

MIAMI BEACH

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Staff Report & Recommendation

Historic Preservation Board

TO: Chairperson and Members
Historic Preservation Board

DATE: August 9, 2016

FROM: Thomas R. Mooney, AICP
Planning Director



SUBJECT: HPB0616-0045, **5225 Collins Avenue.**

The applicant, The Alexander Condominium, is requesting a preliminary evaluation for the replacement of the existing masonry railing with glass railings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Provide applicant with comments

EXISTING STRUCTURE

Local Historic District:	Morris Lapidus / Mid-20 th Century
Status:	Contributing
Original Construction Date:	1962
Original Architect:	Charles McKirahan & Associates

ZONING / SITE DATA

Legal Description:	Lots 19 and 20 of Amended First Ocean Front Subdivision and out lots opposite same facing Indian Creek, According to the Plat Thereof, as Recorded in Plat Book 9, Page 78, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.
--------------------	--

Zoning:	RM-3, Residential Multi-Family, High Intensity
Future Land Use Designation:	RM-3, Residential Multi-Family, High Intensity

THE PROJECT

The applicant has submitted schematic plans entitled "The Alexander All Suite Oceanfront Resort" as prepared by Modis Architects, dated May 25, 2015.

The applicant is requesting a Preliminary Evaluation for a new railing design, including the removal of existing masonry railings to be replaced with glass railings.

The City Code allows for the Historic Preservation Board to give preliminary guidance to an applicant, prior to the submission of a formal application.

Preliminary evaluations by the Board are for informational purposes only, and shall not constitute a binding approval, nor shall any comments, feedback, information or guidance provided by the Board be binding upon the Board during subsequent review of the preliminary

application or a related final application. The Board may provide general comment, feedback, information and guidance during the initial hearing on the application for preliminary evaluations, and may continue discussion on a preliminary evaluation to subsequent meetings in order for the applicant to better address any specific concerns raised by the Board or staff, or may elect to terminate the preliminary evaluation process after providing general comments.

Preliminary evaluation applications shall not constitute a completed application meeting all submission requirements for Certificate of Appropriateness approval, and therefore an applicant acquires no vested rights or protections of any kind, type or nature based upon the filing of the preliminary evaluation application (e.g., no vested right to develop a project in accordance with the Code in effect on the date of submission of a completed preliminary evaluation application). The Board will not issue an order either approving or denying a project or take any formal action on preliminary evaluation applications. Preliminary evaluations shall not entitle applicants to any of the benefits accorded to applicants pursuant to completed applications, inclusive of appeals or rehearings.

COMPLIANCE WITH ZONING CODE

A preliminary review of the request indicates that the application, as proposed, appears to be consistent with the City Code. 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.

CONSISTENCY WITH 2025 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

A preliminary review of the project indicates that the hotel use appears to be **consistent** with the Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan.

STAFF ANALYSIS/RECOMMENDATION:

The applicant has submitted conceptual renderings showing two options for a new railing design. Both options include the removal of the existing masonry railings on the north, south and east elevations and the introduction of new glass railings. Option A includes the retention of the existing masonry guardrails along the balcony sides and the introduction of a glass guardrail along the front of the balconies (the portion parallel to the exterior walls). Option B includes the removal of all portions of the masonry guardrails to be replaced with glass guardrails.

Staff has concerns with the removal of the masonry guardrails, particularly within the western approximately 1/3 of the building on the north and south elevations. Staff believes that the introduction of the glass guardrails in these areas eliminates the powerful horizontal design emphasis created by continuous and uniform horizontal rows of kneewalls and solid masonry balconies on each floor above the pedestal level.

No formal action is required of the Board and a Final Order relative to any comments from Board Members will not be issued. However, Staff would suggest, at a minimum, that direction be given as it pertains to the appropriateness of the demolition of the existing masonry guardrails and the introduction of new glass guardrails.