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Key to this response list:
Sheet (if applicable) - Comment by Reviewer
Response: description of response steps taken and all locations impacted (sheets/documents, etc.)

HPB Zoning Review Comments
Date: 7/26/2019

Comment: 1. Provide evidence that the City has approved the construction of the bridge over the alley or remove it from the drawings.
Response: Please refer to the attached email from Tom Mooney regarding this matter.

Comment: 2. Provide a recent signed and sealed survey, not older than 6 months from the time of application.
Response: A signed & sealed survey dated July 22, 2019 is now provided.

Comment: 3. Portions of the stairs above grade count in the FAR.
Response: Please refer to the proposed FAR diagrams on sheet A-2.17. All stairs (shown shaded) are included in the FAR calculations. The uncovered steps in the courtyard are by definition excluded from the floor area. (Sec 114-1, Definitions, floor area, exemption #2)

Comment: 4. Page A-6.1 at the bottom of the table provide a summary of the hotel units within the new reconstructed area and indicate total number of hotel units below 300 sf and specify area of the smallest unit. Indicate total number of units with area between 300-335 sf. Indicate total number of hotel rooms with area above 335 sf. Staff preliminary calculations indicate 43 new hotel units and table indicates 45 new hotel units. Please clarify.
Response: The table on sheets A-6.1 through A-6.4 has been amended as requested. The number of guestrooms proposed in the Annex building is 45 (13 on the ground floor + 15 on the second + 15 on the third + 2 on the fourth.)

HPB Plan Review Comments
Date: 7/26/2019

1. APPLICATION

Comment: a. In order to retain non-conforming setbacks and parking credits a waiver of code section 118-395(b)(2)(d) must be requested in the letter of intent.

Response: Letter of intent was amended as requested.

2. DEFICIENCIES IN ARCHITECTURAL PRESENTATION

Comment: a. Provide an historical analysis for the building at 1021 Collins Avenue, including microfilm.

Response: A historical report has been provided (on sheets A-1.5 & A-1.6) for the entire 1001 Collins Avenue property. The report makes reference to the building at 1021 Collins Avenue, historically the Warwick Apartments. The oldest microfilm received from the Building Department was from 1997, and thus excluded from the application package.

Comment: b. Provide preliminary shoring and bracing plans and a preliminary engineering methodology on how the remaining walls will be maintained in place during excavation, demolition and reconstruction.

Response: A structural assessment report is provided, addressing these items.

Comment: c. The planters along the front and south side of the building are shown to be demolished in some plans and elevations and renderings and not in others. Please clarify. Please provide photos of all of the planters attached to the building to be demolished.

Response: Based on the historical documentation available, we believe that (1) the planters on the south side of the building are not original to the building and are thus proposed to be demolished, and (2) the single planter on the front side of the building is original, which we propose to preserve. Photos of all planters attached to the building are provided on sheets A-2.2 & A-2.3. Plans, elevations, and renderings have been coordinated per the above.
Comment:  

d. Indicate on the site plan the finish floor elevations of the Essex House ground floor lobby and rooms.

Response:  

Added to site plan, sheet A-5.1.

Comment:  

e. What is the proposed accessibility route into the 1021 building?

Response:  

Added to site plan, sheet A-5.1.

Comment:  

f. Provide a gross square footage calculation for the 1021 annex building including all existing and proposed FAR, basement and accessible rooftops in order to calculate the gross square footage fee.

Response:  

Gross square footage has been added to the Zoning Data Sheet, sheet A-1.3.

2. DESIGN/APPROPRIATENESS COMMENTS (Recommendations)

Comment:  

a. Staff is not supportive of the reconfiguration of the south side entry of the retained portion of the 1021 building. Staff recommends that the courtyard area be reconfigured in order to retain this feature and the stepped planter in their current configurations.

Response:  

The courtyard as currently proposed and the entire first floor of the 1021 building (Annex) will be raised to an elevation of +9.0' NGVD, or Design Flood Elevation (DFE).  

Our objectives in doing so are as follows:

1. Prolong the life of the contributing building by addressing an immediate concern of flooding and sea level rise, which may compromise the structural integrity and continued use of the building.

2. Make the Annex and the entire property completely accessible to those who are mobility-impaired, and create a seamless flow between the two buildings to function as a single hotel.

We believe that leaving the south side entry of the retained portion of the Annex at existing courtyard level would be counterintuitive to our objectives. Also, we hope that the adjustments required to the existing south façade may be deemed as architecturally and historically respectful, considering the concerns listed above.
Comment: b. Staff has concern with regard to the proposed basement which will require the demolition of a substantial portion of the existing building and significant architectural details. Additionally, staff has some concern regarding the introduction of the subterranean structure which is contrary to the City’s sea level rise and adaptation strategies. Finally, staff is concerned that the excavation for the basement may have an adverse structural impact on the Contributing structures.

Response: We intend to address these concerns as follows:

1. The south façade of the building which is proposed to be demolished is also proposed to be reconstructed in a way that will be architecturally consistent with the existing façade. The facades of the third floor addition and rear wing are intended to relate to the existing façade by reinterpreting its architectural elements and details in a way that subtly distinguishes it from the existing façade.

2. The project will be designed in accord with the City’s sea level rise and adaptation strategies by:
   a. Raising the ground floor of the Annex building and courtyard to the DFE (Base Flood Elevation + Freeboard).
   b. Designing below-grade construction to be waterproof with hydrostatic slab to resist uplift pressure, and to be adaptable for future use as a passive stormwater retention vault.
   c. Elevating all critical electrical and mechanical equipment above the DFE.
   d. Providing onsite drainage and stormwater retention to meet or exceed the City’s and Miami-Dade DERM’s requirements.
   e. Maximizing onsite green space and pervious surfaces to increase natural stormwater infiltration.
   f. Complying with resiliency criteria as prescribed in Sec. 133-50 (a).

3. Our structural engineer has performed a structural assessment, studying the constructability of the proposed basement and any potential impact to adjacent structures. Please refer to the report by Optimus Structural Design LLC, included in this application package.
Dory – see below to address comment 5(1).

Hi Alex

I heard from the Manager. The proposed alley bridge has been referred to FCWPC by the City Commission. The air rights for the bridge and the appraisal will be heard by FCWPC in September. Full Commission approval (if it is approved) would not occur until October City Commission at the earliest.

Based upon the City Commission referring the aforementioned matters to Commission Committees, the City will sign the HPB application for improvements to the private properties, inclusive of the proposed pedestrian bridge over the alley in the application, so that the HPB can review everything at once. The HPB is only reviewing the exterior aesthetics of the bridge, and any decision they make regarding the exterior would be subject to final Commission approval. Any approval by the HPB will include an explicit condition in the final order that any improvement over a public ROW is subject to Commission approval and that no permit will be issued unless and until the City Commission approves.

Tom
Dear Tom,

As you know, we represent the Jesta Group, whose affiliates own both the Clevelander and Essex House Hotels, located at 1020 Ocean Drive and 1001 Collins Avenue, respectively. We are proposing an addition and renovation project for the Essex and will be submitting our application soon for the October HPB meeting.

We are including in this HPB application a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a pedestrian bridge connecting the Clevelander and Essex over Ocean Court (similar to the Betsy and Tides connectors). Commissioner Arriola has kindly agreed to sponsor this item and we are working with the Administration on obtaining appraisals for the air rights and taking the other required steps.

For the sake of efficiency, we would like the bridge connector to be heard by HPB at the same time as the rest of our application to HPB. Per your emails below, you agreed to allow this to go to HPB as long as the City Commission previously voted to refer the matter to the Finance Committee. That referral has now occurred.

Accordingly, we would appreciate it if the City Manager would co-sign our application to the HPB solely for the bridge connector portion of the project. Please let us know what is needed to accomplish this.

Thanks

---

I am ok with it going to HPB upon referral to Finance Committee. However, either the City Manager or Eric Carpenter would need to sign the application. Ultimately we will need authorization from the manager to allow an application to proceed to HPB that affects public ROW.