

# MIAMI BEACH

## PLANNING DEPARTMENT

### Staff Report & Recommendation

### Historic Preservation Board

TO: Chairperson and Members  
Historic Preservation Board

DATE: February 14, 2017

FROM: Thomas R. Mooney, AICP  
Planning Director



SUBJECT: HPB16-0075, **643 Lincoln Road**

The applicant, Pandora Jewelry, LLC, is requesting modifications to a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness for modifications to the Lincoln Road façade. Specifically, the applicant is requesting to modify Condition C.1.d. of the order.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

**Denial** of the requested modification to previously issued Certificate of Appropriateness

#### **BACKGROUND**

On July 8, 2014, the Board reviewed and approved a Certificate of Appropriateness for design modifications to the Lincoln Road façade on the existing 1-story 'Contributing' building.

On February 14, 2017, the Board continued the subject application to a date certain of March 13, 2017 at the request of the applicant.

#### **EXISTING STRUCTURE**

Local Historic District:	Flamingo Park
Status:	Contributing
Original Construction Date:	1936
Original Architect:	Igor Polevitsky

#### **ZONING / SITE DATA**

Legal Description:	Lot 1, Block 1 of The Alton Beach Realty, according to the plat thereof recorded in plat book 34, at page 66 of the public records of Dade County, Florida.
--------------------	---

Zoning:	CD-3, Commercial high intensity
Future Land Use Designation:	CD-3, Commercial high intensity
Lot Size:	10,500 S.F. (2.25 Max FAR)
Existing FAR:	Not Provided
Proposed FAR:	No Change
Existing Height:	1-story
Proposed Height:	No Change
Existing Use/Condition:	Commercial

Proposed Use: No Change

### **THE PROJECT**

The applicant has submitted plans entitled "Lincoln Road Mall – Pandora Signage" as prepared by Belinson Gomez Architects, PA, dated December 20, 2016.

**The applicant, Lincoln Centurion Retail, LLC, is requesting modifications to a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness for modifications to the Lincoln Road façade. Specifically, the applicant is requesting to modify Condition C.1.d. of the order.**

### **COMPLIANCE WITH ZONING CODE**

A preliminary review of the project 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 **retail uses** appears to be **consistent** with the Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan.

### **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.  
**Satisfied**
  - 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.  
**Not Satisfied**  
**The proposal to deviate from the approved uniform signage plan may detract from the historic character of the building.**

- b. General design, scale, massing and arrangement.  
**Not Satisfied**  
**The proposal to deviate from the approved uniform signage plan may detract from the historic character of the building.**
  - c. Texture and material and color.  
**Not Satisfied**  
**The proposed matte black color does not conform with the approved uniform signage plan submitted by the architect.**
  - 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.  
**Satisfied**
  - f. The relationship of the size, design and siting of any new or reconstructed structure to the landscape of the district.  
**Not Applicable**
  - 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.  
**Not Applicable**
- 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 Applicable**
  - 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.  
**Not Applicable**

- 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.

**Not Satisfied**

**The proposal to deviate from the approved uniform signage plan may detract from the historic character of the building.**

- 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 Applicable**

- 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.

**Not Applicable**

- 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 Applicable**

- 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.

**Not Applicable**

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

**Not Applicable**

- 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.

**Not Applicable**

- 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 Applicable**
- 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.  
**Not Applicable**
- l. All buildings shall have an appropriate and fully integrated rooftop architectural treatment which substantially screens all mechanical equipment, stairs and elevator towers.  
**Not Applicable**
- 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 Applicable**
- 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.  
**Not Applicable**
- 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.  
**Not Applicable**

#### **STAFF ANALYSIS**

On July 8, 2014, the Board reviewed and approved a Certificate of Appropriateness for modifications to the Lincoln Road façade on the existing 1-story 'Contributing' building. A building permit was subsequently issued and the renovation work has been substantially completed.

As part of the Certificate of Appropriateness approval, the Board imposed the following condition:

Condition C.1.d:

*All building signage shall require a separate permit. A uniform signage plan for the south side of the structure, facing Lincoln Road, shall be required. Such sign plan shall be consistent in color, materials, method of illumination and sign location, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria and/or directions from the Board.*

Prior to the approval of the building permit approval, the architect submitted a signage plan consistent with the above noted condition. Specifically, the plan indicates that all signs shall have a clear anodized brushed aluminum or stainless steel a finish. Currently, two signs have been installed pursuant to the signage plan, "Sugar Factory" and "Pandora". However, the tenant "Pandora" wishes to change the finish of the existing sign from clear anodized brushed aluminum to matte black. As a result, the applicant is currently requesting to modify Condition C.1.d of the final order.

Staff would note that the Board often requires a uniform signage plan for projects which will have multiple tenants in order to establish continuity in terms of location, materials and color. While staff has no objection to the proposed matte black signage, staff would recommend that the signage for both existing tenants and any future tenant have a matte black finish. Such a change would not require a modification of the existing Condition. As such, staff recommends that the application for modification be denied.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

In view of the foregoing analysis, staff recommends the application be **denied**.

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD**  
**City of Miami Beach, Florida**

MEETING DATE: March 13, 2017

FILE NO: HPB16-0075

PROPERTY: 643 Lincoln Road

APPLICANT: Pandora Jewelry, LLC

LEGAL: Lot 1, Block 1 of The Alton Beach Realty, according to the plat thereof recorded in plat book 34, at page 66 of the public records of Dade County, Florida.

IN RE: The Application for modifications to a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness for modifications to the Lincoln Road façade. Specifically, the applicant is requesting to modify Condition C.1.d. of the order.

**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 Flamingo Park 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 the Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria in Section 118-564(a)(1) of the Miami Beach Code.
  - 2. Is not consistent with Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria 'a', 'b' & 'c' in Section 118-564(a)(2) of the Miami Beach Code.
  - 3. Is not consistent with Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria 'c' in Section 118-564(a)(3) of the Miami Beach Code.

**II. Variance(s)**

- A. No variance(s) were filed as part of this application.

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 recommendation, that the application is DENIED for the above-referenced project.

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: \_\_\_\_\_

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

Filed with the Clerk of the Historic Preservation Board on \_\_\_\_\_ (                    )