

MIAMIBEACH

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Staff Report & Recommendation

Design Review Board

TO: DRB Chairperson and Members

DATE: June 06, 2017

FROM: Thomas R. Mooney, AICP
Planning Director

SUBJECT: DRB17-0141
119 East 2nd Court– Single Family Home

The applicant, Tracy Rishty, is requesting Design Review Approval for the construction of a new two-story single family home to replace an existing pre-1942 one-story home.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with conditions

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

Lot 3 of Block 1, of Hibiscus Island Resubdivision, according to the Plat Thereof, as Recorded in Plat Book 34, Page 87, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

SITE DATA:

Zoning: RS-4
Future Land Use: RS
Lot Size: 9,750 SF 78x125
Lot Coverage:
Existing: 2,599 SF / **26.7%**
Proposed: 2,427 SF / **24.9%**
Maximum: 2,925 SF / 30%
Unit size:
Existing: 2,599 SF / **26.7**
Proposed: 4,553 SF / **46%**
Maximum: 4,875 SF / 50%
2nd Floor Volume to 1st: **N/A <25%**

Grade: +4.135' NGVD
Flood: +10.00' NGVD
Difference: 5.865'
Adjusted Grade: +7.0675' NGVD
30" (+2.5') Above Grade: +9.5675' NGVD
First Floor Elevation: +14.00' NGVD (BFE +4')

EXISTING STRUCTURE:

Year Constructed: 1941
Architect: Arnold Southwell
Vacant: No
Demolition Proposed: Full

SURROUNDING PROPERTIES:

East: One-story 1941 residence
North: Two-story 2015 residence
South: Two-story 1967 residence
West: One-story 1969 residence

Height:

Proposed: 24'-0" flat roof
Maximum: 24'-0" flat roof

THE PROJECT:

The applicant has submitted plans entitled "119 East 2nd Court" as prepared by **DOMO Architecture + Design** signed, sealed and dated April 17, 2017.

The applicant is proposing to construct a new two-story residence to replace an existing pre-1942 architecturally significant one-story home.

COMPLIANCE WITH ZONING CODE:

A preliminary review of the project indicates that the application, as proposed, appears to be

consistent with the City Code.

1. The proposed steps and planter levels in the front yard may not comply with the maximum elevations or allowable encroachments.

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.
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.
Not Satisfied; The proposed steps and planter levels in the front yard may not comply with the maximum elevations or allowable encroachments
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 Satisfied; The proposed steps and planter levels in the front yard may not comply with the maximum elevations or allowable encroachments
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.
Satisfied
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 Satisfied
10. Landscape and paving materials shall be reviewed to ensure an adequate relationship with and enhancement of the overall Site Plan design.
Not Satisfied
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.
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).
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.

Satisfied

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

Satisfied

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:

DESIGN REVIEW

The applicant is proposing to construct a new two-story home designed in a contemporary style of architecture on a dry lot on Hibiscus Island that will replace an existing one-story home, constructed in 1941. There are no design waivers or variances being sought as part of this application.

It should be noted that due to the high base flood elevation requirements, which is 10'-0" in this area, the first floor of the home must be located over six (6) feet above the elevation of the street. The Code allows that when the first habitable floor is required to be located six feet or more above grade in order to meet minimum flood elevation requirements, the area under the first habitable floor of the main structure shall not count towards unit size when certain criteria are met. The architect will need to limit the segregated parking garage area under the main structure to be no greater than 600 SF in area, and ensure that the height of the area under the main structure that not have a maximum floor to ceiling clearance of greater than seven feet six inches from grade.

Overall, staff commends the applicant's architect on preparing a simple and elegant design according to the renderings. The project does afford a warm residential street presence and advances the resiliency and efficient space planning of storing the automobile under the open, main slab of the residence. However, there still does seem to be some deficiency in detail regarding the sloping and landscaping within the front of the property.

The simple design contains a compact footprint (less than 25%) and successfully utilizes architectural devices to frame the two floors and is counterbalanced through the use of polished concrete, coral stone, stucco and horizontal framing elements. Staff would strongly recommend that the final material selection match closely the color, texture and detailing of sheet A-7.0 in regards to color, seize and texture of stone, concrete, and the horizontal and vertical wood plank elements.

In relation to the immediate area, the replacement home is harmonious with the recent construction in the area, particular to the abutting property to the north built in 2015 in accordance with building permit B1203746. This home has a lot coverage of 28% and unit size of 48%. Staff recommends that the design of the replacement home be approved.

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

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
City of Miami Beach, Florida

MEETING DATE: June 06, 2017

FILE NO: DRB17-0141

PROPERTY: **119 East 2nd Court**

APPLICANT: Tracy Rishty

LEGAL: Lot 3 of Block 1, of Hibiscus Island Resubdivision, according to the Plat Thereof, as Recorded in Plat Book 34, Page 87, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

IN RE: The Application for Design Review Approval for the construction of a new two-story single family home to replace an existing pre-1942 architecturally significant one-story home.

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 an 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 inconsistent with Design Review Criteria 2, 3, 9, and 10 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 for the proposed new home at 119 East 2nd Court shall be submitted, at a minimum, such drawings shall incorporate the following:
 - a. The stone cladding proposed along the façades of the residence shall consist of a natural keystone or other natural stone, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Design Review Criteria and/or the directions from the Board. The color and texture to match what is depicted in the submitted rendering sheet A-7.0.

- b. The final design and details of the wood “louver façade” cladding proposed along the front façades of the residence shall be submitted, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Design Review Criteria and/or the directions from the Board. The color, vertical and horizontal elements to match what is depicted in the submitted rendering sheet A-7.0
 - c. Any fence or gate at the front of the property shall be designed in a manner consistent with the architecture of the new structure, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Design Review Criteria and/or the directions from the Board.
 - d. The final Design details of the exterior materials and finishes shall be submitted, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Design Review 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. 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.
2. 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. The architect shall substantially increase the amount of native canopy shade trees within the site, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Design Review Criteria and/or the directions from the Board.
- f. The proposed and existing trees located within the swale shall be subject to the review and approval of Green Space and CIP.
- g. 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.
- h. Any existing plant material within the public right-of-way may be required to be removed, as the discretion of the Public Works Department.
- i. 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.
- j. The utilization of root barriers and/or Silva Cells, as applicable, shall be clearly delineated on the revised landscape plan.
- k. The applicant shall verify, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, the exact location of all backflow preventors and all other related devices and fixtures. The location of backflow preventors, Siamese pipes or other related devices and fixtures, if any, and how they are screened with landscape material from the right-of-way, shall be clearly indicated on the site and landscape plans, and shall be subject to the review and approval of staff.
- l. The applicant shall verify, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, the exact location of all applicable FPL transformers or vault rooms. The location of any exterior transformers and how they are screened with landscape material from the right of wall shall be clearly indicated on the site and landscape plans and shall be subject to the review and approval of staff.

- m. 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.

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. During Construction of the new home, the Applicant will maintain gravel at the front of the construction site within the first 15'-0" of the required front yard to mitigate disturbance of soil and mud by related personal vehicles existing and entering the site and with an eight foot (8'-0") high fence with a wind resistant green mesh material along the front of the property line. All construction materials, including dumpsters and portable toilets, shall be located behind the construction fence and not visible from the right-of-way. All construction vehicles shall either park on the private property or at alternate overflow parking sites with a shuttle service to and from the property. The Applicant shall ensure that the contractor(s) observe good construction practices and prevent construction materials and debris from impacting the right-of-way.
- 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. The final building plans shall meet all other requirements of the Land Development Regulations of the City Code.
- D. The Final Order shall be recorded in the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.
- E. 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.
- F. 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.

- G. The conditions of approval herein are binding on the applicant, the property's owners, operators, and all successors in interest and assigns.
- H. 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 Paragraph I, II, III of the Finding of Fact, to which the applicant has agreed.

PROVIDED, the applicant shall build substantially in accordance with the plans, entitled "119 East 2nd Court" as prepared by **DOMO Architecture + Design** signed, sealed and dated April 17, 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 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 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 shall 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_____.

