

MIAMI BEACH

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Staff Report & Recommendation

Design Review Board

TO: DRB Chairperson and Members

DATE: November 06, 2018

FROM: Thomas R. Mooney, AICP
Planning Director



SUBJECT: DRB18-0308
316 West DiLido Drive

DRB18-0308, 316 West DiLido Drive. The applicant, Olivier Francois, is requesting Design Review Approval for the construction of a new two-story single-family residence to replace an existing one-story residence including one or more waivers and variances to reduce the required front, both sides and the sum of the side setbacks.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with conditions

Denial of the variance(s)

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

Lot 13 and 8'-0" wide strip contiguous to same, Block 2, of "DiLido Island Subdivision", According to the Plat Thereof, as Recorded in Plat Book 8, Page 36, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

SITE DATA:

Zoning: RS-3
Future Land Use: RS
Lot Size: 10,500 SF (60x175)
Lot Coverage
Existing: 2,784 (27%)
Proposed: 2,951 SF (**28%**)
Maximum: 3,150 SF / **30%**
Unit size:
Existing: 2,784 (27%)
Proposed: 5,250 SF (**50%**)
Maximum: 5,250 SF / **50%**
2nd Floor Volume to 1st: **2811/2604 | 76%**
***DRB WAIVER**

Height:
Proposed: 24'-0" flat roof
Permitted: 24'-0" flat roof

Grade: +3.79' NGVD

Base Flood: +8.00' NGVD

Difference: 3.45'

Adjusted Grade: +5.895' NGVD

30" (+2.5') Above Grade: 6.29' NGVD

First Floor Elevation: +13.00' NGVD (BFE +5' FB)

EXISTING STRUCTURE:

Year: 1951
Architect: R.L. Leonard
Vacant: No
Demolition: Total

SURROUNDING PROPERTIES:

North: One-story 1959 residence
South: One-story 1952 residence
West: Biscayne Bay
East: One-story 1952 residence

THE PROJECT:

The applicant has submitted plans entitled "DRB Revised Final Submission", as prepared by **Choeff + Levy + Fischman Architecture + Design** dated 05/11/18.

The applicant is proposing to construct a new contemporary two-story residence on a waterfront site on the western side of DiLido Island.

The applicant is requesting the following three design waiver(s):

1. The second floor's physical **volume exceeds 70%** of the first floor in accordance with Section 142-105(b) (4) (c).
2. A two-story side elevation in **excess of 60'-0" in length** in accordance with Section 142-106(2)(d).

The applicant is requesting the following variance(s) which pertain to the proposed planters on the second floor of the residence:

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 one-story porte-cochere 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.

One-story, detached structures have a minimum front setback requirement of 20'-0", but a two-story residence must be setback an additional 10'-0". In this design, the two-story residence is setback 51'-8" from the front property line and the detached one-story open garage porte-cochere portion is proposed at 20'-0". However, the design features a front balcony that projects over the required 5'-0" separation between the two structures, resulting in this variance request. Although the balcony overhang is unattached to the garage and is separated from the roof of the structure, it was determined that a setback variance would be required unless a 5'-0" open to the sky distance separation between the two structures is provided. Additionally, the planter that is referenced in variance requests #2 and #3 (and #4), continues along the front façade at the roof line and extends into the required 30'-0" setback. Planters are not identified under Section 114-1132 as an allowable encroachment permissible within required yards and as such, this element is required to adhere to the setback of the principal structure.

Staff finds that there are no practical difficulties or hardships associated with this variance, since this is a design driven element and can be easily modified to eliminate the variance. 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.

2. A variance to reduce by 1'-4" the minimum required interior side setback of 7'-6" in order to construct a two-story residence with planters up to 6'-2" from the north (side) property line.

3. A variance to reduce by 1'-4" the minimum required interior side setback of 7'-6" in order to construct a two-story residence with planters up to 6'-2" from the south (side) property line.
 4. A variance to reduce by 2'-8" the minimum required sum of the side yards of 15'-0" in order to construct a two-story residence and provide a sum of the side yards of 12'-4".
- Variances 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:

(2)Side yards:

a. The sum of the required side yards shall be at least 25 percent of the lot width.

c. Interior sides. For lots greater than 60 feet in width any one interior side yard shall have a minimum of ten percent of the lot width or ten feet, whichever is greater. For lots 60 feet in width or less, any one interior side yard shall have a minimum of seven and one-half feet.

The subject property has a lot width of 60'-0", which requires the principal structure to be setback 7'-6" along both side yards. The design as proposed includes the exterior walls on the north and south side that comply with the setback requirements. However, there are elements proposed within the yards that are not allowable encroachments, such as the planters integrated with projecting eyebrows at both the ground floor and second floor which reduce the side setback up to 6'-2". Similarly, the south side walls are proposed at the required 7'-6" setback, but with planters at the second floor that encroach an additional 1'-4" into the required yard.

Planters are not identified under Section 114-1132 as an allowable encroachment permissible within required yards; as such, those elements are required to adhere to the setback of the principal structure. Staff would note that although the city Code does not include planters as a permitted encroachment, open balconies and railings are allowed. These architectural features could have a greater impact on the building's architecture and on abutting properties.

Staff finds that there are no practical difficulties or hardships associated with this variance, since this is a design driven element. 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.

As such, should the Board find merit in the design, the Code does allow for certain projections into the required yards, such as "Ornamental Features" or "Exterior Unenclosed Private Balconies". In that instance, building elements may project into required yards for a distance not to exceed 25 percent of the required setback, or 1'-10" in this case, which would leave a 5'-8" setback distance to both side property lines.

Staff has worked with the architect closely as the design of the residence has advanced in refinement over the course of several meetings. Staff does believe that the vertical and

horizontal elements improve the overall design of the home and provide visual interest to the projecting slab elements along the side. However, staff has not been able to identify a practical difficulty or hardship. As such, staff recommends denial of variance requests #2, #3 and #4.

PRACTICAL DIFFICULTY AND HARDSHIP CRITERIA

The applicant has submitted plans and documents with the application that staff has concluded **DO NOT** satisfy Article 1, Section 2 of the Related Special Acts.

Additionally, staff has concluded that the plans and documents submitted with the application **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.

COMPLIANCE WITH ZONING CODE:

A preliminary review of the project indicates that the application, as proposed, appears to be inconsistent, in addition to the requested variances, with the following sections of the City Code:

- Front porte-cochere/carport must remain 5'-0" clear separation open to sky or request variance (front setback variance requested herein).
- The rooftop summer kitchen is not allowable height exception; structure must be

eliminated from plans.

- Sheet A-5.0: Elevator and spiral stair on second floor must count towards overall unit size for the project.
- Planter is encroaching on 30'-0" front setback on floor plans, not clear on section detail (front setback variance requested herein).
- For two story homes with an overall lot coverage of 25% or greater, the physical volume of the second floor shall not exceed 70% of the first floor of the main home, exclusive of any enclosed required parking area and exception from this provision may be granted **through DRB approval** in accordance with the applicable design review criteria. **The applicant is requesting a 2nd Floor Volume to 1st of 92% with a 28% lot coverage which will require a waiver from the DRB. If the detached one-story porte-cochere was counted towards the first floor square footage, the request for a 2nd Floor Volume to 1st would be 76%.**
- Two-story side elevations located parallel to a side property line shall not exceed 50 percent of the lot depth, or 60 feet, whichever is less, without incorporating additional open space, in excess of the minimum required side yard, directly adjacent to the required side yard:
 - The additional open space shall be regular in shape, open to the sky from grade, and at least eight feet in depth, measured perpendicular from the minimum required side setback line.
 - The square footage of the additional open space shall not be less than one percent of the lot area. The open space provided along a side elevation in accordance with this subsection, whether required or not, shall not be included in the lot coverage calculation provided that the combined depth of the open space, as measured from the required side setback line(s), is less than 30 percent of the maximum developable building width of the property, as measured from the interior setback lines, and the total open space provided does not exceed five percent of the lot area. Any portions of the interior side yard open space in excess of five percent of the lot area shall be included in the total lot coverage calculation.
 - **The elevation (height) of the open space provided shall not exceed the maximum permitted elevation height of the required side yard, and**
 - **at least 75 percent of the required interior open space area shall be sodded or landscaped previous open space.**

The intent of this regulation shall be to break up long expanses of uninterrupted two-story volume at or near the required side yard setback line and exception from the minimum requirements of this provision may be granted only through design review board approval in accordance with the applicable design review criteria.

- Height exceptions: (f.) Elevator bulkheads shall be located as close to the center of the roof as possible and be visually recessive such that they do not become vertical extensions of exterior building elevations.

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.
Not Satisfied; the applicant is requesting three (3) design waivers and four (4) variances to be granted by the Board.
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 three (3) design waivers and four (4) variances to be granted by 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 three (3) design waivers and four (4) variances to be granted by 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.
Not Satisfied; the applicant is requesting three (3) design waivers and four (4) variances to be granted by the Board.
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 three (3) design waivers and four (4) variances to be granted by the Board.
6. The proposed Structure, and/or additions or modifications to an existing structure, indicates sensitivity to and is compatible with the environment and adjacent Structures, and enhances the appearance of the surrounding properties.
Not Satisfied; the applicant is requesting three (3) design waivers and four (4) variances to be granted by the Board.

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).

Not Satisfied; the applicant is requesting three (3) design waivers and four (4) variances to be granted by 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

18. In addition to the foregoing criteria, subsection [118-]104(6)(t) of the city Code shall apply to the design review board's review of any proposal to place, construct, modify or maintain a wireless communications facility or other over the air radio transmission or radio reception facility in the public rights-of-way.

Not Applicable

19. The structure and site complies with the sea level rise and resiliency review criteria in Chapter 133, Article II, as applicable.

Not Satisfied; see below

COMPLIANCE WITH SEA LEVEL RISE AND RESILIENCY REVIEW CRITERIA

Section 133-50(a) of the Land Development establishes review criteria for sea level rise and resiliency that must be considered as part of the review process for board orders. The following is an analysis of the request based upon these criteria:

1. A recycling or salvage plan for partial or total demolition shall be provided.

Not Satisfied

A recycling plan shall be provided as part of the submittal for a demolition/building permit to the building department.

2. Windows that are proposed to be replaced shall be hurricane proof impact windows.

Satisfied

3. Where feasible and appropriate, passive cooling systems, such as operable windows, shall be provided.

Satisfied

4. Whether resilient landscaping (salt tolerant, highly water-absorbent, native or Florida friendly plants) will be provided.

Satisfied

5. 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.

Satisfied

6. The ground floor, driveways, and garage ramping for new construction shall be adaptable to the raising of public rights-of-ways and adjacent land.

Satisfied

7. Where feasible and appropriate, all critical mechanical and electrical systems shall be located above base flood elevation.

Satisfied

8. Existing buildings shall be, where reasonably feasible and appropriate, elevated to the base flood elevation.

Not Applicable

9. 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.

Satisfied

10. Where feasible and appropriate, water retention systems shall be provided.

Not Satisfied; as part of the civil engineering design to be provided at time of permit.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

DESIGN REVIEW

The applicant is proposing to construct a new two-story residence on a waterfront parcel on the western side of DiLido Island. The proposal includes a request for three (3) design waivers and four (4) variances as part of the application.

The proposed design consists of a rectilinear two-story volume massed with two, irregularly shaped, open spaces configured on either side elevation programmed as passive reflecting ponds with cascading water fall elements. There is a detached one-story garage located at the front of the site in the southern portion of the parcel. The home comprises an open floor plan on the ground floor with gym, office and the service area located towards the front of the home while the common areas are towards the water. The second floor is configured with the master suite situated towards the western portion of the residence with three, large, additional bedrooms at the eastern half. As an interesting note on the floorplan, the rear of the property skews along both levels in the 165 degree angle to maximize the better vistas in that direction off of Biscayne Bay. There are striking vertical bamboo bean poles proposed along the front and rear, and portion of the south, elevations that are particularly alluring in the design and add a freshness to the thin slabs that they support coupled with a front planter overhanging focus element.

The tropical modern residence features an elegant material palette highlighted by the incorporation of structural architectural "bamboo" poles along the first and second levels, thin slabs with wide roof overhangs and built-in planters offset by warm tropical wood and aluminum tones, and architectural board-formed concrete. The design incorporates a two-

story home elevated at BFE plus maximum freeboard, featuring 2 side reflective pool areas set as askew angles. These side recesses create interesting exterior site and landscape opportunities and minimize the overall volume of the design creating depth and interest into standard side "open space" courtyards. The residence features an elevator located in the northern portion of the siteplan, adjacent to the north side reflective pool that accesses the habitable roof deck. The Code requires that elevator [bulkheads] be located as close to the center of the roof [floorplan] as possible and be visually recessive such that they do not become vertical extensions of exterior building elevations. The elevator is not located central to the residence and although the vertical element does become part of the side (east) elevation, it is offset by about 8'-0" of the reflective pool. and It is also positioned at a diagonal within the floor plan in relation to the rectangular shape of the parcel to minimize its presence. In this instance, staff has no objection to the location of the elevator.

The applicant is also requesting a waiver of the open space requirement for two-story elevations that exceed 60'-0" in length. Specifically, the applicant proposes to provide the open space recesses along both north and south side elevations in order to break up the massing. However, as designed, both the north and south open spaces has been configured as reflecting ponds with cascading water fall feature at a higher elevation than permitted. The Code requires that the open space recesses along the side elevations do not exceed the maximum permitted elevation height of the required side yard, and at least 75 percent of the required interior open space area shall be sodded or landscaped previous open space. While the resulting open space is higher than adjusted grade and is not landscaped, it does satisfy most of the regulation's criteria and endeavors the intent of the ordinance since the designated open space successfully breaks up the massing of the two-story elevation, and does not count towards the lot coverage of the site. Therefore this design feature does not meet the regulations of the Code and thereby require waivers for both sides. The architect has designed the residence with varied movement and accentuated the forms with architectural elements that provide visual interest. Both side elevations have incorporated open spaces as recesses that are open to the sky. The design of both open space areas address the intent of the ordinance, which is to break up the two-story massing. As such, staff is supportive of the requested open space waiver along both the north and south sides.

The second design waiver pertains to the second floor to first floor ratio. Since the proposed lot coverage is greater than 25%, any second floor massing is restricted to 70% of the first floor unless a waiver is sought by the DRB. The proposed home has a lot coverage of 28% and thus the second floor exceeds the first floor's volume by 22%. To mitigate the massing's impact the applicant added some articulation along both the side elevations with expansive open space areas (see below). Also, the lot coverage proposed is below the maximum allowed by approximately 200 SF. Furthermore, if the 558 SF of area for the detached garage structure were to count towards the first floor volume, as traditional one-story **attached** garages would, it would bring the ratio down to about 76%. This one-story massing appears directly in front of the two-story residence, detached from the main residence; although the area does not count towards the ratio it adds to the proportion of the ground floor massing. Staff has no objection to the requested waiver of the volume as proposed since it is primarily "internal" to the site and is architecturally offset by the expansive side courtyards, deep front setback of 51'-8" to the exterior of the two-story residence, and the rich movement and change of planes of the façades. Overall the front of the residence incorporates a lighter and open feel, which mitigates the second to first floor

ratio being sought. As such, staff is supportive of the waiver.

Staff applauds the architectural team on a well-designed residence, including the architectural richness and complexity of all four façades of the residence. The features and exterior material finishes work harmoniously to create a residence with a unique architectural palette and design elements (i.e. bamboo poles, planters) that compliments the bold forms and usage of the solids and the voids and side recessive pool areas. Staff recommends that the design of the replacement home be approved including the requested design waivers.

VARIANCE ANALYSIS:

As noted in the 'Project' section of the staff report, the variance request is not the minimum necessary to make a reasonable use of the property, as it is associated with the proposed design of the home. The applicant is requesting multiple setback variances for the new construction. The proposed home can be redesigned to comply with the setback requirements since this is new construction on a vacant lot; 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 requests, and the design, including the waivers, 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

F:\PLAN\DRB\DRB18\11-06-2018\NOV 18 STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS\DRB18-0308 316 W Dilido Drive.NOV18.doc

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
City of Miami Beach, Florida

MEETING DATE: November 06, 2018

FILE NO: DRB18-0308

PROPERTY: **316 West DiLido Drive**

APPLICANT: Olivier Francois

LEGAL: Lot 13 and 8'-0" wide strip contiguous to same, Block 2, of "Dilido Island Subdivision", According to the Plat Thereof, as Recorded in Plat Book 8, Page 36, 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 residence to replace an existing one-story residence including one or more waivers and variances to reduce the required front, both sides and the sum of the side setbacks.

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 an 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 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 12, and 19 in Section 118-251 of the Miami Beach Code.
- C. 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 Sea Level Rise Criteria 1 and 10 in Section 133-50(a) of the Miami Beach Code.
- D. The project would be consistent with the criteria and requirements of Section 118-251 and/ or Section 133-50(a) if the following conditions are met:
 - 1. Revised elevation, site plan, and floor plan drawings for the proposed new home at 316 West DiLido Drive shall be submitted, at a minimum, such drawings shall incorporate the following:
 - a. The residence shall be designed to comply with all of the required setback requirements.

- b. The 70% limitation for the second floor volume **shall be** waived as proposed.
- c. The side open space requirement along both side elevations (north and south) **shall be** waived as proposed.
- d. The location of the elevator **shall be** permitted as proposed.
- e. The habitable roof deck shall be setback a minimum of ten feet from each side of the exterior outer walls with the exception of pathways leading to vertical circulation access points.
- f. The architect shall explore extending the bamboo architectural features: through the elements above and below the slabs.
- g. The rooftop summer kitchen is not allowable height exception, as such rooftop element must be eliminated from plans.
- h. The elevator and spiral stair on second floor (sheet A-5.0) must count towards overall unit size for the project.
- i. The mechanical equipment area proposed along the second floor projecting balcony encroaching into the side yard is not an allowable encroachment. The horizontal slats along the south edge of the balcony shall be reduced in height to a railing height (except along the ac equipment) or the slab shall comply with the building setbacks.
- j. The stone cladding proposed along the façades of the residence shall consist of a natural keystone or other natural stone, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Design Review Criteria and/or the directions from the Board.
- k. The final design details and color selection of the vertical and horizontal “ornamental aluminum” cladding proposed finish 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.
- l. The final design details of the exterior materials and finishes 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.
- m. 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.
- n. 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, prepared by a Professional Landscape Architect, registered in the State of Florida, and corresponding plans 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 plans shall comply with Chapter 26-Landscape Requirements of the Miami Beach Code and 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. Prior to any site demolition work, a tree protection fence following the City standard shall be installed for trees scheduled to remain subject to the review and approval of the City Urban Forester.
 - d. Any necessary root and tree branch pruning with a diameter at breast height (DBH) of 2" or greater shall be approved by the City Urban Forester prior to any tree work.
 - e. 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.
 - 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. The proposed and existing trees located within the swale shall be subject to the review and approval of Green Space and CIP.
 - 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 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-way 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 two-story residence at 20'-0" from the front (east) property line.
 - 2. A variance to by 1'-4" the minimum required interior side setback of 7'-6" in order to construct a two-story residence with planters up to 6'-2" from the north

(side) property line.

3. A variance to reduce by 1'-4" the minimum required interior side setback of 7'-6" in order to construct a two-story residence with planters up to 6'-2" from the south (side) property line.
 4. A variance to reduce by 2'-8" the minimum required sum of the side yards of 15'-0" in order to construct a two-story residence and provide a sum of the side yards of 12'-4".
- B. The applicant has submitted plans and documents with the application that **DO NOT** satisfy Article 1, Section 2 of the Related Special Acts, allowing the granting of a variance if the Board finds that practical difficulties exist with respect to implementing the proposed project at the subject property.

The applicant has submitted plans and documents with the application that also **DO NOT** indicate the following, 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 requested variance(s)**, 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.
2. The structure shall be redesigned to comport with all of the required setbacks.

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. Upon the issuance of a final Certificate of Occupancy or Certificate of Completion, as applicable, the project approved herein shall be maintained in accordance with the plans approved by the board, and shall be subject to all conditions of approval herein, unless otherwise modified by the Board. Failure to maintain shall result in the issuance of a Code Compliance citation, and continued failure to comply may result in revocation of the Certificate of Occupancy, Completion and Business Tax Receipt.
- 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 exiting and entering the site, and with an 8'-0" high fence with a wind resistant green mesh material along the front 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. If applicable, 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.
- D. A recycling/salvage plan shall be provided as part of the submittal for a demolition/building permit, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff.
- E. All applicable FPL transformers or vault rooms and backflow prevention devices shall be located within the building envelope with the exception of the valve (PIV) which may be visible and accessible from the street.
- F. 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.
- G. The Final Order shall be recorded in the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.

- H. 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.
- I. 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.
- J. The conditions of approval herein are binding on the applicant, the property's owners, operators, and all successors in interest and assigns.
- K. 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 Finding of Fact, to which the applicant has agreed.

PROVIDED, the applicant shall build substantially in accordance with the plans, entitled "DRB Revised Final Submission", as prepared by **Choeff + Levy + Fischman Architecture + Design** dated 05/11/18, and dated August 03, 2018, 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 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 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 shall expire for any reason (including but not limited to construction not

