

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. 23227
2015 Marseille Drive – Parking Improvements

The applicant, City M Marseille II LLC, is requesting Design Review Approval for the exterior modifications to an existing two-story residential building including a variance to reduce the minimum required front setback for at-grade parking in order to construct three parking spaces in the front yard facing Marseille Drive.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with conditions

Approval of the variance

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

Lot 2 less eastern 10'-0" of Block 34 of "Isle of Normandy Miami View Section", according to Plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book 40, Page 33, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

SITE DATA:

Zoning: RM-1
Future Land Use: RM-1
Lot Size: 6,800SF
Grade: +3.75' NGVD
Base Flood Elevation (BFE): +8.00' NGVD
Difference: 4.25'
Adjusted Grade: +5.87' NGVD

Surrounding Properties:

East: 1-story 1952 duplex
North: 1-story 1952 duplex
West: 1-story 1940 single family home
South: 5-story Multi-Family Building

EXISTING STRUCTURE:

Architect: Robert M. Nordin
Year of Construction: 1957
Existing Use: Multifamily (4 Units)
Proposed Use: Multifamily (6 Units)
Existing parking: 0
Proposed Parking: 3 spaces

THE PROJECT:

The applicant has submitted plans entitled "APARTMENTS BUILDING REMODELING", as prepared by **Pavel Gonzalez PE** dated, signed, and sealed February 12, 2016.

The applicant is renovating an existing two-story MiMo residential building that currently contains four, spacious living units. The interior reconfiguration will yield six (6) standard size apartments—with no new square footage added to the property. In addition to the

renovation of the building, the applicant is proposing to provide three at-grade parking spaces facing Marseille Drive. Since the open area is considered the lot's required front yard, a variance to place the parking in this location is required.

The applicant is requesting the following variance(s):

1. A variance to reduce by 16'-7" the minimum required front setback of 20'-0" for at grade parking in order to construct parking spaces at 3'-5" from the front (south) property line.

- Variance requested from:

Sec. 142-156. Setback requirements.

The setback requirements for the RM-1 residential multifamily, low density district are as follows: At-grade parking lot on the same lot except where (c) below is applicable, Front: 20'-0". Minimum: 20'-0" | Proposed: 3'-5"

The applicant is retaining the existing contributing 1950s two-story MiMo building. This variance request is the minimum variance required in order to construct parking spaces for the new residential units and satisfy the design review criteria while preserving the existing structure. Staff maintains that the corner parcel location of the property and the retention and preservation of the existing contributing building on site creates a practical difficulty, thus requiring the variance.

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 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 inconsistent with the following sections of the City Code, in addition to the requested variance(s):

1. Provide a unit size table showing number of units and compliance with the minimum area requirements.

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 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:

A preliminary review of the project indicates that the proposed **residential** appears to be **consistent** with the Future Land Use Map of the 2025 Comprehensive Plan.

ACCESSIBILITY COMPLIANCE

Additional information will be required for a complete review for compliance with the Florida Building Code 2001 Edition, Section 11 (Florida Accessibility Code for Building Construction). These and all accessibility matters shall require final review and verification by the Building Department prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.

CONCURRENCY DETERMINATION:

In accordance with Chapter 122 of the Code of the City of Miami Beach, the Transportation and Concurrency Management Division has conducted a preliminary concurrency evaluation and determined that the project does not meet the City's concurrency requirements and level-of-service standards. However, the City's concurrency requirements can be achieved and satisfied through payment of mitigation fees or by entering into an enforceable development agreement with the City. The Transportation and Concurrency Management Division will make the determination of the project's fair-share mitigation cost.

A final concurrency determination shall be conducted prior to the issuance of a Building Permit. Mitigation fees and concurrency administrative costs shall be paid prior to the project receiving any Building Permit. Without exception, all concurrency fees shall be paid prior to the issuance of a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy or Certificate of Occupancy.

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 project requires a variance from the Design Review Board.
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 project requires a variance from the Design Review Board.
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.
Not Satisfied; the proposed project requires a variance from the Design Review Board.
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.
Not Satisfied; the proposed project requires a variance from the Design Review Board.
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 Applicable

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

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).

Not Satisfied; the proposed project requires a variance from the Design Review Board.

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 Satisfied; the mechanical equipment has not been identified. It shall be centrally located on a roofplan and screened from view.

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 Satisfied; trash rooms or allocated trash areas have not been identified.

STAFF ANALYSIS:
VARIANCE REVIEW

The existing contributing two-story building on the property is being retained, which creates practical difficulties that result in this variance request. Staff finds that this site condition meets the criteria for the granting of the variances to accommodate the renovation. The City of Miami Beach has often found that the retention and preservation of a contributing structure within a historic district as meeting the practical difficulties standard of the Charter.

For existing apartment buildings, which are classified as "contributing" and are located within either the Normandy Isles National Register District or the North Shore National Register District, and which are being substantially retained, preserved and restored, there is no parking requirement for the existing structure, and any addition up to a maximum of 2,500 square feet, whether attached or detached. Unfortunately, in this instance the subject site falls outside of the boundaries of both National Register Districts. It should be noted that this structure would likely be considered as 'contributing', as it is typical of the MiMo style of architecture of the time.

The original building, constructed in 1957, contains four, spacious two bedroom two bathroom units averaging approximately 1,100 square feet in size. The applicant is proposing to subdivide the building from four to six units without adding any additional square footage. The three spaces are a Code requirement for the creation of two new residential units (1.5 spaces per unit).

The applicant is proposing to utilize concrete pavers for the parking area and install shrubbery along the perimeter. Staff has no objection to the requests and recommends approval of the variances as proposed.

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

F:\PLAN\DRB\DRB16\04-05-2016\APR16 Staff Reports\DRB 23227 2015 Marseille Drive.APR16.doc

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
City of Miami Beach, Florida

MEETING DATE: April 5, 2016

FILE NO: 23227

PROPERTY: **2015 Marseille Drive**
Parking Improvements

APPLICANT: City M Marseille II LLC

LEGAL: Lot 2 less eastern 10'-0" of Block 34 of "Isle of Normandy Miami View Section", according to Plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book 40, Page 33, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

IN RE: The Application for Design Review Approval for the exterior modifications to an existing two-story residential building including a variance to reduce the minimum required front setback for at-grade parking in order to construct three parking spaces in the front yard facing Marseille Drive.

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 inconsistent with Design Review Criteria 2, 3, 5, 6, 12, 14 and 17 in Section 118-251 of the Miami Beach Code.

- C. The project would be 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 project at 2015 Marseille Drive shall be submitted to and approved by staff; at a minimum, such drawings shall incorporate the following:
 - a. The existing structure on site shall be fully renovated and restored, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Design Review Criteria and/or the directions from the Board.
 - b. The existing doors of the existing structure shall be removed; new full view impact doors be provided that is consistent with the with the architectural style of the building, 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 existing windows of the existing structure shall be removed; new casement windows shall be provided and shall incorporate a muntin configuration that is consistent with the with the architectural style of the building, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Design Review Criteria and/or the directions from the Board.
 - d. No fencing shall be permitted within the front yard. Any fencing to secure the property shall be flush with the building facades in order to open the front landscape areas to the street and shall not be permitted within the provided front yard setbacks in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Design Review Criteria and/or the directions from the Board.
 - e. The proposed project shall comply with the minimum and average unit size requirements for a renovated residential building in the RM-1 Zoning District.
 - f. 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.
 - g. 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.
 - h. 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. The existing walkway along the western side of the building and parallel to the sidewalk shall be eliminated in order to expand the amount of landscape area.
 - e. 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.
 - f. The use of sod in the south yard shall not be permitted, instead a low lying ground cover shall be installed, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Design Review Criteria and/or the directions from the Board.
 - 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. The applicant filed an application with the Planning Department for the following variance(s):
 - 1. A variance to reduce by 16'-7" the minimum required front setback of 20'-0" for at grade parking in order to construct parking spaces at 3'-5" from the front (south) property line.
- 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 hereby grants the requested variance(s) and 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. The final building plans shall meet all other requirements of the Land Development Regulations of the City Code.

- C. The Final Order shall be recorded in the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.
- 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 "APARTMENTS BUILDING REMODELING", as prepared by **Pavel Gonzalez PE** 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

