



RESPONSES TO COMMENTS – January 6th, 2020

**Fire Review - Not Reviewed Jorge Clavijo Ph: email: JorgeClavijo@miamibeachfl.gov
Comments: HPB19-0366 Initial Review – 12-4-19**

1. Ensure compliance with the Fire Department Access requirements spelled out in NFPA 1 Chapter 18.

Response: The access driveway at the drop off area shall be no less than 22' in width and the overhead clearance will be a min. of 14'6".

2. Specify the load bearing capacity and clearance dimensions of the Vehicular ramps and any roads or access routes to be used by Emergency Vehicles.

Response: The load bearing capacity for the ramps and drives shall meet the required code at the time of building permit

3. The Loading Spaces on the South Side of the building appear to be blocking Fire Department Access to the Fire Command Room, Fire Pump Room, and Emergency Generator Room, as shown.

Response: The loading spaces have been redesigned to allow for fire dept access

4. Specify the location of the fuel port for the emergency generator for review. Ensure that the fuel port is within view of the fuel truck during filling.

Response: The fuel port will be located in the loading space at the lobby level

5. The roof top pool deck is an Assembly area which required two remote exits.

Response: The roof top has been redesigned to allow for an additional exit from the pool deck

6. No information on the proposed Life Safety Systems, Occupant Loads, required separations have been submitted for review at this time.

Response: This information will be reviewed at time of permit

7. As a Hi-Rise building, two independent water supplies will be required. They must be located remotely from one another.

Response: Understood. These will be provided during permitting

8. Fire Hydrants must be located within 100 feet of each of the required Fire Department Connections. If one is not within the required distance a new hydrants may be required.

Response: understood.

2. HPB Plan Review - Fail James Seiberling Ph: email: JamesSeiberling@miamibeachfl.gov
Comments: First submittal: December 16, 2019
Comments issued: December 27, 2019
Final submittal (CAP & Paper): January 6, 2020
Notice to proceed issued: January 13, 2020
Agenda finalized & all fees paid by: January 15, 2020
Tentative HPB meeting agenda date: March 10, 2020
SUBJECT: HPB19-0366, 6747 and 6757 Collins Avenue.

1. DEFICIENCIES IN ARCHITECTURAL PRESENTATION

a. The rendering provided is washed out. Please provide photorealistic renderings showing the proposed building in context. Provide ocean side rendering.

Response: 2 renderings have been provided in the package

c. The rendered elevation drawings are washed out.

Response: The rendered elevations have been revised.

d. The shading of the plans (floor plans, elevations, section) and the three dimensional objects make the plans difficult to read. Please remove all shading.

Response: The shading has been removed on the floor plans

e. Provide a material samples page.

Response: The material page is provided on sheet A1.04 with additional details

f. Provide details of the divider screens.

Response: The balcony screen divider is located on sheet A3.00

g. Provide details of the screening adjacent to the lobby.

Response: The Brise soliel detail in on the material page on sheet A1.04

2. DESIGN/APPROPRIATENESS COMMENTS (Recommendations)

a. None

2. Environmental Review - Not Reviewed Elizabeth Wheaton Ph: email: elizabethwheaton@miamibeachfl.gov

3. Building Dept – DRC Review - Not Reviewed Ana Salgueiro Ph: 305-673-7610 email: AnaSalgueiro@miamibeachfl.g

4. Urban Forestry Group Review - Not Reviewed Omar Leon Ph: email: OmarLeon@miamibeachfl.gov

5. HPB Admin Review - Fail Victor Nunez Ph: email: VictorNunez@miamibeachfl.gov

Comments Issued: December 27, 2019

7. Transportation - LUB Review - Fail Firat Akcay Ph: email: Firatakay@miamibeachfl.gov
Comments: General Correction

8. Public Works - LUB Review - Not Reviewed Otniel Rodriguez Ph: email: OtnielRodriguez@miamibeachfl.gov

9. Planning Landscape Review - Fail Ricardo Guzman Ph: email: RicardoGuzman@miamibeachfl.gov

Comments:

General Correction #1:

1- The proposed landscape plan shall satisfy or exceed minimum landscape code requirements as prescribed by CMB Code

Chapter 126. Include standard CMB Landscape Legend on plans. Landscape legend is available at the following link:

<https://www.miamibeachfl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Landscape-Legend-Form-7-11-2016.pdf>

Response: Agreed

2- The use of Silva Cells or approved equal should be considered for canopy shade trees planted in areas where rooting space may be limited.

Response: Agreed

Comments: General Correction #1:

1- The proposed landscape plan shall satisfy or exceed minimum landscape code requirements as prescribed by CMB Code

Chapter 126. Include standard CMB Landscape Legend on plans. Landscape legend is available at the following link:

<https://www.miamibeachfl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Landscape-Legend-Form-7-11-2016.pdf>

Response: Agreed

2- The use of Silva Cells or approved equal should be considered for canopy shade trees planted in areas where rooting space may be limited.

Response: Agreed

10. HPB Zoning Review - Fail Irina Villegas Ph: email: ivillegas@miamibeachfl.gov

Comments: Comments issued on December 9

1. A letter of intent shall be submitted.

Response: letter of intent has been submitted

2. Required interior side setbacks is 16'-0", not 20'-0"

Response: Plans have been modified to show 16' as the interior side setback for the tower

3. Indicate required rear pedestal setback at 66'-8" on floor plans.

Response: the rear pedestal setback is now shown as 66'-8" on the plans and sheet A0.19

4. The project does not comply with the required tower rear setback of 83'-3", as noted on page A0.20.
Response: The Rear Tower Setback is now shown at 83'-3" on the floor plans and sheet A0.19
5. Height in zoning table is not consistent with height indicated in elevation drawings.
Response: Agreed
6. Pool is not an allowable encroachment in the tower front yard.
Response: Pool and pool deck are now not located in the tower front yard
7. Indicate length of projections and setbacks to projections in required yards.
Response: projections are shown on the floor plans
8. Maximum encroachment of balcony/terrace in the rear and front yards is 6'-0".
Response: Plans have been revised to show a max projection of 6'.
9. Pool deck and parapet are not an allowable encroachment in required yards.
Response: Pool deck has been removed from the yard
10. Two-way drive aisle at the elevators does not comply with 22'-0" in width.
Response: Drive aisle is 22' wide
11. Provide additional section details.
Response: Additional sections of the yards have been provided on sheet A4.02
12. Elevations indicated on elevation drawings (floor slabs, pool deck, parking) is not consistent with elevation points indicated on floor plans.
Response: This has been corrected
13. Indicate elevation of pool deck in NGVD. Oceanfront Overlay.
Response: Elevation of the pool deck is now shown on the floor plans and the sectionis
14. Pool deck shall be setback 15'-0" from the side property lines and 10'-0" from the rear property line.
Response: This has been corrected
15. Provide a diagram of the Oceanfront Overlay showing calculations for compliance with 50% open space (section 142-802(8)). As proposed, the project does not comply.
Response: shown on sheet A2.02
16. Provide calculations for loading requirements.
Response: loading calcs are shown on the zoning data sheet A1.01
17. Total loading required is 4 spaces.
Response: agreed, 4 spaces area shown

18. Provide commercial /residential uses required at the front and rear.
Response: The ground floor is a future basement level. The second level has all of the commercial uses required. The parking is screened behind landscape similar to the Monad project on West Avenue
19. Bike parking is not an allowable encroachment in required yards and shall be removed from side yards and rear yard
Response: the bike parking has been removed from the required at Grade parking setbacks

Comments issued on December 27.

1. Provide a narrative responding to staff comments.
Response: Narrative provided
2. Missing letter of intent.
Response: Letter of Intent provided
3. The project requires two variances from the requirements to provide commercial or residential component at the ground level. Staff will not be supportive of such variances.
Response: This project has provided the same screening of parking as the Monad Project has
4. The required pedestal rear setback is 66'-8". Revise plans and zoning information
Response: the rear pedestal setback has been revised to 66'-8"
5. Revise FAR drawings. The terrace area up to the edge of the columns on floors 3- count in FAR. Only the balcony areas beyond the columns can be discounted. Indicate trash room at the ground level and remove it from FAR.
Response: the FAR drawings have been revised. Trash room has been added to the ground floor
6. The length of the tandem loading spaces shall be the length of the anticipated trucks, plus space to unload and maneuver. Provide dimensions of the trucks to access the property. The most interior loading space does not provide adequate space and cannot count as required loading space.
Response: the loading area has been revised to show adequate space. See sheet A2.01
7. Indicate line of front setback on section detail 1 on page A4.02. Maximum elevation of the driveway within the front yard (20'-0") is 9.59' NGVD, as the maximum elevation allowed for projections up to 5'-0" (25%) of the front yard. Any element higher will require a front setback variance for a structure. Provide a grading plan showing finish elevation in required yards. Include sections or detail drawings if necessary.
Response: Sheet A4.02 has been revised to show the max height of 9.59' in the front yard. Grading plan is shown on sheet A2.01. An additional sheet A4.02a has been provided that show the elevations of the north and south yards.
8. Maximum height of the top of side walls on the edge of driveway within the front 20'-0" is 7'-0" from grade elevation. (13.18' NGVD)
Response: walls in the front driveway has been reduced in height.

9. It is not clear how the bicycle parking is accessed. The space provided does not appear to be functional to access and exit.
Response: the Bikes have been arranged to be upright so there is more space in the accessway to access the bikes.
10. Structural columns at the parking level shall be setback 18" from the edge of the driveway.
Response: the columns have been shifted to be 18" from the drive aisle
20. Maximum FAR allowed is 2.25, as the property is not located in the architectural district and the lot area is below 45,000 sf. Revise zoning information.
Response: the Data sheet and the FAR has been revised. That was a typo
21. Finish floor elevation of parking is not consistent in floor plan on page A2.0 and section on page A4.0. and section on page A4.02.
Response: these sheets have been coordinated
22. Building height shall be measured from BFE +5'-0"= 13.0' NGVD. Indicate building height on elevation drawings.
Response: the building heights have been modified and coordinated.
23. Maximum projection for balconies within required yards is 6'-0". Project does not comply at the tower levels.
Response: Plans have been revised to have a max encroachment of 6'
24. Provide a detail plan showing pavement in the front yard. Is it a ramp provided? Indicate width and finish material. Remove landscape from the floor plans. Section on page A2.02 does not show pavement and type of finish
Response: the walkway up to the second level is a sloped walkway which does not require handrails because it meets the minimum slope. The detail is shown on sheet A2.02 and A4.02
25. Identify trash room on plans.
Response: the trashroom is now shown on sheet A2.00. on the north and south of the vehicular ramps accessed from the sides.
26. The pool does not count as open space. Revise open space calculations in the oceanfront.
Response: the open space has been revised on sheet A2.02
27. The paved area adjacent to both trellis structure in the Oceanfront Overlay shall be setback 15'-0" from both side property lines. The paving encroaching is considered part of the deck, not as a walkway attached.
Response: the deck and trellis' have been set back to 15'