

## RESPONSES TO APPLICATION COMMENTS

Project Name:	The Eighty 4
Project Address:	756 84 Street, Miami Beach FL 33141
Architect's Project Number:	18001
File Number:	DRB18-0239
Date:	05/04/2018

### Comments:

#### 1. APPLICATION COMMENTS

#### 2. DEFICIENCIES IN ARCHITECTURAL REPRESENTATION

a. Yard sections – do not show how increase yard height is retained on site, nor are they designed for on-site water captures.

Please see revised sheet A-502 showing proposed yard sections depicting perimeter retaining walls, as well as adjoining shallow swales for water retention and infiltration purposes. The slope of the Front Yard by the Street, a transition space, is 1:12, which is far less steep than the maximum permitted 1:5 slope. Proper retention areas and probable French Drain at driveway approach connection shall be provided as part of Civil Engineering drainage design, at the time of Building Permit review and approval.

b. Sheet A-201 – Second Floor: include in FAR calculation the portion of walkway and stairwell going down that is covered by stairs above.

Please see revised sheet A-201 with requested floor area inclusion for the portion of walkway and stairwell going down that is covered by the stair landing above.

c. Sheet A-201 – Second Floor: include in FAR calculation walkway/corridor (connecting the private balconies) that is covered by fourth floor walkway above.

Please see revised sheet A-201 with requested floor area inclusion for the walkway/corridor connecting the private balconies and covered by the identical one on the Fourth Floor above.

Notice that we shrunk the whole building along its length, as compared to the previous submittal, so that we could remove enough square footage to make up for these additional, previously overlooked contributing areas.

d. A-401-A404 Increase elevation marks font sizes ADD height of parapet.

Done. Font sizes were originally conceived for native 24"x36" format, but we now increased them as requested. Apologies for the inconvenience. Height of parapet provided as requested.

e. A-501 Increase elevation marks font sizes ADD height of parapet.

Done. Font sizes were originally conceived for native 24"x36" format, but we now increased them as requested. Apologies for the inconvenience. Height of parapet provided as requested.

f. A-502 Increase elevation marks font sizes

Done as well.

g. Add "FINAL SUBMITTAL" to front cover title for heightened clarity of reference for next deadline. Also drawings need to be dated.

It was labeled as "FINAL DESIGN REVIEW BOARD SUBMITTAL" from the previous round. We left it as such. Dates have been updated on all drawings.

h. Add narrative response sheet.

Provided herein, as requested.

### 3. ZONING/VARIANCE COMMENTS

a. Driveway width variance to reduce the required width from 12'-0" to 10'-0".

Noted. Spelled out in Letter of Intent accordingly.

b. Revise FAR drawings as noted. Portions of open terrace, walkway covered by a slab above counts in FAR, stair exceeds maximum FAR.

Done. Please see corresponding responses above.

c. Revise note regarding width of drive aisle to be 23'-0". Required drive aisle width is 22'-0"

Please see revised sheet A-102.

d. Maximum elevation in all required yards is 7.13' (future adjusted grade)

Please see revised sheet A-502.

e. Finish floor elevation of second floor indicated on page A-302 and A-501 is incorrect.

Thanks for the catch. Please see revised corrected sheets A-302 and A-501.

f. Walkway on the west side cannot exceed 44" in width.

Walkway on the West side has been reduced to 44" in width, but for the turning spaces in front of acclimatized trash enclosure and at side entrance. See revised sheet A-101.

g. Letter of intent shall be revised to include the following criteria, responding to these new requirements. If any item does not apply, just indicate Not Applicable, or provide an answer if the project satisfies any of the criteria.

#### COMPLIANCE WITH SEA LEVEL RISE AND RESILIENCY REVIEW CRITERIA

- A recycling or salvage plan for partial or total demolition shall be provided.
- Windows that are proposed to be replaced shall be hurricane proof impact windows.

- Where feasible and appropriate, passive cooling systems, such as operable windows, shall be provided.
- Whether resilient landscaping (salt tolerant, highly water-absorbent, native or Florida friendly plants) will be provided.
- 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.
- The ground floor, driveways, and garage ramping for new construction shall be adaptable to the raising of public rights-of-ways and adjacent land.
- Where feasible and appropriate, all critical mechanical and electrical systems shall be located above base flood elevation.
- Existing buildings shall be, where reasonably feasible and appropriate, elevated to the base flood elevation.
- 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.
- Where feasible and appropriate, water retention systems shall be provided.

Noted. Please see revised Letter of Intent.

#### 4. DESIGN/APPROPRIATENESS COMMENTS

- a. Missing material board – note materials and colors being proposed.

Please see revised Elevations with simple, precise notes describing proposed materials, finishes and colors.

- b. The lobby stair needs to be substantially transparent at the ground level.

The lobby stair complies with means of egress requirements, is greatly visible and substantially accessible from the Lobby, provides access to all dwelling units above, and is located before access to the elevator. Being substantially transparent from the outside, on the Ground Floor, would make perfect sense if the rest of the stairway above were hidden from view, as it happens in most buildings. In this particular instance, however, we have chosen to undress the whole stair from the Second Floor up, bathe it in gold, and turn it into the sculptural volume that constitutes the axis and focal point of the composition. Its location and configuration are unmistakable and impossible to miss from the outside. Having it enclosed on the Ground Floor, therefore, is not essential for location and enticement to walk it up, but is however of utmost importance to have a solid base to the composition. Any low opening would severely weaken the façade.

c. Planning staff has strong design concerns re/ the aesthetic and design and function of the stair. The applicant is advised to engage the FIRE to ensure that the stair will satisfy their egress requirements. The applicant is strongly encouraged to redesign the impractical and unattractive rear stairwell feature. The stair also does not appear to be structurally feasible.

Applicant met with Chief Fire Analyst at the Fire Department, and he approved of the suitability of the proposed stair for means of egress requirements. The only modification required was to raise the guardrail from 42" to 48" high, and turn it from clear into translucent (frosted) glass. Some of the rear façade windows and doors shall have a 45-min fire rating, given proximity, which is something we had already foreseen. We also conferred with our Structural Engineer who provided a letter confirming the feasibility of the design as proposed. We know our structures...

We offer planning staff our reassurances that the rear stair will be a superb sculptural element reminiscent of Morris Lapidus' "stair to nowhere". While we shared staff's concerns with the initial massing of the first iteration, we are by now very confident about the current proposal's suitability and appearance.

d. There are ZERO five-story buildings in the immediate vicinity. Planning staff has serious concerns about the scale and massing of the proposed architecture. The architect should reconsider the design direction and proceed with a more modest project that will fit well within the established low-scale character of the surrounding neighborhood. The increased (55') height, enlarged parking level for the mechanical lifts, and five stories design, all greatly increase the perceived height and mass of the proposed structure, and are inconsistent with the low-scale quality of the immediate RM-1 zoning district. Staff would continue to recommend that the massing and height of the project be reduced by one (1) full floor, and would strongly recommend that the massing be broken up including a reduced setback at the front of the building for one or two floors.

The current character of the neighborhood is determined by far more than the number of stories of the existing buildings. Type, syntax, relation to public realm, color palette, mix of uses, walkability, ratio of paved spaces to natural landscaping, water edge conditions, and a myriad other urban and architectural elements define that character. I would venture to say that the number of stories is perhaps the most transient one. Paris had mostly two stories for centuries, before becoming denser and acquiring the five-to-six story consistent character we know it for, along most arrondissements, in Baron Haussmann's time. Closer to home, Manhattan was mostly two to four stories up to the 1890s: a far cry from what it is today. Most of the existing housing stock in the shallow one-to-two story buildings in the block is towards the end of its useful life, and falls short of the imposing demands for affordability and diversity, not to mention it is under base flood elevation. Four and five story buildings do exist in the neighborhood, and if those shallow buildings are to be replaced, it will only be economically feasible if the FAR and building height permitted as of right are put to work. Otherwise, nothing will continue to happen.

e. The side elevations lack architectural interest.

This building is conceived as an urban building intended to last 100 years. As such, eventually similar ones on both sides will join it; thus hiding those facades from view from the street and

most angles in adjoining properties. Percentage of openings is limited by fire separation distance, and we actually find the ragged profile of its inclined front lines quite compelling. Traditionally, urban buildings concentrate the design punch and budget in their front façade and along the first few feet of the side ones. We should not depart from that common sense approach validated for centuries.

## 5. LANDSCAPE COMMENTS

a. Provide a landscape plan signed and sealed by a registered Landscape Architect licensed in the State of Florida. Landscape plan shall satisfy or exceed minimum landscape code requirements as prescribed by CMB Chapter 126. Please include standard 'landscape legend' outlining code requirements as part of the plan.

Please see complete Landscape Plan as provided in previous submittal.

b. A Tree Disposition Plan is only required if trees are existing on site.

Noted.