

June 27, 2016

VIA HAND DELIVERY

The Chairperson and Members of the
Miami Beach Historic Preservation Board
City of Miami Beach Planning Department
1700 Convention Center Drive, 2nd Floor
Miami Beach, Florida 33139

**Re: Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Design & Demolition and
Variances | 1610 Euclid Avenue Miami Beach (the "Property")**

Dear Chairperson and Members of the Historic Preservation Board:

Our firm represents Euclid 1610, Inc. (the "Applicant"), in connection with land use and zoning matters relating to the Property. Please accept this Application, on behalf of the Applicant, for a Certificate of Appropriateness for design and demolition ("COA") and variances in connection with the redevelopment of the Property (the "Project").

I. The Property

The Property is located in the Flamingo Park Historic District and the Miami Beach Architectural District. The Property is zoned Residential Multifamily, Medium Intensity (RM-1) on the City of Miami Beach Official Zoning Map and designated Residential Multifamily, Medium Intensity (RM-1) on the City's Future Land Use Map.

The Property contains a 1939 2-story Art Deco 16 unit apartment building (building A) then with a 1966 6 unit apartment (building B) towards the Southside of the site and a single unit residence in the rear separated by a courtyard (building C).

II. Project

Applicant is submitting to the Historic Preservation Board ("HPB") for a COA to upgrade the Property into a boutique apartment complex with a total of 22 units, one less than currently on site. The modifications are in line with the historic nature and design of the Property, while at the same time allow for general improvements consistent with the area. In general, the renovations include: (i) new construction of a four (4) townhome units addition; (ii) total renovation with slight demolition of the Property.

III. Request for Certificate of Appropriateness

Applicant is hereby requesting an approval of the COA to permit the renovation and additions. In renovation of the property into a boutique hotel within the Museum Historic district it will be compatible with the surrounding properties.

IV. Compliance with COA Criteria

In accordance with Section 118-564 of the Code, the Application complies with the criteria for issuance of a COA. The proposed physical improvements and additions are designed to be compatible with the surrounding properties. The general design, scale and massing of the renovations to the Property are appropriate to the size of the lot and compatible with the surrounding properties.

V. Waiver of Section 118-395(b)(2)(d)(1)

The aggregate demolition of the first floor slab results in less than 75% of the original first floor slab remaining intact. Pursuant to Section 118-395(b)(2)(d)(2) of the Code, Applicant is requesting the HPB to waive the requirement that at least 75% of the first floor slab remain to allow the Project to retain its floor area, height, setback and parking credits, as applicable. The Project is a member of the stock of contributing buildings in Miami Beach. The replacement of the first Floor slab flooring will ensure the building's structural integrity for future generations to enjoy.

VI. Request for Variance

The applicant is requesting the following variances, as determined by the interpretation of the Planning Director:

1. A variance under 142-156 (A) to waive 10' of the minimum required 15' rear setback for the Project.
2. A variance under 142-155 (B) to waive the minimum apartment room size requirements for the existing building B at 348 sf where the minimum required is 400 sf (52 sf variance).
3. A variance under 142-155 (B) to waive the average apartment room size requirements for the existing building B at 529 sf average where the average requirement is 550 sf (21sf variance).
4. A variance under 142-155 (B) to waive the average apartment room size requirements for the existing building A at 516 sf average where the average requirement is 550 sf (32sf variance).

Section 118-353(d) of the Code delineates the standards of review for a variance application. Specifically, a variance shall be approved upon demonstration of the following:

- a) 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;

Satisfied; The Project has contributing structures and the Applicant cannot meet the average and minimum unit size for apartments without demolishing the existing buildings and in order to follow the contributing structure lines it requires relief from room size requirements. In regards to the rear setback, in order to maintain the courtyard the variance should be granted. In addition the properties in the area normally have only a 5' rear setback.

- b) That the special conditions and circumstances do not result from the action of the applicant;

Satisfied; Project has contributing structure. In order to not change the exterior facades of the contributing structure the change creates the relief from room size and average requirements. Applicant cannot meet the rear setback requirements without demolishing the eliminating the historic interior courtyard.

- c) 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;

Satisfied; The HPB and formerly Board of Adjustment routinely grant similar variance requests for historic structures.

- d) 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;

Satisfied; Applicant is entitled to create boutique apartment complex of the character of the surrounding areas. Failure to approve the Application will result in an unfair competitive advantage to Applicant's competitors and will also create a significant hardship for creating rooms larger that would then require alterations to the historic façade.

- e) That the variance granted is the minimum variance that will make possible the reasonable use of the land, building or structure;

Satisfied; The variance requested is the minimum variance required to provide the necessary apartment use without demolishing the historic structure.

- f) 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

Satisfied; Granting of the variance will be in harmony with the general intent and purpose of the Code and will not be injurious to the local area. Rather, as stated above, the Applicant intends be in harmony with surrounding areas.

- g) 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.

Satisfied; Granting of this request is consistent with the comprehensive plan and does not reduce the levels of service as set forth in the plan .

VII. Conclusion

The Applicant is requesting the approval of the COA and variances to redevelop the contributing property into an apartment building. Based on the foregoing, we respectfully request your favorable consideration of this Application.

Sincerely,

Alfredo J. Gonzalez

