

MIAMI BEACH
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
Staff Report & Recommendation

Design Review Board

TO: DRB Chairperson and Members

DATE: April 5, 2016

FROM: Thomas R. Mooney, AICP
Planning Director



SUBJECT: Design Review File No. 23201
1691 Michigan Avenue

The applicants, 1691 Michigan Avenue Investments LP, are requesting modifications to a previously approved Design Review Approval for exterior alterations to the façade of an existing six-story building. Specifically, exterior modifications to the vertical circulation tower façade and installation of a new projecting sign including variances.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of the modifications to the elevator tower

Approval of the variances with modifications.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

Lots 7-10 & Lots 14-20 of Block 37 of the "Palm View Subdivision", According to the Plat Thereof, as Recorded in Plat Book 6, Page 29, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

HISTORY:

On October 11, 1999, the Design Review Board approved a six and seven-story office and public parking structure, with ground level retail, pursuant to DRB File No. 12108.

On October 6, 2015, the Design Review Board approved a portion of proposed modifications for exterior alterations to the façade of the existing six-story building, specifically to the ground level retail and continued other alterations and variances for signs to a date certain of January 5, 2016.

On January 5, 2016 the Board continued the application to a date certain of April 5, 2016.

SITE DATA:

Zoning:	CD-3 (Commercial, High Intensity) and GU (Government)
Future Land Use:	CD-3 (Commercial, High Intensity) and GU (Government)
Lot Size:	76,500 SF
Existing Use:	Office/Parking garage w/ retail

LAND USES:

East: Office/Parking Garage w/ ground floor retail
North: Palm View Historic District
South: Two-story retail / office building
West: Municipal surface parking lot

THE PROJECT:

The applicant has submitted plans entitled "The Lincoln" as prepared by **Beilinson Gomez Architecture** dated signed and sealed February 12, 2016.

The applicant is proposing exterior alterations to the exterior of the vertical stairwell circulation tower.

Additionally, the applicant is proposing a projecting, double-faced sign, reading *WILLIAMS-SONOMA*, to be mounted vertically above the ground floor and installed as a projecting blade sign on the altered stairwell/elevator tower. Note: GU-zoned properties shall follow the sign regulations as determined by the surrounding districts as determined by the Planning Director.

The applicant is requesting the following variance(s):

1. A variance to exceed by 40 SF the maximum allowed 15 SF of area for a projecting sign in order to install a vertical projecting sign on the building walls facing Michigan Avenue with 55 SF of area.
 - Variance requested from:

Section 138-172. Schedule of sign regulations for principal and accessory use signs.
CD-3 – Number: One sign per street frontage for each licensed principal and licensed accessory use, however, multiple signs for the same licensed establishment may be permitted through the design review procedure if the aggregate sign area does not exceed the maximum size permitted under this subsection.
Projecting sign: 15 SF.

The applicant is proposing to install a projecting double-faced sign above the ground floor, in order to provide greater visibility for the retail establishment shoppers on Lincoln Road. Further, by removing the stairwell façade elements, a plain surface can be created that would further highlight the sign and offer a higher visibility. The sign is proposed as a vertical plane that extends 3'-8" (44") from the wall and measures 15'-0" (180") high, which results in a 55 SF sign. This is more than 3 times the maximum permitted area for a projecting sign (15 SF). Individual halo-lit reverse channel 10" high letters are mounted vertically to the face spelling 'WILLIAMS-SONOMA'.

Staff maintains that this size of sign is not in keeping with the pedestrian character of the neighborhood and would recommend a slight reduction in size of this type of sign, in order to be more in keeping with the Code requirements. Staff recommends that the maximum projection of the sign not exceed 2'-6" (30") in width, and 13'-4" (160") in height, yielding a projecting sign more proportioned with the sign detail provided in the submitted plans and less obtrusive to the neighboring Palm View and Flamingo Park Local Historic Districts.

This modification will result in a sign area of 33.3 SF (30" x 13'-4") and the variance would be "to exceed by 18.3 SF the maximum allowed 15 SF of area for a projecting sign in order to install a vertical projecting sign on the building walls facing Michigan Avenue with 33.3 SF of area".

With this modification, staff is supportive of this variance request. Staff finds that the planters and screening part of the building design elements facing the front might reduce the store visibility from the adjacent commercial corridor on Lincoln Road as well as the store location along a side street. These conditions are practical difficulties that justify the variance requested.

2. A variance to relocate an allowable projecting sign from the ground floor to the 2nd through 4th levels of a multistory commercial building, facing Michigan Avenue.
 - Variance requested from:

Sec. 138-171. General provisions.

(g) Signs located above the ground floor shall be limited to the name of the building or the use that encompasses the largest amount of floor area on the building.

The applicant is requesting a variance to relocate a projecting sign to portions of the building where signage would not be otherwise permitted. In order to obtain a higher exposure of the business, the sign is proposed in a vertical position, which extend more than one floor above the ground floor where a typical projecting sign is allowed. The installation of a projecting blade sign is a strategic marketing tool for increasing the visibility to potential customers on Lincoln Road. Staff finds that location of the store and the building design elements might reduce the store visibility and create the practical difficulties that justify the variance requested.

3. A variance to exceed by 43.9 SF the maximum permitted aggregate sign area per storefront of 23.6 SF in order to install one flat sign on the first floor and a vertical projecting sign located on the building walls facing Michigan with an aggregate area of 67.5 SF.
 - Variance requested from:

Section 138-172. Schedule of sign regulations for principal and accessory use signs.
CD-3 – Number: One sign per street frontage for each licensed principal and licensed accessory use, however, multiple signs for the same licensed establishment may be permitted through the design review procedure if the aggregate sign area does not exceed the maximum size permitted under this subsection.

Wall sign: 30 SF (20 SF for the first 25'-0" of linear frontage, plus 1 SF for every 3'-0" of linear frontage over 25'-0" up to a maximum of 30 SF: 23.6 SF based on 35'-11" of frontage).

The maximum sign area permitted for an individual business is based on the length of the storefront. In this instance, the store occupies 35'-11" of length that would allow up to a total of 23.6 SF (20SF plus 1 SF for every 3'-0" of linear frontage over 25'-0"). As such, the aggregate area of the flat sign and the projecting sign combined exceeds the maximum area allowed.

The flat sign is ten (10") inches high, which is the same height as the adjacent store 'Pottery Barn', and as an individual sign, complies with the maximum area allowed. However, because the projecting sign must be included in the computation of the total sign area, the proposed signs combined require a variance. Based on the details of the projecting sign, staff recommends that its size be reduced to 33.3 s.f. as noted in variance number 1. This will result

in a modification of the variance to exceed by 22.2 SF the total aggregate area of the signs to install two signs with an aggregate area of 45.8 SF.

With this modification, staff is supportive of the variance request. Considering the location of the store in reference to the Lincoln Road Mall and the disadvantage in visibility due to the building's design elements on the façade and landscape, staff finds that practical difficulties exist which create the need for this variance request.

PRACTICAL DIFFICULTY AND HARDSHIP CRITERIA

The applicant has submitted plans and documents with the application that staff has concluded satisfy Article 1, Section 2 of the Related Special Acts.

Additionally, staff has concluded that the plans and documents submitted with the application comply with the following hardship criteria, 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.

COMPLIANCE WITH ZONING CODE:

A preliminary review of the project indicates that the application, as proposed, appears to be consistent with the following sections of the City Code, aside from the requested variances pertaining to the proposed signage as noted herein this application. 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.

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 is 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.
Not Satisfied; the proposed signage requires multiple variances.
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 proposed signage requires multiple variances.
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.
Not Satisfied; the proposed signage requires multiple variances.
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; the proposed signage is in scale with similar retailers.
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; a lighting plan has not been provided.

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

Not Satisfied; a landscape plan has not been provided.

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.

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).

Satisfied

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.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

DESIGN REVIEW

The subject property is a mixed-use structure containing a seven story office building component, a five-story parking garage and a ground floor retail component along Jefferson Avenue and also along Michigan Avenue. The building extends from 17th Street to North Lincoln Lane, and with the exception of a corner residential building, occupies an entire city block. The applicant is proposing exterior alterations to the first two levels of the parking garage's western façade (Michigan Avenue), as well as altering the exterior of the vertical circulation tower (also along Michigan Avenue).

On October 6, 2015, the Design Review Board approved a portion of proposed modifications for exterior alterations to the façade of the existing six-story building, specifically to the ground level retail and continued other alterations and variances for signs to a later meeting date. The applicant was approved to install a freestanding wall and metal awning that will serve as the new, updated façade of the ground floor retail component of the parking garage along Michigan Avenue.

The applicant is requesting approval to install a projecting sign at the second level of the east façade of the proposed addition for their future retail tenants, Pottery Barn and Williams-Sonoma. Staff is generally supportive of the request and believes a projecting sign has been integrated into the architecture. The garage portion of the site was originally conceived as a composition of overlapping projecting concrete planters with lush landscaping. The actual realization of the building due to value engineering led to a faulty fiberglass planter system attached to varying portions of the parking garage façades that never functioned properly or allowed the plantings to thrive. In this regard, staff has no objections to the selective removal of the planters and architectural elements that are located directly along the stair tower not be modified, as the proposed removal dramatically cleans up the adorned vertical element.

With the success of the closed-off pedestrianized section of Lincoln Road, the installation of projecting signs are a more strategic marketing tool for increased visibility to pedestrian shoppers on the intersecting side streets. The proposed projecting sign will allow the retailers to be seen from Lincoln Road which is approximately 250'-0" to the south. Staff is supportive of the new projecting sign, inclusive of the requested variances.

VARIANCE REVIEW

Since the approval of the project on October 2015, the applicant has modified the signage program proposed for the retail build out of a national chain, specifically in terms of the size of and number of sign variances. In this regard, the applicant has greatly reduced the abundant and excessive nature of the original proposal.

Three variances are requested for the proposed signs: to exceed the total aggregate area of the signs, to relocate a projecting sign above the first floor and to exceed the maximum area for a

projecting sign. Although staff is not opposed to an increase in sign area, based on the retail location and existing conditions of the site, as noted in the "Project" description, staff would recommend that the overall frame dimensions of the projecting sign be reduced in size while keeping the actual sign area as proposed, to be more in keeping with the pedestrian character of the area. With this modification, staff is supportive of variances number 1, number 2 and number 3 and recommend that the Board approve the applicant's requests with the staff recommendations.

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 and Practical Difficulty and Hardship criteria.

TRM/JGM/IV

F:\PLAN\DRB\DRB16\04-05-2016\APR16 Staff Reports\DRB 23201 1691 Michigan Avenue.APR16.doc

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
City of Miami Beach, Florida

MEETING DATE: April 5, 2016

FILE NO: 23201

PROPERTY: **1691 Michigan Avenue**

APPLICANT: 1691 Michigan Avenue Investments, LP

LEGAL: Lots 7-10 & Lots 14-20 of Block 37 of the "Palm View Subdivision", According to the Plat Thereof, as Recorded in Plat Book 6, Page 29, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

IN RE: The Application for Design Review Approval for modifications to a previously approved Design Review Approval for exterior alterations to the façade of an existing six-story building. Specifically, exterior modifications to the vertical circulation tower façade and installation of a new projecting sign including variances.

SUPPLEMENTAL 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 Approval

- 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 3, 4, 5, 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. All of the original conditions of approval by this Board shall remain in full force and effect under the prior Final Order dated October 6, 2015 for DRB File No. 23201 except as modified herein.
2. 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. All future ground level building signage shall require a separate permit. Signage shall consist of reverse channel, back-lit letters, in a manner to be approved by staff. No exterior raceway or exterior disconnect switches shall be allowed. Intermittent lights, moving or revolving lights shall not be permitted.
 - b. The proposed modifications to the vertical stair tower (above the ground floor) shall be permitted.
 - c. The installation of any new lighting attached to the exterior of the building shall be subject to the review and approval of the Planning Department.
 - d. The final details of all exterior surface finishes and materials, including samples, 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.

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. The applicant filed an application with the Planning Department for the following variance(s), which were either approved by the Board with modifications, or denied (Underlying denotes new language and ~~striketrough~~ denotes stricken language):
 1. A variance to exceed by 18.3 ~~40~~ SF the maximum allowed 15 SF of area for a projecting sign in order to install a vertical projecting sign on the building walls facing Michigan Avenue with 33.3 ~~55~~ SF of area. (Modified variance).

2. A variance to relocate an allowable projecting sign from the ground floor to the 2nd through 4th levels of a multistory commercial building, facing Michigan Avenue.
 3. A variance to exceed by 22.2 ~~43.9~~ SF the maximum permitted aggregate sign area per storefront of 23.6 SF in order to install one flat sign on the first floor and a vertical projecting sign located on the building walls facing Michigan with an aggregate area of 45.8 ~~67.5~~ SF. (Modified variance).
- 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 imposes the following conditions 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.

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. Design Review Approval and 'II. Variances' noted above.

- A. 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.
- B. 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.
- 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 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 "The Lincoln" as prepared by **Beilinson Gomez Architecture** dated signed and sealed February 12,

2016, 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

BY: _____
DEBORAH J. TACKETT
DESIGN AND PRESERVATION MANAGER
FOR THE CHAIR

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

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this _____ day of _____, 20____ by Deborah J. Tackett, Design and Preservation Manager, 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\DRB16\04-05-2016\APR16 Final Orders\DRFT DRB 23201 1691 Michigan Ave.APR16.fo.docx