

## HPB19-0349 Applicant Responses to Staff Comments

1. Irina Villegas Ph: email: [ivillegas@miamibeachfl.gov](mailto:ivillegas@miamibeachfl.gov)  
HPB Zoning Review - Fail  
Comments: Comments issued on February 28.

1. Survey shall be revised to provide the total lot area and length of boundaries per district.

R: Acknowledged. See attached revised survey information.

2. Zoning information shall be provided in the Department format. The information provided is confusing. The lot area shall be provided by district (RO and RM-1 separately) in a survey. As the property is of irregular shape, the lot area cannot be considered the area on record. Provide zoning information per district.

R: Acknowledged. See attached sheet A-8 under "General Site Information". A clarification sketch has been implemented to show RO and RM-1 separately. Areas have been also broken down per zoning district. See attached revised survey information that match the areas.

3. Revise disclaimer on page 08. The North Miami code does not apply to this property.

R: Disclaimer revised:

ZONING INFORMATION ON THIS DOCUMENT IS BASED ON THE MIAMI BEACH CODE UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.

ALL INFORMATION HAS BEEN OBTAINED FROM THE FOLLOWING SOURCES:

1. MUNICODE - MIAMI BEACH, FLORIDA
2. FLORIDA BUILDING CODE 2017

4. Maximum FAR allowed cannot be verified as the lot area per district is not provided in the survey and the FAR of the existing building is not provided. Page 08A shows area that must be verified in survey. Based on the survey dimensions, the lot area provided is not accurate.

R: Acknowledged. See attached revised survey information.

5. FAR diagrams are insufficient as the areas counted are not clearly identified on diagrams. The areas counted must be clearly outlined with a different line or shading. Portion of covered terrace on the south side counts in FAR at the 5th Floor. Covered terrace and corridor at the roof level count in FAR.

R: Acknowledged. Terrace on 5<sup>th</sup> floor shall be considered "open to sky" as the canopy covering the south east portion of the deck contains a min. 50% opening ratio. The mechanical area on roof was cut back to maintain deck as open to sky on 5<sup>th</sup> Floor. See sheets A-20 & A-21.

6. Dimensioned floor plans of the new building shall be provided.

R: Acknowledged. See attached all revised floor plans A-18 @ A-21A.

7. Property lines shall be indicated on floor plans.

R: Acknowledged. See attached all revised floor plans A-18 @ A-21A.

8. Section drawings shall be marked on floor plans.

R: See attached all revised floor plans A-18 @ A-21A.

9. A site plan showing the two districts boundaries including the location of the existing and proposed structures shall be provided.

R: See attached revised sheet A-16.

PROPOSED STRUCTURE (LOCATED ON SITE 1 – RM1 DISTRICT)

PARKING LOT OF PROPOSED STRUCTURE (LOCATED ON SITE 2 – RM1 DISTRICT)  
EXISTING STRUCTURE / 2 STORY BUILDING (LOCATED ON SITE 2 – RO DISTRICT)

10. Trash enclosure shall be relocated to be air conditioned and an enclosed structure.

R: N/A. This is not required for residential developments per code.

11. Clearly identify the existing and future use of the retained structure. The use of this building shall be in accordance with the permitted uses in the RO district.

R: As depicted on sheet A-8, proposed use of project on site #1 in RM-1 district is a Multi-Family low density apartment and the existing structure use on site #2 in RO district is an apartment complex w/ office.

12. Provide a diagram showing that the project complies with additional landscaped areas at the ground level, in addition to the minimum setback requirements equal or greater than 5% of the lot area.

R: See sheet A-8 with adequate % of green space / pervious / impervious & building footprint information.

13. As determined by Tom Mooney, the North Beach Conservation Overlay district regulations apply to the existing retained contributing building in the RO district.

R: Acknowledged.

7. Urban Forestry Group Review - Fail

Omar Leon Ph: email: OmarLeon@miamibeachfl.gov

Comments:

Urban Forestry Comments:

- Tree evaluation required. This needs to be prepared by an ISA Certified Arborist and or and ASCA Registered Consulting Arborist with in good standing.

Comments:

Proposed work could come in direct conflict with existing trees/palms. Please include a tree survey drawn to scale identifying the species and listing the height, spread and DBH of all existing trees/palms. The tree survey shall be prepared by and bear the seal of a professional land surveyor, licensed in the State of Florida. In addition, a tree disposition and site plan drawn to scale identifying and listing all existing trees/palms and specifying the condition of each tree and whether such trees/palms are to remain, to be removed or to be relocated shall be provided. This plan shall also illustrate the location of all existing structures and/or all proposed new construction, as applicable, the location of any overhead and/or underground utilities, the new locations of existing trees/palms to be relocated on site, and all areas affected by construction-related activities, such as access routes to the property, and staging area. The plan shall be prepared by and bear the seal of a landscape architect currently licensed to practice in the State of Florida.

**Applicant Response:** A tree evaluation has been provided on Sheet L-1.0. This Tree Disposition Plan was prepared by Michael Grosswirth, ISA Certified Arborist (FL-9157A) and shall serve as the tree report for this project.

**Applicant Response:** No trees shown to remain in place will be in conflict with any construction. All trees on site have been field located and shown on Sheet L-1.0 in their approximate locations, as there is a small degree of inaccuracy inherent in field locations. This small degree of inaccuracy is a non-factor since all but 5 trees are being either removed or relocated, and the trees that are staying are outside the areas of construction. The Tree Disposition Plan provided (Sheet L-1.0) depicts species, height, spread, dbh and condition of all onsite trees. All existing structures, utilities, slabs, fences, powerlines, etc., are shown on this plan. Mitigation is also calculated and shown at the bottom of the Tree Disposition Chart, based on 500 square feet per Category 1 replacement trees.

9. Planning Landscape Review - Fail  
Comments:

Ricardo Guzman Ph: email: RicardoGuzman@miamibeachfl.gov

General Correction #2:

- 1- The use of Silva Cells or approved equal should be incorporated in conjunction with the installation of canopy shade trees proposed in areas where rooting space may be limited subject to staff review and approval.
- 2- Prior to issuance of a Building Permit, the applicant shall provide a Tree Report prepared by a Certified Arborist for any existing canopy shade trees with a DBH of 3" or greater located in public or private property, which may be scheduled for removal or relocation for the review and approval of the City of Miami Beach Urban Forester.
- 3- Should tree #3 (Identified as a specimen size Ficus / 50' hgt x 45' spread 48" caliper) be determined to be in good health, every effort shall be made to preserve and protect the tree at its current location. If determined to be an invasive species, the applicant shall seek a variance from Miami Dade County / DERM in order to waive requirement for removal. Parking layout should be modified, which may include the removal of parking spaces, in order to accommodate and protect the root system of the tree subject to staff review and approval.

**1. Applicant Response:** The use of Silva Cells is not applicable for this project. Large growing trees (Oaks) are proposed in areas with ample room for root development. All other trees, due to overhead power lines, are small growing species (per FP&L Right Tree/Right Place guidelines) do not have extensive root systems and are well suited for narrower planting areas. Palms being used are a slender trunk variety and also are well suited to narrow planting areas.

**2. Applicant Response:** See Sheet L-1.0 for all requested information. This sheet was prepared by Michael Grosswirth, ISA Certified Arborist (FL-9157A) and shall serve as the tree report for this project. A note has been added to Sheet L-1.0 to this effect. A tree removal/relocation permit application shall be submitted for the removal/relocation of the specified trees.

**3. Applicant Response:** Tree #3 is a ficus species identified as a prohibited species per Chapter 24 of the Miami Dade County Code (by reference from Chapter 46 of the Miami Beach Land Development Code) and can be removed with a no fee permit. The tree is in poor condition and is currently causing damage to the fence line running between the subject site and the property to the west, has completely engulfed another tree (cabbage palm) thereby making it structurally unstable as the engulfed palms deteriorates, has an uneven and lopsided canopy, and has substantial limb damage and trunk damage.

10. Public Works - LUB Review - Fail  
Comments:

Aaron Osborne Ph: email: AaronOsborne@miamibeachfl.gov

HPB19-0349, Denied, (2-24-20)

1. Please show the Miami Beach Sight Visibility Triangles at the driveway. It is to be shown in according to CMB Detail Drawing RS-16. When you have a sidewalk, you are to show two (2) sets of Visibility Triangles; one (1) between the road and the driveway apron and another between the sidewalk and the driveway inside your property. (Sheets 16, 17, & L-2.0)
  - A. Remember no obstructions from 2 feet to 6 feet above grade are allowed within the sight triangles.
  - B. The trash enclosure should not be within the sight visibility triangle.

**1. Applicant Response:** 5' x 156' Sight Visibility Triangles have been added to the Landscape Plan (Sheet L-2.0).

**A. Applicant Response:** A. A note has been added to the plans that all shrubs within the triangles are to be maintained at a maximum 24" height. Trees within the triangle are specified with 6' of clear trunk.

**B. Applicant Response:** Trash enclosure has been relocated out of the triangle.

HPB Plan Review - Fail

Subject : HPB19-0349, 910 Marseille Drive

1. Deficiencies in Architectural Presentation

a. Provide 3D photo realistic renderings of the proposed building in context.

R: Acknowledged. See attached.

b. Indicate the location of the backflow preventers and FPL transformer on the site plan.

R: Acknowledged. See attached revised site plan sheet A-16.

c. Provide a material samples page.

R: Acknowledged. See attached new sheet A-31.

d. Provide Gross Square Footage diagrams and calculation in order to assess Gross Square Footage fee. Gross Square Footage us the FAR plus, parking spaces and any terraces, decks, balconies, etc above the ground floor.

R: See sheet A08A for added gross area information.

e. FAR diagrams must be shaded to indicate which areas are included in the FAR.

R: See sheet A08A for all revised shaded FAR diagrams.

f. Show property lines and required setbacks on all floor plans and all levels.

R: See revised sheets A18 / A19 / A20 & A21, now depicting all required setbacks.

g. Provide an historic resources report for the existing building.

R: Acknowledged. See attached.

2. Design / Appropriateness comments (Recommendations)

a. Staff recommends further articulation of the west elevation which may include score lines, changes in materials, etc.

R: Acknowledged. See attached revised west elevation on sheet A25 & A30.