23269

PROPERTY: **5350-5370 North Bay Road**

APPLICANTS: Rex and Carolyn Runzheimer

LEGAL: Lots 9 and 10 of Block 14 of the LaGorce Golf Subdivision, according to Plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book 14, Page 43 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

IN RE: The Application for Design Review Approval for the construction of a new two-story single family home including a variance to reduce the minimum required front setback to replace an existing pre-1942 architecturally significant two-story home. This application is subject to the approval of a lot split application pending before the Planning Board.

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 2-3, 5, and 12 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 home at 5350-5370 North Bay Road shall be submitted to and approved by staff; at a minimum, such drawings shall incorporate the following:
 - a. The proposed one-story attached garage shall comply with the required 30'-0" front setback, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Design Review Criteria and/or the directions from the Board.

- b. Additional material finishes shall be introduced throughout the project in order to break up the large stucco areas, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Design Review Criteria and/or the directions from the Board.
 - c. The final details of all exterior surface finishes and materials, including samples, shall be submitted, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Design Review Criteria and/or the directions from the Board.
 - d. 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.
 - e. 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 home, 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. The applicant shall incorporate additional canopy shade trees throughout the project, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Design Review Criteria and/or the directions from the Board.

- e. Direct, segregated pedestrian access to the site from the street and sidewalk shall be provided to the main entrance, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Design Review Criteria and/or the directions from the Board.
- f. 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.
- g. Any proposed walkways within the required yards shall be 44" in width except for landing where a 5'-0" turning radius is required, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Design Review Criteria and/or the directions from the Board.
- 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. The applicant filed an application with the Planning Department for the following variance(s):

1. ~~A variance to reduce by 10' 0" the minimum required front setback of 30' 0" for a two-story single-family home in order to construct an attached one-story garage at 20' 0" from the front (east) property line. (Variance denied).~~

B. The applicant has submitted plans and documents with the application that the Board has concluded do not satisfy Article 1, Section 2 of the Related Special Acts.

The applicant has submitted plans and documents with the application that the Board has concluded do not 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.

C. The Board hereby **Denies** the Variance requests, and imposes the following conditions

based on its authority in Section 118-354 of the Miami Beach City Code:

1. Substantial modifications to the plans submitted and approved as part of the application, as determined by the Planning Director or designee, may require the applicant to return to the Board for approval of the modified plans, even if the modifications do not affect variances approved by the Board.
 - a. The proposed structure shall comply with the required front setback of 30'-0" for two-story structures.

The decision of the Board regarding variances shall be final and there shall be no further review thereof except by resort to a court of competent jurisdiction by petition for writ of certiorari.

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

- A. Where one or more parcels are unified for a single development, the property owner shall execute and record a unity of title or a covenant in lieu of unity of title, as may be applicable, in a form acceptable to the City Attorney.
- B. During Construction work, the Applicant will maintain gravel at the front of the construction site within the first 15'-0" of the required front yard to mitigate disturbance of soil and mud by related personal vehicles existing and entering the site and with an 8'-0" high fence with a wind resistant green mesh material along the front of the property line. All construction materials, including dumpsters and portable toilets, shall be located behind the construction fence and not visible from the right-of-way. All construction vehicles shall either park on the private property or at alternate overflow parking sites with a shuttle service to and from the property. The Applicant shall ensure that the contractor(s) observe good construction practices and prevent construction materials and debris from impacting the right-of-way.
- C. In the event Code Compliance receives complaints of unreasonably loud noise from mechanical and/or electrical equipment, and determines the complaints to be valid, even if the equipment is operating pursuant to manufacturer specifications, the applicant shall take such steps to mitigate the noise with noise attenuating materials as reviewed and verified by an acoustic engineer, subject to the review and approval of staff based upon the design review or appropriateness criteria, and/or directions received from the Board.
- D. 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.
- E. The final building plans shall meet all other requirements of the Land Development Regulations of the City Code.
- F. The Final Order shall be recorded in the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.

- G. 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.
- H. 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.
- I. The conditions of approval herein are binding on the applicant, the property's owners, operators, and all successors in interest and assigns.
- J. 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 plans, entitled "North Bay Road Residence", as prepared by **Kobi Karp** dated, signed, and sealed 4/13/2016, 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 _____ (_____)