

# 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: DRB17-0116

#### **Citywide Distributed Antenna System (DAS) Nodes: 2 Island Avenue**

The applicant, Crown Castle NG East, Inc., is requesting Design Review Approval for the installation of a Stealth Distributed Antenna System (DAS) node within the public right-of-way at the following approximate location outside of historic districts: **2 Island Avenue**.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval with conditions

#### **HISTORY:**

At the January 07, 2014 Design Review Board meeting, Crown Castle presented a preliminary evaluation to the City in order to start initial review and obtain guidance and feedback of the proposed Stealth Distributed Antenna System (DAS) Node network. The pre-application process was intended to provide the applicant the opportunity to engage in more in-depth conceptual discussions with staff and the community. The pre-application process did not result in any binding decisions or entitlement actions.

Thus far, the Design Review Board and the Historic Preservation Board have reviewed and approved numerous stand-alone DAS utility poles.

#### **LEGAL DESCRIPTION:**

Latitude – North 25° 47' 28.3", Longitude – West 80° 08' 56.6";  
X = 936156.046, Y = 530705.238

#### **THE PROJECT:**

The applicant has submitted plans entitled "City of Miami Beach Crown Castle Distributed Antenna System, Co-location MBBI01 SFL10208", 2 Island Avenue, Miami Beach, FL 33139", as prepared by **Crown Castle**, dated Final Submittal February 21, 2017.

The applicant is proposing to install a Stealth Distributed Antenna System (DAS) node within the public right-of-way at the following approximate location: 2 Island Avenue.

#### **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.

**Satisfied**

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.

**Satisfied**

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.

**Satisfied**

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.

**Satisfied**

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.

**Satisfied**

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 Applicable**

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 Applicable**

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).

**Satisfied**

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.

**Not Applicable**

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.

**Satisfied**

**ANALYSIS:**

The applicant, Crown Castle NG East, Inc., is requesting Design Review Approval for the installation of a Stealth Distributed Antenna System (DAS) node within the public right-of-way at the following approximate location outside of historic districts: **2 Island Avenue**. For this location, the applicant is proposing a stand-alone pole to be located within the sidewalk approximately 2'-7" north of the curb along Island Avenue.

As opposed to cellular companies locating antennas on large monopoles or lattice tower structures in and around the city, a DAS network creates a grid of smaller scale antennas distributed more evenly throughout the city, usually installed to satisfy a deficiency of coverage and/or capacity in a dense urban setting. The DAS system is intended to supplement existing wireless communications networks in the City by strengthening the signal between existing antenna towers providing cellular and digital communications signals to the modern digital network of smartphones, tablets and computers.

Staff has met with the applicant and has performed site inspections for each of the site locations proposed. Staff would note that due to conditions that vary in our City, such as historic properties, sidewalk width and existing street furniture, each site requires careful review and analysis so as not to negatively impact the quality of the architectural character or pedestrian experience. A joint effort between applicant and staff is required to ensure that the best location, in terms of aesthetic appropriateness and visibility, is achieved while still meeting the radiofrequency objectives by covering the areas that need to be covered.

At this particular location, the applicant is proposing to install a stand-alone DAS utility stealth designed pole within the existing sidewalk area at the northwest quadrant of the Island Avenue, Venetian Way intersection. Staff would note that there are no existing 28' tall 'cobra head' style light fixtures located within this block as it is Belle Isle Park.

Although there are several 12'-0" high 'acorn-style' light poles within the immediate area, staff does not believe that the introduction of one of these fixtures onto the 28'-0" tall DAS utility pole would be appropriate. Consequently, staff is supportive of the applicant's proposal to install a stand-alone pole in an inconspicuous portion of the large corner sidewalk.

Pursuant to Federal Law, the City does not have the ability to render a decision against a telecommunication facility based on perceived health impacts, provided the proposed equipment is in conformance with RF emissions limits established by the FCC. The primary area for City review is that of aesthetics of the DAS network. Staff has relatively few concerns about the aesthetic impact of the proposed node at this location, and finds no concerns over the aesthetics or visual cluttering of this node due to interference with sightlines from specific historic structures as this location is immediate west of a City surface parking lot.

It is important to add that on February 11, 2015 the City Commission adopted modifications to the City's Land Use Development Regulations pertaining to telecommunications regulations. This Ordinance, among other things, regulates the acceptable locations for siting telecommunications equipment, including distance separations from existing and future antenna systems, distances from residential uses, encouragement of co-locating equipment onto single facilities whenever possible, and minimizing (or "stealth") equipment as much as possible. Staff has determined that the subject application complies

with the regulations contained within the subject telecommunications ordinance.

**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

F:\PLAN\DRB\DRB17\04-04-2017\APR17 Staff Reports\DRB17-0116 DAS NODE 2 Island Avenue.APR17.docx

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**  
**City of Miami Beach, Florida**

MEETING DATE: April 04, 2017

FILE NO: DRB17-0116

PROPERTY: Citywide Distributed Antenna System (DAS) Nodes: 2 Island Avenue

APPLICANT: Crown Castle NG East, Inc

LEGAL: Latitude – North 25° 47'28.3", Longitude – West 80° 08'56.6";  
X =936156.046, Y = 530705.238

IN RE: The Application for Design Review Approval for the installation of a Stealth Distributed Antenna System (DAS) node within the public right-of-way at the following approximate location outside of historic districts: **2 Island Avenue.**

**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 elevation, site plan and floor plan drawings shall be submitted to and approved by staff; at a minimum, such drawings shall incorporate the following:
    - a. The exterior of the steel pole shall be powder coated finished and the final exterior color selection shall be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Design Review Criteria and/or the directions from the Board.
    - b. The applicant shall submit a restrictive covenant agreeing to design, construct and maintain in perpetuity, the Das utility pole and integrated street light as proposed, including bearing all costs associated with its

design, construction and maintenance, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by the Public Works Director and City Attorney. The covenant shall be recorded in the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.

- c. 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.
- d. 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 Design Review Board retains jurisdiction so that should any new development or construction adjacent to the approved DAS Node require the removal of this DAS Node, this approval is subject to modification or revocation pursuant to a noticed hearing before the Design Review Board.
- B. The Final Order shall be recorded in the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.
- C. All equipment shall be serviced and maintained by Crown Castle.
- D. 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.
- E. 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.
- F. The conditions of approval herein are binding on the applicant, the property's owners, operators, and all successors in interest and assigns.

- G. 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.

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 "City of Miami Beach Crown Castle Distributed Antenna System, Co-location MBBI01 SFL10208", 2 Island Avenue, Miami Beach, FL 33139", as prepared by **Crown Castle**, dated Final Submittal February 21, 2017, and as approved by the Design Review 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\_\_\_\_\_.

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
THE CITY OF MIAMI BEACH, FLORIDA

F:\PLAN\DRB\DRB17\04-04-2017\APR17 Final Orders\DRFT DRB17-0116 2 Island Avenue.APR17.FO.docx