

MIAMI BEACH

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Staff Report & Recommendation

Design Review Board

TO: DRB Chairperson and Members

DATE: April 04, 2017

FROM: Thomas R. Mooney, AICP
Planning Director



SUBJECT: DRB17-0117
920 Alton Road – Super graphic

The applicant, Mark Lehmkuhl, is requesting Design Review Approval for the installation of an artistic super graphic along the south and east façades of an existing one-story building.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with conditions

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

FLEETWOOD SUB PB 23-34, LOTS 20 & 21 BLK AND PROP INT IN & TO COMMON ELEMENTS NOT DEDICATED TO PUBLIC, LOT SIZE 100.00 X 50 OR 16939-1637 049 5, 02-4203-001-0460

SITE DATA:

Zoning: CD-2 (Commercial, Medium Intensity)

Future Land Use Designation: CD-2

EXISTING STRUCTURE:

The artwork is proposed to be located entirely within private property, along the east and south elevations.

THE PROJECT:

The applicant has submitted plans entitled "920 Alton Supergraphic Concept", as prepared by **Ghosthouse, Creative Group**, undated, and conceived by **Rozas Studio, Inc.**

The applicant is proposing to install a new artistic super graphic along the eastern and southern elevations of an existing one-story commercial building.

COMPLIANCE WITH ZONING CODE:

A preliminary review of the project indicates that the application, as proposed, is consistent with the following sections of the City Code:

1. **Sec. 138-204. – Noncommercial graphics and images.**
 - (a) *Non-electric graphics and images.* Artistic murals, graphics and images composed of paint, tile, stone, or similar, non-electronic medium, which have no commercial association, may be applied to a building or structure, if approved by the design review board or historic preservation board, as applicable, in accordance with the applicable design review or certificate of appropriateness criteria.

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.

COMPLIANCE WITH DESIGN REVIEW CRITERIA:

Design Review encompasses the examination of architectural drawings for consistency with the criteria stated below with regard to the aesthetics, appearances, safety, and function of the structure or proposed structures in relation to the site, adjacent structures and surrounding community. Staff recommends that the following criteria are found to be satisfied, not satisfied or not applicable, as hereto indicated:

1. The existing and proposed conditions of the lot, including but not necessarily limited to topography, vegetation, trees, drainage, and waterways.
Not Applicable
2. 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
3. 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
4. The color, design, selection of landscape materials and architectural elements of Exterior Building surfaces and primary public interior areas for Developments requiring a Building Permit in areas of the City identified in section 118-252.
Not Satisfied; the black paint along the west elevation is inconsistent with City paint standards.
5. The proposed site plan, and the location, appearance and design of new and existing Buildings and Structures are in conformity with the standards of this Ordinance and other applicable ordinances, architectural and design guidelines as adopted and amended periodically by the Design Review Board and Historic Preservation Boards, and all pertinent master plans.
Satisfied
6. The proposed Structure, and/or additions or modifications to an existing structure, indicates a sensitivity to and is compatible with the environment and adjacent Structures, and enhances the appearance of the surrounding properties.
Satisfied
7. The design and layout of the proposed site plan, as well as all new and existing buildings 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 contiguous and adjacent Buildings and lands, pedestrian sight lines and view corridors.
Not Applicable
8. 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 all parking spaces are usable and are safely and

conveniently arranged; pedestrian furniture and bike racks shall be considered. Access to the Site from adjacent roads shall be designed so as to interfere as little as possible with traffic flow on these roads and to permit vehicles a rapid and safe ingress and egress to the Site.

Not Applicable

9. 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. Lighting shall be reviewed to assure that it enhances the appearance of structures at night.

Not Satisfied

10. Landscape and paving materials shall be reviewed to ensure an adequate relationship with and enhancement of the overall Site Plan design.

Not Applicable

11. 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 Satisfied

12. The proposed structure has 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

13. The building has, where feasible, space in that part of the ground floor fronting a 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 street, or streets shall have residential or commercial spaces, shall have the appearance of being a residential or commercial space or shall have an architectural treatment which shall buffer the appearance of the parking structure from the surrounding area and is integrated with the overall appearance of the project.

Not Applicable

14. The building shall have an appropriate and fully integrated rooftop architectural treatment which substantially screens all mechanical equipment, stairs and elevator towers.

Not Applicable

15. An 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

16. All portions of a project fronting a street or sidewalk shall incorporate an architecturally appropriate amount of transparency at the first level in order to achieve pedestrian compatibility and adequate visual interest.

Satisfied

17. 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

18. In addition to the foregoing criteria, subsection [118-]104(6)(t) of the City Code shall apply to the design review board's review of any proposal to place, construct, modify or maintain a wireless communications facility or other over the air radio transmission or radio reception facility in the public rights-of-way.

Not Applicable

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has no objections to the installation of an artistic super graphic along the southern and eastern elevation of the existing building. Originally built in 1949 as an auditorium, the structure has been retrofitted and remodeled throughout the years for various uses. The current building resembles a warehouse with stark, windowless side elevations, and an eastern, front elevation of four storefront windows set within plain stucco walls and crowned with a corrugated metal awning along the entire length of the façade. The building is setback approximately 65'-0" from the sidewalk and contains an unimproved, parking area in front.

The applicant seeks to artistically improve the southern and eastern elevations of the building to better represent its current tenants, a trendy new lounge/restaurant concept to replace the space formerly occupied by 'Able and Baker'. The artist, Juan Manuel Rozas, is proposing a mural in both color and gray that partially covers the south, side elevation and wraps around to span the entire length of the east, front façade, inclusive of the metal awning. The artistic mural will extend along the metal awning above the popular fast-casual restaurant 'GOGO Fresh Food Café'. Three mural concepts are proposed for the Board to decide on, in both vibrant multicolor hues and shades of gray.

Mr. Rozas has a portfolio of mural works that include completed murals for "Bodega Taqueria y Tequila" and "Michael Mina 74" restaurant at the Fontainebleau Hotel, in Miami Beach, and "Coya Taco" in Wynwood, Miami.

Three three mural concepts are similar, but distinct, patterns of sweeping motifs of nature – flowers, birds, water and clouds – the color pallet for each option varies. The first design option is comprised of vibrantly painted central motifs softened by shades of gray. The second design option is predominately expressed in gray tones with a few motifs articulated in shades of green. The third design option is fully rendered in vibrant colors.

The artistic super graphic transforms the somber structure, with no significant architectural detailing or visual interest, into an exciting artistic canvas. Staff is supportive of any of the three options for the artistic super graphic but of the three, staff would recommend approval of third most vibrant design, option 3.

RECOMMENDATION:

In view of the foregoing analysis, staff recommends the application be **approved**, subject to the conditions enumerated in the attached Draft Order, which address the inconsistencies with the aforementioned Design Review criteria.

TRM/JGM/FSC

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
City of Miami Beach, Florida

MEETING DATE: April 04, 2017

FILE NO: DRB17-0117

PROPERTY: **920 Alton Road**

APPLICANT: Mark Lehmkuhl

LEGAL: Lots 20 & 21 of Block 3 of 'Fleetwood Subdivision', according to the plat thereof, as recorded in plat book 28, page 34, of the public records of Miami-Dade County Florida.

IN RE: The Application for Design Review Approval for the installation of an artistic super graphic along the south and east façades of an existing one-story building.

ORDER

The City of Miami Beach Design Review 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. Design Review

- A. The Board has jurisdiction pursuant to Section 118-252(a) of the Miami Beach Code. The property is not located within a designated local historic district and is not a individually designated historic site.
- 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 is consistent with the Design Review Criteria in Section 118-251 of the Miami Beach Code.
- C. The project would remain consistent with the criteria and requirements of section 118-251 if the following conditions are met:
 1. Revised elevations prior to the installation of the proposed supergraphic; at a minimum, such drawings shall incorporate the following:
 - a. The artist shall proceed with the 'Option 3' mural for the super graphic. Any minor change to incorporate such imagery may be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Design Review Criteria and/or the directions from the Board. Any substantial alterations or deviations from the artistic imagery approved herein either now or in the future shall be reviewed by the Design Review Board as a new application.

- b. The artistic mural shall be maintained by the applicant, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Design Review Criteria and/or the directions from the Board.
- c. The final exterior surface color scheme, including color samples, shall be subject to the review and approval of staff and shall require a separate permit.
- d. 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.
- e. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the project Architect shall verify, in writing, that the subject project has been constructed in accordance with the plans approved by the Planning Department for Building Permit

In accordance with Section 118-262, the applicant, or the city manager on behalf of the City Administration, or an affected person, Miami Design Preservation League or Dade Heritage Trust may seek review of any order of the Design Review Board by the City Commission, except that orders granting or denying a request for rehearing shall not be reviewed by the Commission.

II. Variance(s)

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

III. General Terms and Conditions applying to both 'I. Design Review Approval and II. Variances' noted above.

- A. The Final Order shall be recorded in the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.
- B. 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.
- C. The conditions of approval herein are binding on the applicant, the property's owners, operators, and all successors in interest and assigns.
- D. Nothing in this order authorizes a violation of City Code or other applicable law, nor allows a relaxation of any requirement or standard set forth in the City Code.

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

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

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this _____ day of _____ 20__ by James G. Murphy, Chief of Urban Design, Planning Department, City of Miami Beach, Florida, a Florida Municipal Corporation, on behalf of the Corporation. He 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 Design Review Board on _____ ()

F:\PLAN\DRB\DRB17\04-04-2017\APR17 Final Orders\DRFT DRB17-0117 920 Alton Rd.APR17.FO.docx