

MIAMI BEACH

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Staff Report & Recommendation

Historic Preservation Board

TO: Chairperson and Members
Historic Preservation Board

DATE: December 8, 2020

FROM: Thomas R. Mooney, AICP
Planning Director



SUBJECT: HPB20-0430 a.k.a. HPB 7490, **3425 Collins Avenue.**

An application has been filed requesting modifications to a previously issued Certificate of Appropriateness for the partial demolition renovation and restoration of the existing 16-story hotel building, including the total demolition of the 1955 south addition, and the construction of a new 16-story detached ground level addition. Specifically, the applicant is requesting approval of a redesigned new detached ground level tower addition and modifications to the site plan.

RECOMMENDATION

Continuance of the application to a date certain of February 9, 2021

BACKGROUND

On September 13, 2011, the Board approved a Certificate of Appropriateness for the partial demolition, renovation and restoration of an existing 9-story building and an existing 16-story building, including the installation of new balconies on the east and south elevations, and the construction of a new 10-story multifamily building with a roof-top pool deck at the rear of the site, along with a new landscape and hardscape plan for the entire site.

On November 14, 2014, the Board approved a new Certificate of Appropriateness for the partial demolition, renovation and restoration of the existing 16-story hotel building, including the total demolition of the 1955 south addition, and the construction of a new 16-story detached ground level addition, as part of a new residential development (HPB 7490).

On March 8, 2016, Board approved modifications to the previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness including the approval of additional demolition, building design modifications and site plan modifications (HPB 7490).

At the same meeting, the Board approved modifications to previously approved variances to reduce the Dune Overlay and Oceanfront Overlay required setbacks; to reduce the minimum required subterranean, pedestal and tower setbacks, to reduce the required sum of the side pedestal and tower setbacks, to exceed the maximum building and fence height and to exceed the maximum projection of balconies (BOA 3760). Additionally, new variances were approved by the Board to reduce the required subterranean front, side and rear setbacks, to reduce the required front setback for a driveway, to exceed the maximum allowed height for a porte-cochere and to exceed its maximum length (HPB 7603).

On October 5, 2016, a full building permit (B1504467) was issued for the approved project. Since that time, a significant amount of demolition has occurred, including the removal of the 1955 south addition, portions of the ground level exterior walls and all exterior doors and windows.

On June 9, 2020, the Board reviewed and approved modifications to the contributing Versailles building (HPB20-0376) and variances from the required side facing a street setback.

On October 14, 2020, the City Commission adopted Ordinance No. 2020-4366, amending the Faena District Overlay regulations including the following modifications:

- The required parking for a place of assembly is one space per eighty (80) square feet of floor area available for seating.
- Within areas that have an underlying zoning designation of RM-3, lots which are oceanfront lots with a lot area greater than 70,000 sq. ft. that also contain a contributing historic structure shall have a maximum height of 250 feet.
 - Any building with a height exceeding 203 feet shall have a front setback of 75 feet as measured to the closest face of a balcony.
- Within areas that have an underlying zoning designation of RM-3, lots which are oceanfront lots with a lot area greater than 70,000 sq. ft. that also contain a contributing historic structure:
 - The required pedestal and tower side street setback for alterations to and extensions of a contributing historic structure shall be equal to the existing setback of the contributing historic structure.
 - The required pedestal side street setback for attached or detached additions to a contributing historic structure that are located on the ground is 0'.
 - The subterranean, pedestal, and tower interior side setbacks shall be zero (0') feet for properties abutting a GU zoned parcel, and which also provide a view corridor between an existing contributing building and the construction of a detached ground level addition, subject to the review and approval of the historic preservation board, in accordance with the certificate of appropriateness review criteria.
 - There are no required sum of the side yard setbacks for pedestal or tower side setbacks.
 - The required subterranean rear setback is 46' from the bulkhead line.
 - The required subterranean front setback is 15'.
 - The required front setback for at-grade parking and driveways is 8'-6".
 - The maximum permitted width of a porte-cochere for a contributing building may exceed the requirements of allowable encroachments as outlined in the city code section 142-1132, not to exceed the width of an original porte-cochere. The maximum permitted height of such porte-cochere shall be 19'.
 - The term "grade, average existing" which means the average grade elevation calculated by averaging spot elevations of the existing topography taken at ten-foot intervals along the property lines, shall be substituted for the term "grade" for purposes of fence and wall heights and setbacks. However, a fence or wall which faces Collins Avenue shall be measured from grade (the city sidewalk elevation at the centerline of the front of the property).

On November 10, 2020, the Board reviewed and continued to a date certain of January 12, 2021, modifications to the contributing Versailles building (HPB20-0389) including the final design of the

north, south and east elevations of the new eastern extension, porte-cochere and rooftop addition and modifications to the ground level north façade and a small 1-story ground level addition at the east side of the building.

EXISTING SITE

Local Historic District:	Collins Waterfront
Classification:	Contributing
Original Construction Date:	1940
Original Architect:	Roy France

ZONING / SITE DATA

Legal Description:	Lots 1 through 8 inclusive, and the 16.00 foot Alley all in Block 21, AMENDED PLAT OF OCEAN FRONT PROPERTY OF THE MIAMI BEACH SUBDIVISION, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 5, Pages 7 and 8, 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
Lot Size:	73,812 S.F. / 3.0 Max FAR
Proposed FAR:	221,034 S.F. / 3.0 FAR, as represented by the applicant
Proposed Height:	250'-0", as represented by the applicant
Proposed Use:	Multifamily Residential

THE PROJECT

The applicant has submitted plans entitled "Aman Hotel & Residences", as prepared by Revuelta Architecture International, dated December 8, 2020.

COMPLIANCE WITH ZONING CODE

A preliminary review of the project indicates that the application, as proposed, appears to be consistent with the City Code. This 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 proposed **residential use** is **consistent** with the Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan.

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 Applicable
- (2) Windows that are proposed to be replaced shall be hurricane proof impact windows.
Not Applicable

- (3) Where feasible and appropriate, passive cooling systems, such as operable windows, shall be provided.
Satisfied
- (4) Resilient landscaping (salt tolerant, highly water-absorbent, native or Florida friendly plants) shall be provided, in accordance with Chapter 126 of the City Code.
Not Applicable
There are no modifications to the approved and permitted landscape plan at this time.
- (5) The project applicant shall consider the 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. The applicant shall also specifically study the land elevation of the subject property and the elevation of surrounding properties.
Satisfied
The first habitable floor of the new residential building is proposed to be located at 70'-4" NGVD. The land elevation of the site is consistent with the surrounding properties.
- (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 and shall provide sufficient height and space to ensure that the entry ways and exits can be modified to accommodate a higher street height of up to three (3) additional feet in height.
Satisfied
- (7) In all new projects, all critical mechanical and electrical systems shall be located above base flood elevation. Due to flooding concerns, all redevelopment projects shall, whenever practicable, and economically reasonable, move all critical mechanical and electrical systems to a location above base flood elevation.
Satisfied
- (8) Existing buildings shall be, where reasonably feasible and economically appropriate, elevated up to base flood elevation, plus City of Miami Beach Freeboard.
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.
Not Applicable
There is no habitable area proposed to be located below base flood elevation plus freeboard.
- (10) In all new projects, water retention systems shall be provided.
Satisfied
Additional information shall be provided at the time of building permit review.
- (11) Cool pavement materials or porous pavement materials shall be utilized.
Satisfied
Additional information shall be provided at the time of building permit review.

- (12) The project design shall minimize the potential for a project causing a heat island effect on site.

Satisfied

COMPLIANCE WITH CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CRITERIA

A decision on an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness shall be based upon the following:

- I. Evaluation of the compatibility of the physical alteration or improvement with surrounding properties and where applicable, compliance with the following criteria pursuant to Section 118-564(a)(1) of the Miami Beach Code (it is recommended that the listed criteria be found Satisfied, Not Satisfied or Not Applicable, as so noted):
- a. The Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings as revised from time to time.
Not Satisfied
The project is not consistent with Standard 9. The proposed addition is not compatible with the massing, size and scale of the existing Contributing building on the site.
 - b. Other guidelines/policies/plans adopted or approved by Resolution or Ordinance by the City Commission.
Satisfied
- II. In determining whether a particular application is compatible with surrounding properties, the Board shall consider the following criteria pursuant to Section 118-564(a)(2) of the Miami Beach Code (it is recommended that the listed criteria be found Satisfied, Not Satisfied or Not Applicable, as so noted):
- a. Exterior architectural features.
Satisfied
 - b. General design, scale, massing and arrangement.
Not Satisfied
The proposed massing of the new addition is incompatible and overwhelms the Contributing building on the site.
 - c. Texture and material and color.
Satisfied
 - d. The relationship of a, b, c, above, to other structures and features of the district.
Satisfied
 - e. The purpose for which the district was created.
Not Satisfied
The proposed massing of the new addition is incompatible and overwhelms Contributing building on the site.
 - f. The relationship of the size, design and siting of any new or reconstructed structure to the landscape of the district.
Satisfied

- g. An historic resources report, containing all available data and historic documentation regarding the building, site or feature.
Satisfied
 - h. The original architectural design or any subsequent modifications that have acquired significance.
Satisfied
- III. The examination of architectural drawings for consistency with the criteria pursuant to Section 118-564(a)(3) of the Miami Beach Code and stated below, with regard to the aesthetics, appearances, safety, and function of any new or existing structure, public interior space and physical attributes of the project in relation to the site, adjacent structures and properties, and surrounding community. The criteria referenced above are as follows (it is recommended that the listed criteria be found Satisfied, Not Satisfied or Not Applicable, as so noted):
 - a. 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.
Not Satisfied
The number of driveways/curb cuts proposed to be located along Collins Avenue is excessive and will have an adverse impact of the pedestrian experience and pedestrian safety.
 - b. 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.
Satisfied
 - c. The color, design, surface finishes and selection of landscape materials and architectural elements of the exterior of all buildings and structures and primary public interior areas for developments requiring a building permit in areas of the city identified in section 118-503.
Satisfied
 - d. The proposed structure, and/or additions to an existing structure is appropriate to and compatible with the environment and adjacent structures, and enhances the appearance of the surrounding properties, or the purposes for which the district was created.
Not Satisfied
The proposed massing of the new addition is incompatible and overwhelms Contributing building on the site.
 - e. The design and layout of the proposed site plan, as well as all new and existing buildings and public interior spaces 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 preserving historic character of the neighborhood and district,

contiguous and adjacent buildings and lands, pedestrian sight lines and view corridors.

Satisfied

- f. 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 any driveways and parking spaces are usable, safely and conveniently arranged and have a minimal impact on pedestrian circulation throughout the site. Access to the site from adjacent roads shall be designed so as to interfere as little as possible with vehicular traffic flow on these roads and pedestrian movement onto and within the site, as well as permit both pedestrians and vehicles a safe ingress and egress to the site.

Not Satisfied

The number of driveways/curb cuts proposed to be located along Collins Avenue is excessive and will have an adverse impact of the pedestrian experience and pedestrian safety.

- g. 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 and consistent with a City master plan, where applicable.

Satisfied

- h. Landscape and paving materials shall be reviewed to ensure an adequate relationship with and enhancement of the overall site plan design.

Satisfied

- i. 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

- j. Any proposed new structure shall have 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 massing of the new addition is incompatible and overwhelms Contributing building on the site.

- k. All buildings shall have, to the greatest extent possible, space in that part of the ground floor fronting a sidewalk, 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 sidewalk street, or streets shall have residential or commercial spaces, or shall have the appearance of being a residential or commercial space or shall have an architectural treatment which shall buffer the appearance of a parking structure from the surrounding area and is integrated with the overall appearance of the project.

Satisfied

- I. All buildings shall have an appropriate and fully integrated rooftop architectural treatment which substantially screens all mechanical equipment, stairs and elevator towers.
Satisfied
- m. Any 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 Satisfied
The proposed massing of the new addition is incompatible and overwhelms Contributing building on the site.
- n. All portions of a project fronting a street or sidewalk shall incorporate an amount of transparency at the first level necessary to achieve pedestrian compatibility.
Satisfied
- o. 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.
Satisfied

ANALYSIS

On November 14, 2014, the Historic Preservation Board reviewed and approved a Certificate of Appropriateness for the partial demolition, renovation and restoration of the existing Contributing Versailles Hotel building, including the total demolition of the 1955 south addition, and the construction of a new 16-story detached ground level addition, as part of a new residential development. The applicant is currently requesting approval of a redesigned new detached ground level tower addition and modifications to the site plan.

New tower design

The proposed residential tower was designed by renowned architect Kengo Kuma. According to the applicant, the design has been inspired by the geometry of Japanese folded paper streamers known as Shide, as well as the rhythm and proportions of Art Deco architecture. The building is proposed to be clad in aluminum panels with a printed wooden texture in a “honey white” color, as described by the architect.

The proposed 250’-0” (243’-0” top of roof) tall residential tower is proposed to be located along the southern portion of the site in approximately the same location as the previously approved addition. The building is proposed to be setback 89’-4” from the Collins Avenue property line when measured to the nearest balcony projection; an increased setback of 24’-0” from Collins Avenue as compared to the previously approved design. This additional setback in combination with the quadruple open height pedestal will afford significantly enhanced views to the historic Versailles Hotel building.

Staff would like to commend the applicant and the design team on the sophisticated and forward-thinking approach for the tower design. The geometry and rhythm of the proposed new tower including the tapered balcony edges, delicate vertical screen elements and rounded angular form have resulted in a design that appropriately responds to the unique architectural character of the historic district. Notwithstanding the positive attributes of the design, staff has one concern relative to the scale and massing of the tower. As currently proposed, staff believes that the addition has the potential to overwhelm the existing contributing Versailles Hotel. In this regard, the

approximately 45'-0" tall pedestal and approximately 18'-0" floor to floor heights of the penthouse levels create superfluous height that, as presently configured, is incompatible with the historic context. In order to establish a more successful relationship with the district, staff recommends that the applicant explore ways to reduce the overall scale of the tower, which may include additional setbacks at the penthouse levels from both the east and west sides of the building, a reduction in the height of the pedestal level, and/or a reduction in height of the penthouse levels.

Since the plans were submitted, staff has continued to work with the applicant on further refinements to the tower design. Prior to the writing of this report, the applicant has advised staff that they have agreed to reduce the overall height by 21'-8" by modifying the following portions of the building:

- The podium height is proposed to be reduced by 17'-8".
- Penthouse levels 16 and 17 are proposed to be reduced by 2'-0" each.

As a result of these changes, the height to the top of the roof will be 221'-4" with a roof deck and outdoor bar counter above for a total height of 228'-4". Staff believes the reduction in height will greatly improve the compatibility of the new tower in relation to the contributing Versailles Hotel and should serve to address the inconsistencies noted above in the Certificate of Appropriateness criteria.

Basement levels

A new, 3-level approximately 145,000 sq. ft. basement is proposed to be constructed below most of the site, including below the existing Versailles hotel building. In addition to back of house and service areas, the basement is proposed to contain an approximately 25,000 sq. ft. spa and 120 parking spaces. The applicant has provided a letter from Keller, a geotechnical specialist contractor, which outlines a general methodology for the basement construction. While understanding the desire to add hotel and residential amenities, staff has a serious concern regarding the construction of a 3-level basement underneath the historic Versailles hotel. As has occurred in a similar proposal, the excavation and construction of a basement below the existing building has the potential to compromise the structural integrity of the remaining portions of the building and may ultimately lead to its structural failure. In order to have a higher degree of confidence that the excavation for the basement levels under the existing contributing building will not undermine the structural integrity of the exterior walls, staff would strongly recommend that this portion of the basement not be approved until detailed information prepared by a licensed engineer is presented to staff and the Board. Staff would also recommend that additional information be provided regarding the contractor's experience in successfully completing projects of similar magnitude.

Finally, in light of projected sea level rise, staff has included recommendations in the attached draft order to ensure the future adaptability of the basement. This along with the applicant's proffer to pay for nine injection wells within the Indian Creek drainage basin, providing water quality treatment for 27 acres, should significantly enhance the resiliency of the project and the neighborhood.

Front yard reconfiguration

Within the front yard of the property (along Collins Avenue), the applicant is proposing to introduce segregated driveways for vehicular access to both the hotel and residences, as well as separate accessible pedestrian paths. More specifically, starting from south to north along Collins Avenue, the applicant is proposing an entrance driveway to the residences, an entrance driveway to the

hotel and an exit driveway for hotel vehicles that are not permitted to enter the site. Along the south side of the property (34th Street parking lot) there is an exit driveway for the residences and along the north side of the site (35th Street street-end), there is an exit driveway for the hotel. Additionally, towards the rear of the site there is an entrance to the basement parking garage on the north side and an exit on the south side.

Staff has serious concerns with the overall vehicular and pedestrian circulation plan, as currently proposed. Staff would also note that in comparison to the previously approved project, there are three additional curb cuts, two on Collins Avenue and one along the 34th Street parking lot. While understanding the applicant's desire to provide enhanced security for both hotel guests and residents, the additional curb cuts will have an exceedingly adverse impact on pedestrian safety, especially along Collins Avenue, as well as the overall design, scale and context of the project at the main entrance. As such, staff recommends that no more than two 12'-0" wide curb cuts be permitted along Collins Avenue and that less emphasis, from both an operational, as well as design perspective, be placed on vehicular accommodation. Additionally, staff strongly recommends further development of the pedestrian ramping and circulation components in order to better organize and integrate these elements into the landscape.

Jack Stewart mural

A mosaic tile mural entitled "Apollo" was introduced on the site in 1955 concurrently with the construction of the previously existing Melvin Grossman designed south addition. The mural, created by artist Jack Stewart, was primarily located along the west elevation with a portion extending along south elevation, wrapping the corner. In 2014, the Board reviewed and approved the demolition of the south addition inclusive of the artistic mural. The mural was subsequently removed and relocated to a storage facility and the 1955 addition was demolished.



Jack Stewart mural, 1997 photograph

The applicant has submitted a letter dated October 13, 2020 proffering to donate the mural to the City including covering all the cost for its relocation and restoration. The City has considered a number of options in terms of locating the Apollo mural on a City property. However, given the size (approximately 92' in length by 17' in height) of the mural, no appropriate option has been found. Staff believes that the best option would be for the applicant to adaptively re-install the mural within the project site. One option would be for the applicant to design a ground mounted base using the same architectural language and materials of the proposed tower, within the area between the two buildings. The introduction of the mural as a garden sculpture in this location could also serve to enhance and better organize the accessible pedestrian pathways. Attached to this report is a very preliminary image of how this could potentially be accomplished.

In summary, staff is supportive of the proposed application and is enthusiastic about the property's return to an active and vibrant use. There are however, three areas of the proposed project that staff believes could greatly benefit from additional development including the scale of the tower, front yard vehicular and pedestrian circulation as well as the portion of the basement located immediately below the historic Versailles Hotel. Consequently, staff is recommending the application be continued as noted below.

RECOMMENDATION

In view of the foregoing analysis, staff recommends the application be **continued to a date certain of February 9, 2021** in order to address the concerns noted herein. In the event the Board should approve the application staff recommends that the conditions in the attached draft order be included, which address the inconsistencies with the aforementioned Certificate of Appropriateness criteria.



HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
City of Miami Beach, Florida

MEETING DATE: December 8, 2020

PROPERTY/FOLIO: 3425 Collins Avenue / 02-3226-001-1440

FILE NO: HPB20-0376

IN RE: An application 3425 Collins, LLC by for modifications to a previously issued Certificate of Appropriateness for the partial demolition renovation and restoration of the existing 16-story hotel building, including the total demolition of the 1955 south addition, and the construction of a new 16-story detached ground level addition. Specifically, the applicant is requesting approval of a redesigned new detached ground level tower addition and modifications to the site plan.

LEGAL: Lots 1 through 8 inclusive, and the 16.00 foot Alley all in Block 21, AMENDED PLAT OF OCEAN FRONT PROPERTY OF THE MIAMI BEACH SUBDIVISION, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 5, Pages 7 and 8, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

CONSOLIDATED ORDER

The City of Miami Beach Historic Preservation 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. Certificate of Appropriateness

- A. The subject site is located within the Collins Waterfront Local Historic District.
- 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:
 - 1. Is consistent with Sea Level Rise and Resiliency Review Criteria in Section 133-50(a) of the Miami Beach Code.
 - 2. Is not consistent with the Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria 'a' in Section 118-564(a)(1) of the Miami Beach Code.
 - 3. Is not consistent with Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria 'b' & 'e' in Section 118-564(a)(2) of the Miami Beach Code.
 - 4. Is not consistent with Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria 'a', 'd', 'f', 'j' & 'm' in Section 118-564(a)(3) of the Miami Beach Code.

5. Is consistent with Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria in Section 118-564(f)(4) of the Miami Beach Code.
- C. The project would be consistent with the criteria and requirements of section 118-564 and 133-50(a) if the following conditions are met:
1. Revised elevation, site plan and floor plan drawings shall be submitted, and at a minimum, such drawings shall incorporate the following:
 - a. The Board acknowledges and accepts the applicant's proffer to pay for nine (9) injection wells at a total estimated value of \$225,000, in a continuous system with a total capacity of 18,000 GPM, which will provide water quality treatment for 27 acres in the Indian Creek drainage basin. The City shall select the sites for the injection wells and conduct all construction work and the applicant shall finalize such agreement in a form approved by the City Attorney's Office prior to the issuance of a building permit for the new tower design.
 - b. The applicant shall restore and install the Jack Stewart "Apollo" mural within the site in a location to be determined by the Board prior to the issuance of a building permit for the new tower design.
 - c. The height of the residential addition shall not exceed 221'-4" to the top of the roof and shall not exceed 228'-4" to the top of the outdoor bar counter.
 - d. Detailed information prepared by a licensed engineer shall be provided regarding the excavation and construction of a 3-level basement below the Versailles Hotel building, as shown in the plans dated December 8, 2020, as well as additional information regarding the contractor's experience in successfully completing projects of similar magnitude, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by the Board, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit or a revision to any active Building Permit that includes this basement area.
 - e. No more than two 12'-0" wide curb cuts be shall be permitted along the Collins Avenue property line, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria and/or the directions from the Board.
 - f. The design of the north, south and east elevations of the new eastern extension of the Versailles building, as shown in the plans dated February 10, 2020, inclusive of the balcony design shall be further developed, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by the Board prior to the issuance of a Building Permit or a revision to any active Building Permit.
 - g. The plans for porte-cochere/entry canopy on the west side of the Versailles building, as shown in the plans dated February 10, 2020, shall be further developed and shall require the review and approval of the Board, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit or a revision to any active Building Permit that includes a porte-cochere/entry canopy.

- e. h. The interior design, including but not limited to materials, finishes and lighting elements of the new lobby of the Versailles building, as shown in the plans dated February 10, 2020, shall be further developed, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by the Board prior to the issuance of a Building Permit or a revision to any active Building Permit.
- d. i. The design of the entire rooftop addition on the Versailles building, as shown in the plans dated February 10, 2020, shall be further developed, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by the Board prior to the issuance of a Building Permit or a revision to any active Building Permit that includes a rooftop addition.
- e. j. The loading space proposed to be located at the drop off area for the new residential tower along Collins Avenue shall not be permitted. All loading spaces required for the new residential tower shall be located internal to the structure.
- f. k. Any kitchen equipment and venting systems associated with the ground level café shall be chased internally through to the roof.
- g. l. The maximum FAR for the project site shall not exceed 3.0.
- ~~h. The enclosed corridors located on the roof terrace of the new tower shall not be permitted and shall be redesigned as open air corridors.~~
- i. m. The facades of the existing building shall be fully restored to the greatest extent possible, with the exceptions noted on the plans, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria and/or the directions from the Board.
- j. n. The original historic "Versailles" signage located on the west elevation shall be recreated to the greatest extent possible, according to available historic documentation, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria and/or the directions from the Board.
- ~~k.~~ o. The final design and details of the proposed canopy located at the west elevation of the historic Versailles tower shall be provided, and all lighting and any required sprinkler systems shall be completely recessed into the structure, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria and/or the directions from the Board.
- l. p. Final details of all exterior surface finishes and materials for the historic Versailles tower and the new residential tower, including samples, shall be submitted, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria and/or the directions from the Board.
- ~~m.~~ q. A museum quality historic analysis and display of the existing historic structure, inclusive of a photographic and written description of the history and evolution of the original building and its changes of use over time, shall be submitted to and

approved by staff, prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy or a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy; such historic analysis shall be displayed prominently within the public area of the historic structure, in a location to be determined by staff.

- ~~n.~~ r. All roof-top fixtures, air-conditioning units and mechanical devices shall be clearly noted on a revised roof plan and elevation drawings and shall be screened from view, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff, consistent with the Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria and/or the directions from the Board.
- s. The applicant shall take every precaution to protect the adjacent structures during construction, consistent with applicable strategies outlined in the National Park Service Preservation Tech Notes Bulletin entitled *Temporary Protection, Number 3, Protecting a Historic Structure during Adjacent Construction*, dated July 2001.
- t. If the applicant proceeds with construction of additional basement area, the applicant shall implement comprehensive stormwater management and floodproofing systems in consultation with the Building and Public Works Departments. The systems shall incorporate the following:

 - i. The stormwater management system shall be designed in accordance with the 10/25-year storm event criteria, as determined by the Building Official.
 - ii. The stormwater management system shall include a combination of bio-swales and/or rain gardens, exfiltration trenches, and stormwater injection wells.
 - iii. A conventional cistern shall be provided to collect and store runoff from roof and deck drains and shall include an overflow system to divert runoff to the drainage wells.
 - iv. The existing and proposed basement area shall be dry floodproofed to BFE +1. The basement driveway entrance and exit shall be dry floodproofed to BFE +4.
 - v. Sump pumps shall be provided in the basement and shall have the capacity to remove accumulated water, as well as all vapor and seepage of water during a flooding event.
 - vi. All construction materials below BFE +1 shall be flood damage resistant.
 - vii. A Floodproofing Emergency Operations Plan and a Floodproofing Inspection and Maintenance Plan shall be filed with the Building Department.
- u. The applicant shall submit an engineering analysis confirming that the basement area could be modified to expand water management capacity at a future point in time where the basement is compromised and can no longer serve other functions, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department, in consultation with the Building and Public Works Departments.

2. In accordance with Section 118-395(b)(2) of the City Code, the requirement pertaining to an existing structure's setbacks and parking credits, is hereby waived, to allow for the reconstruction of the original floor slabs.
3. ~~In accordance with Section 118-564(f)(6) of the City Code, the requirement that a full building permit for the new construction be issued prior to the issuance of a demolition permit for existing noncontributing structures, is hereby waived, if the following requirement is met:~~
 - a. ~~A Building Permit for the reconstruction of the south wall of the historic Versailles tower, according to the plans approved by the Board, shall be issued prior to or concurrently with the permit for the total demolition of the 8-story 1955 south addition.~~
4. 3. Site plan approval is contingent upon meeting Public School Concurrency requirements. Applicant shall obtain a valid School Concurrency Determination Certificate (Certificate) issued by the Miami-Dade County Public Schools. The Certificate shall state the number of seats reserved at each school level. In the event sufficient seats are not available, a proportionate share mitigation plan shall be incorporated into a tri-party development agreement and duly executed prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.
5. 4. A revised landscape plan, prepared by a Professional Landscape Architect, registered in the State of Florida, and corresponding site plan, shall be submitted to and approved by staff. The species type, quantity, dimensions, spacing, location and overall height of all plant material shall be clearly delineated and subject to the review and approval of staff. At a minimum, such plan shall incorporate the following:
 - a. Street trees shall be required along 35th Street and Collins Avenue, if feasible, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by the Public Works Department.
 - b. A fully automatic irrigation system with 100% coverage and an automatic rain sensor in order to render the system inoperative in the event of rain. Right-of-way areas shall also be incorporated as part of the irrigation system.
 - c. Any overhead utilities located in the adjacent public right-of-ways, shall be placed underground, if feasible, and subject to the review and approval of the Public Works Department.
 - d. ~~Pursuant to the Escrow Agreement executed between the owner and the City, signed by both parties in March 2009, the owner has agreed to enter into a Streetscape Agreement for all public right-of-way improvements abutting the subject property, including 32nd Street between Collins Avenue and the Ocean, Collins Avenue, and 34th Street between Collins Avenue and the Ocean, inclusive of the City's public surface parking lot. The following conditions shall be required to be completed, as part of the Streetscape improvements, prior to the issuance of a Partial Certificate of Occupancy (P.C.O), Temporary Certificate of Occupancy (T.C.O.) or final Certificate of Occupancy (C.O.) for either the new building or~~

~~existing building on the Versailles property (3425 Collins Avenue), whichever occurs last.~~

- ~~e. 34th Street: The owner will install drainage structures and hardscape improvements (including sidewalks, A.D.A. ramps, and vehicular approaches, as described in the City right-of-way plans adjacent to the east side of Collins Avenue at 34th Street), or will provide funding for such work, at the discretion of the City's Capital Improvement Projects Department.~~
 - ~~f. 34th Street Surface Parking Lot: The owner will provide landscape and irrigation, or will provide funding for such improvements at the discretion of the City's Capital Improvement Projects Department for the 34th Street surface lot.~~
 - ~~g. Public Beach Access at 34th Street: The owner will construct the paved public beach access, including all associated hardscape, landscape, and irrigation, from Collins Avenue to the Ocean. This shall also include all landscape, hardscape, and irrigation located between the east end of the 34th Street parking lot and the Ocean.~~
 - ~~h. Pursuant to Condition 3.d.i below, the owner shall provide lighting in all landscape areas constructed or funded by the owner, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff.~~
- ~~6. The applicant has proffered and agreed to construct a grade level Public Beach Walk along the rear of the subject site, subject to the following conditions. The approval of the subject application is contingent upon such Public Beach Walk being constructed in accordance with the following conditions:~~
- ~~a. The existing raised boardwalk adjacent to the dune and the site, in between 34th and 35th Streets, shall be demolished and removed. A new Public Beach Walk shall be designed, permitted and built by the applicant and shall connect to the existing raised boardwalks to the north and to the south. All costs associated with the design, permitting and construction of the Public Beach Walk, as described herein, shall be borne by the applicant.~~
 - ~~b. The applicant shall enter into and record a restrictive covenant, approved by the Miami Beach City Attorney, which runs with the land, confirming the applicant's agreement to design, permit and construct a Public Beach Walk, in accordance with the conditions herein. The restrictive covenant shall be recorded in the public records, at the expense of the applicant.~~
 - ~~c. The Public Beach Walk shall be generally consistent with the beach walk master plan, and shall require the review and approval of the Public Works Department, as well as all other applicable regulatory agencies and authorities.~~
 - ~~d. The Public Beach Walk shall be substantially completed as soon as reasonably possible after the issuance of all required permits for its construction.~~

- ~~e. The construction of the Public Beach Walk will be timed to coincide with the beach walk project behind the Saxony Hotel. If the Versailles is ready for C.O. and construction of the Public Beach Walk has not commenced and completed, then the applicant shall post a bond, or provide other security acceptable to the City Attorney, for the cost of construction of the Public Beach Walk, to guarantee its construction and completion.~~

In accordance with Section 118-537, the applicant, the owner(s) of the subject property, the City Manager, Miami Design Preservation League, Dade Heritage Trust, or an affected person may appeal the Board's decision on a Certificate of Appropriateness to a special master appointed by the City Commission.

II. Variance(s)

- A. The applicant filed an application with the Planning Department for the following variance(s):
1. A variance to reduce 6'-0" from the minimum required setback of 11'-0" from the Erosion Control Line in order to construct a perimeter fence in the Dune Preservation Overlay District at 5'-0" from the Erosion Control Line and a height up to 16.50 NGVD.
 2. A. A variance to reduce 10'-0" from the minimum required setback of 15'-0" from the side property line in order to construct a perimeter fence in the Oceanfront Overlay District at 5'- 0" from the north property line and a height up to 16.50 NGVD.

B. A variance to reduce 10'-0" from the minimum required setback of 15'-0" from the side property line in order to construct a perimeter fence in the Oceanfront Overlay District at 5'- 0" from the south property line and a height up to 16.50 NGVD.
 3. A. A variance to reduce all minimum required pedestal street side setback of 16'-0" in order to construct new stairs up to the north property line facing 35th Street.

B. A variance to reduce 5'-7" from the minimum required pedestal street side setback of 16'-0" in order to construct a column in the elevated terrace at 10'-5" from the north property line facing 35th Street.
 4. A. A variance to reduce by a range from 13'-2" to 5'-2" the minimum required pedestal street side setback of 16'-0" in order to construct the first and second floor at a setback ranging from 2'-10" to 10'-10" from the south property line facing 34th Street.

B. A variance to reduce a range from 15'-4" to 3" the minimum required pedestal street side setback of 16'-0" in order to construct the third and fourth floors of the new 16 story addition at a range from 8" to 15'-9" from the south property line facing 34th Street.

C. A variance to reduce 11'-0" from the minimum required pedestal street side setback of 16'-0" in order to construct a perimeter fence at 5'-0" from the south property line facing 34th Street and a maximum height of 16.50 NGVD.

5. A variance to reduce 31'-4" from the minimum required pedestal sum of the side setbacks of 32'-0" in order to provide a sum of the side yards of 8".
6. A variance to reduce 1'-10" from the minimum required subterranean street side setback of 10'-0" in order to construct columns at 8'-2" from the south property line facing 34th Street.
7. A. A variance to reduce a range from 15'-4" to 3" the minimum required tower street side setback of 16'-0" in order to construct the fourth through sixteen floors of the new 16 story addition at a range from 8" to 15'-9" from the south property line facing 34th Street.

B. A variance to reduce 7'-2" from the minimum required tower street side setback of 16'-0" in order to construct the pool and pool deck at 8'-10" from the south property line facing 34th Street.
8. A variance to reduce 25'-9" from the minimum required tower sum of the side setbacks of 32'-0" in order to provide a sum of the side yards of 6'-3".
9. A variance to exceed by 3'-0" the maximum permitted building height of 200'-0" in order to construct a new 16 story residential addition on the southwest side of the property with a maximum height of 203'-0" measured from base flood elevation plus 1'-0" (9.00' NGVD) to the top of the roof kitchen counter.
10. A. A variance to reduce 4'-0" from the minimum required subterranean street side setback of 10'-0" in order to leave underground sheet piles for the construction of the basement retaining walls at 6'-0" from the north property line facing 35th Street.

B. A variance to reduce a range from 10'-0" to 6'-0" from the minimum required subterranean street side setback of 10'-0" in order to leave underground sheet piles for the construction of the basement retaining walls at a range from 0'-0" to 4'-0" from the south property line facing 34th Street.
11. A variance to reduce 4'-0" from the minimum required subterranean rear setback of 50'-0" in order to leave underground sheet piles for the construction of the basement retaining walls at 46'-0" from the rear property line.
12. A variance to reduce 4'-0" from the minimum required subterranean front setback of 20'-0" in order to leave underground sheet piles for the construction of the basement retaining walls at 16'-0" from the front property line facing Collins Avenue.

13. A variance to exceed by 10.6% (9'-5") the maximum permitted width of 30% (26'-7") of the building's core front (88'-8") in order to construct a new porte-cochere with a width of 40.6% (36'-0") of the building's front, facing Collins Ave.
 14. A variance to exceed by 3'-0" the maximum permitted height of 16'-0" for a porte-cochere in order to construct a new porte-cochere in front of the property up to 19'-0" in height, facing Collins Ave.
 15. A variance to reduce 11'-6" from the minimum required front setback of 20'-0" for at grade parking in order to construct a new driveway at 8'-6" from the front property line facing Collins Avenue.
 16. A variance to reduce by 10.47' the minimum required pedestal side facing a street setback of 16.0' in order to extend the floorplates on floors 2 through 5.
 17. A variance to reduce by 10.47' the minimum required tower side facing a street setback of 16.0' in order to extend the floorplates on floors 6 through 14.
- B. The applicant has submitted plans and documents with the application that satisfy Article 1, Section 2 of the Related Special Acts, allowing the granting of a variance if the Board finds that practical difficulties exist with respect to implementing the proposed project at the subject property.

The applicant has submitted plans and documents with the application that also indicate the following, as they relate to the requirements of Section 118-353(d), Miami Beach City Code:

That special conditions and circumstances exist which are peculiar to the land, structure, or building involved and which are not applicable to other lands, structures, or buildings in the same zoning district;

That the special conditions and circumstances do not result from the action of the applicant;

That granting the variance requested will not confer on the applicant any special privilege that is denied by this Ordinance to other lands, buildings, or structures in the same zoning district;

That literal interpretation of the provisions of this Ordinance would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zoning district under the terms of this Ordinance and would work unnecessary and undue hardship on the applicant;

That the variance granted is the minimum variance that will make possible the reasonable use of the land, building or structure;

That the granting of the variance will be in harmony with the general intent and purpose of this Ordinance and that such variance will not be injurious to the area involved or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare; and

That the granting of this request is consistent with the comprehensive plan and does not reduce the levels of service as set forth in the plan.

C. The Board hereby grants the requested variance(s) and imposes the following condition based on its authority in Section 118-354 of the Miami Beach City Code:

1. Substantial modifications to the plans submitted and approved as part of the application, as determined by the Planning Director or designee, may require the applicant to return to the Board for approval of the modified plans, even if the modifications do not affect variances approved by the Board.
2. Revised detailed drawings shall be submitted and, at a minimum, such drawings shall incorporate the following:
 - u. The top of the foundation of any structure and the top of underground sheet piles shall be at least 3' below the grade elevation (3.58' NGVD) established for the property in order to provide enough rooting space for the proposed landscape.
3. A revised landscape plan, prepared by a Professional Landscape Architect, registered in the State of Florida, and corresponding site plan, shall be submitted to and approved by staff. The species type, quantity, dimensions, spacing, location and overall height of all plant material shall be clearly delineated and subject to the review and approval of staff.
4. A revised landscape plan, and corresponding site plan, shall be submitted to and approved by staff. The species type, quantity, dimensions, spacing, location and overall height of all plant material shall be clearly delineated and subject to the review and approval of staff. At a minimum, such plan shall incorporate the following:
 - a. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a tree protection plan for all trees to be retained on site. Such plan shall be subject to the review and approval of staff, and shall include, but not be limited to a sturdy tree protection fence installed at the dripline of the trees prior to any construction.
 - b. In order to identify, protect and preserve mature trees on site, which are suitable for retention and relocation, a Tree Report prepared by a Certified Tree Arborist shall be submitted for the mature trees on site.
 - c. Any tree identified to be in good overall condition shall be retained, and protected in their current location if they are not in conflict with the proposed home, or they shall be relocated on site, if determined feasible, subject to the review and approval of staff. A tree care and watering plan also prepared by a Certified Arborist shall be submitted prior to the issuance of a Building Permit or Tree Removal/Relocation Permit. Subsequent to any approved relocation, a monthly report prepared by a Certified Arborist shall be provided to staff describing the overall tree performance and adjustments to the maintenance plan in order to ensure survivability, such

report shall continue for a period of 18 months unless determined otherwise by staff.

- d. Existing trees to be retained on site shall be protected from all types of construction disturbance. Root cutting, storage of soil or construction materials, movement of heavy vehicles, change in drainage patterns, and wash of concrete or other materials shall be prohibited.
- e. Street trees shall be required within the swale at the front of the property if not in conflict with existing utilities, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by the Public Works Department.
- f. Any existing plant material within the public right-of-way may be required to be removed, at the discretion of the Public Works Department.
- g. A fully automatic irrigation system with 100% coverage and an automatic rain sensor in order to render the system inoperative in the event of rain. Right-of-way areas shall also be incorporated as part of the irrigation system.
- h. The utilization of root barriers and/or Silva Cells, as applicable, shall be clearly delineated on the revised landscape plan.
- i. The applicant shall verify, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, the exact location of all applicable FPL transformers or vault rooms; such transformers and vault rooms, and all other related devices and fixtures, shall not be permitted within any required yard or any area fronting a street or sidewalk. The location of any exterior transformers, and how they are screened with landscape material from the right-of-way, shall be clearly indicated on the site and landscape plans, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Design Review Criteria and/or the directions from the Board.
- j. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the Landscape Architect or the project architect shall verify, in writing, that the project is consistent with the site and landscape plans approved by the Planning Department for Building Permit.

The decision of the Board regarding variances shall be final and there shall be no further review thereof except by resort to a court of competent jurisdiction by petition for writ of certiorari.

III. General Terms and Conditions applying to both 'I. Certificate of Appropriateness' and 'II. Variances' noted above.

- A. This Final Order consolidates all conditions and requirements for Certificate of Appropriateness approval as same are contained herein, in the Orders dated November 14, 2014, ~~and March 8, 2016, and June 9, 2020.~~ Accordingly, this Order shall serve as the Final Order for the proposed project and, in the event of conflict between the provisions hereof and those of the November 14, 2014, ~~or March 8, 2016, or June 9, 2020~~ Orders, the provisions hereof shall control.

- B. A Construction Parking and Traffic Management Plan (CPTMP) shall be approved by the Parking Director pursuant to Chapter 106, Article II, Division 3 of the City Code, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.
- C. Where one or more parcels are unified for a single development, the property owner shall execute and record a unity of title or a covenant in lieu of unity of title, as may be applicable, in a form acceptable to the City Attorney.
- D. Applicant agrees that in the event Code Compliance receives complaints of unreasonably loud noise from mechanical and/or electrical equipment, and determines the complaints to be valid, even if the equipment is operating pursuant to manufacturer specifications, the applicant shall take such steps to mitigate the noise with noise attenuating materials as reviewed and verified by an acoustic engineer, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria and/or the directions from the Board.
- E. 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.
- F. The Final Order shall be recorded in the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.
- G. 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.
- H. The 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.
- I. The conditions of approval herein are binding on the applicant, the property's owners, operators, and all successors in interest and assigns.
- J. Nothing in this order authorizes a violation of the City Code or other applicable law, nor allows a relaxation of any requirement or standard set forth in the City Code.
- K. The applicant agrees and shall be required to provide access to areas subject to this approval (not including private residences or hotel rooms) for inspection by the City (i.e.: Planning, Code Compliance, Building Department, Fire Safety), to ensure compliance with the plans approved by the Board and conditions of this order.
- L. All applicable FPL transformers or vault rooms and backflow prevention devices shall be located within the building envelope with the exception of the valve (PIV) which may be visible and accessible from the street.

- M. 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.
- N. Upon the issuance of a final Certificate of Occupancy or Certificate of Completion, as applicable, the project approved herein shall be maintained in accordance with the plans approved by the board and shall be subject to all conditions of approval herein, unless otherwise modified by the Board. Failure to maintain shall result in the issuance of a Code Compliance citation, and continued failure to comply may result in revocation of the Certificate of Occupancy, Completion and Business Tax Receipt.
- O. The applicant agrees and shall be required to provide access to areas subject to this approval (not including private residences or hotel rooms) for inspection by the City (i.e.: Planning, Code Compliance, Building Department, Fire Safety), to ensure compliance with the plans approved by the Board and conditions of this order.
- P. The issuance of a building permit is contingent upon meeting Public School Concurrency requirements, if applicable. Applicant shall obtain a valid School Concurrency Determination Certificate (Certificate) issued by the Miami-Dade County Public Schools. The Certificate shall state the number of seats reserved at each school level. In the event sufficient seats are not available, a proportionate share mitigation plan shall be incorporated into a tri-party development agreement and duly executed. No building permit may be issued unless and until the applicant obtains a written finding from Miami-Dade County Public Schools that the applicant has satisfied school concurrency.

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 Findings of Fact, to which the applicant has agreed.

PROVIDED, the applicant shall build substantially in accordance with the plans entitled "Versailles" as prepared by Nichols Brosch Wurst Wolfe & Associates, Inc, dated September 22, 2014, plans entitled "Versailles" as prepared by Nichols Brosch Wurst Wolfe & Associates, Inc, dated January 25, 2016, plans entitled "Aman Resort at the Historic Versailles Hotel", as prepared by Revuelta architecture international, dated February 10, 2020 and plans entitled "Aman Hotel & Residences", as prepared by Revuelta architecture international, dated December 8, 2020, as approved by the Historic Preservation 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 set forth in this Order. No building permit may be issued unless and until all 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 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 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 should 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____.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
THE CITY OF MIAMI BEACH, FLORIDA

BY: _____
DEBORAH TACKETT
CHIEF OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION
FOR THE CHAIR

STATE OF FLORIDA)
)SS
COUNTY OF MIAMI-DADE)

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this _____ day of _____ 20____ by Deborah Tackett, Chief of Historic Preservation, Planning Department, City of Miami Beach, Florida, a Florida Municipal Corporation, on behalf of the corporation. She is personally known to me.

NOTARY PUBLIC
Miami-Dade County, Florida
My commission expires:_____

Page 15 of 15
HPB20-0430
Meeting Date: December 8, 2020

Approved As To Form:
City Attorney's Office: _____ ()

Filed with the Clerk of the Historic Preservation Board on _____ ()

~~Strike-Thru~~ denotes deleted language
Underscore denotes new language

DRAFT