


MIAMI BEACH

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Staff Report & Recommendation

Design Review Board

TO: DRB Chairperson and Members

FROM: Thomas R. Mooney, AICP
Planning Director 

SUBJECT: DRB18-0344 (aka DRB0616-0034)
2850 Prairie Avenue

DATE: January 02, 2019

An application has been filed requesting exterior design modifications to a previously issued Design Review Approval for the construction of a new two-story residence on a vacant site, including one or more waivers.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with conditions

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

Lot 10 of Block 3, of the "Mid-Golf First Addition" according to Plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book 7, Page 161 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

HISTORY:

On August 02, 2016, the Design Review Board (DRB), pursuant to File No. DRB0616-0034, reviewed and approved an application for the construction of a new two-story residence including waivers and the following variances:

1. The second floor's physical volume exceeds 70 percent of the first floor in accordance with Section 142-105(b)(4)(c). The proposed second floor is 80 percent of the first floor, an increase of +10 percent.
2. A variance from the minimum required side facing a street setback of 15'-0" in order to construct a new two-story single family residence at 10'-0" from the north property line.
3. A variance from the minimum required sum of the side setbacks of 25'-0" in order to construct a new two-story single family residence with a sum of the side setbacks of 20'-0".

SITE DATA:

Zoning:	RS-4
Future Land Use:	RS
Lot Size:	9,750 SF
Lot Coverage:	
Approved:	2,881 SF / 29.5%
Proposed:	2,664 SF / 27.4%
Maximum:	2,925 SF / 30%
Unit size:	
Approved:	4,450 SF / 46%
Proposed:	4,768 SF / 49%
Maximum:	4,875 SF / 50%

2nd Floor Volume to 1st:

Approved: **80%**
Proposed: **99%***

***DRB WAIVER**

Height:	
Approved:	23'-6" flat roof
Proposed:	23'-6" flat roof
Maximum:	24'-0" flat roof
Grade:	+4.00' NGVD (approx.)
Flood:	+8.00' NGVD
Difference:	+4.00' NGVD (approx.)
Adjusted Grade:	+6.00' NGVD (approx.)

SURROUNDING PROPERTIES:

North: Two-story residence (DRB 23223)
South: Two-story 1926 residence (HPB)

West: Miami Beach Golf Course
East: One-story 1940 residence

THE PROJECT:

The applicant has submitted plans entitled "Naman Residence" as designed and prepared by **Beilinson Gomez Architects P.A.**, signed, sealed, and dated 11.05.2018.

The applicant is proposing exterior design modifications and site plan changes to a previously approved two-story residence on a vacant parcel abutting the eastern edge of the Miami Beach Golf Course.

The applicant is requesting to modify the following 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). The original approval included a second floor that was 80% of the first floor. Now, the redesign is 100%.

COMPLIANCE WITH ZONING CODE

A preliminary review of the project indicates that the application, as proposed, may be inconsistent with the following sections of the City Code:

1. For two story residences 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 residence, 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 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.
Satisfied
3. The dimensions of all buildings, structures, setbacks, parking spaces, floor area ratio, height, lot coverage and any other information that may be reasonably

necessary to determine compliance with the requirements of the underlying zoning district, and any applicable overlays, for a particular application or project.

Not Satisfied; the proposed design requires a design 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 proposed design requires a design 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.
Not Satisfied; the proposed design requires a design waiver from 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 proposed design requires a design 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.

Not Applicable

14. The building shall have an appropriate and fully integrated rooftop architectural treatment which substantially screens all mechanical equipment, stairs and elevator towers.

Satisfied; a rooftop plan demonstrates the mechanical equipment shall be screened, but no specific details of the screening has been submitted.

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.
Not 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

On August 02, 2016, the Design Review Board reviewed and approved an application for the construction of a new single family two-story residence on a vacant site facing the Miami Beach Golf Course, pursuant to DRB0616-0034. Subsequently, a building permit was applied for and issued, pursuant to Permit No. BR1701319, in accordance with the DRB

plans. Now, site plan modifications and exterior design changes are being requested due to the increase in construction costs, as stated in the applicant's letter of intent.

The original design approval for the residence featured simple volumes and rich exterior finishes that resulted in a successful modern design. The design was comprised of varying volumetric forms that were carefully curated to work beside, against and atop of one another. Finished in a material selection that included natural stone, stucco, metal perforations and wood screening; all of the features and finishes worked harmoniously together to create a residence with a diverse architectural palette that complimented the bold forms and enhanced the usage of solids and voids created by open terraces.

The proposed modifications to the residence endeavor to preserve the concept of the previously approved design, specifically the application of voids and material texture to define the various forms of the residence. However, the articulation of the residence's massing has been minimized and the architecture lessened. As a consequence of budget, the cantilevered voids that carved out open terraces were redesigned with support columns. Other architectural features, most notably along the side elevations, were modified in the proposed design. The front elevation of the residence has been minimally modified. Small, architectural nuances, such as a notch in the parapet to denote a change of materiality along a common plane, have been removed, and the glazing along the ground floor has been replaced with a perforated metal screen that wraps the north corner of the front facade and completes the garage elevation.

The north elevation facing the unimproved West 29th Street right-of-way has been significantly modified. The elevation is broken up by a deep recess from which an open terrace and secondary entrance are sited. The open terrace, once cantilevered, has been redesigned with a wide structural column that has been offset from the recess, but flush with the exterior building wall. The ground floor, once dominated by a stucco wall with discerning openings that enhanced the relationship of voids and solids, has been reduced in size with the introduction of large panes of glazing and the incorporation of wood screening that clads the entirety of the second story. Whereas in the previously approved design the ground floor was articulated as a robust support to a delicately veiled second story, the proposed modifications have inverted the relationship by breaking up the solid wall into a system of posts and beams and increasing the dominance of the second story and its wood screening. The sense of a floating upper story has been lost, as well as the well-delineated forms and juxtaposition between solids and voids. While the proposed elevation is elegant, it is not as dynamic as the previously proposed and staff recommends that the architect revisit the design.

The south, interior side elevation has also been significantly modified. Whereas the previously approved elevation contained varying volumes, planes and heights, the proposed design of this elevation has been simplified into two dominant two-story building volumes - a large rectilinear volume set back behind terrace walls and a small tower-like volume towards the front of the building. The larger building volume, screened on the ground floor by a slotted terrace wall towards the rear, and a smaller stone wall, is accented with wood screening along the rear portion of the upper story, but predominately finished in white stucco and devoid of openings. The central elevation is a two-story, stark white wall, behind which the residence's central circulation is sited. The previous design had incorporated small slotted openings punctured on a similarly blank canvas to allow light to filter into the two-story staircase of the residence. Staff recommends the re-introduction of openings to

allow light into the central space.

The proposed residence contains a lot coverage of 27.4% and has a second floor to first floor ratio of 99% where the Code restricts the second floor to 70% unless waived by the Design Review Board. The previously approved design was granted a similar design waiver, of 80% with a higher lot coverage (29.5%), due to its design merits. While the design of the proposed residence needs further refinement, it does maintain the majority of the second floor massing away from Prairie Avenue and the Golf Course. Additionally, the mass has been shifted away, with a greater setback, from the abutting, historically designated, single family residence built in 1923. Towards the north, the 70'-0" wide unimproved right-of-way has been used as a natural buffer. Staff does not object to this waiver, provided that the architect further develop the side elevations of the proposed design.

Staff recommends that the modifications design of the replacement residence be approved with modifications including the requested waiver.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

TRM/JGM

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
City of Miami Beach, Florida

MEETING DATE: January 02, 2019

FILE NO: DRB18-0344

PROPERTY: **2850 Prairie Avenue**

APPLICANT: Namron Miami, LLC.

LEGAL: Lot 10 of Block 3, of the "Mid-Golf First Addition" according to Plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book 7, Page 161 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

IN RE: The Application for Design Review Approval for exterior design modifications to a previously issued Design Review Approval for the construction of a new two-story residence on a vacant site, including one or more waivers.

SUPPLEMENTAL 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 consistent with Design Review Criteria 3, 5, 6, 9, 12, 14, 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 not consistent with Sea Level Rise Criteria 1 and 10 in Section 133-50(a) of the Miami Beach Code.
- D. The project would remain consistent with the criteria and requirements of Section 118-251 if the following conditions are met:
 - 1. All of the original conditions of approval by this Board shall remain in full force and effect under the prior Final Order dated August 02, 2016 for DRB0616-0034, except as modified herein.

2. Revised elevation, site plan, and floor plan drawings for the proposed new home at 2850 Prairie Avenue shall be submitted, at a minimum, such drawings shall incorporate the following:
 - a. Design loses much of its exterior architectural richness, particularly along the both sides elevations and rear elevations. Applicant should try to retain more of the uniqueness of the original design.
 - b. The 70% limitation for the second floor volume **shall** be waived as proposed.
 - c. The (north) side open space requirement **shall** be waived as proposed.
 - 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.

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

II. Variance(s)

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

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

- A. The final building plans shall meet all other requirements of the Land Development Regulations of the City Code.
- B. The Supplemental Final Order shall be recorded in the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.
- C. 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.
- D. The Supplemental 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.

- E. The conditions of approval herein are binding on the applicant, the property's owners, operators, and all successors in interest and assigns.
- F. Nothing in this order authorizes a violation of 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 "Naman Residence" as designed and prepared by **Beilinson Gomez Architects P.A.**, signed, sealed, and dated 11.05.2018, 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 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

