

# MIAMI BEACH

## PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Staff Report & Recommendation

Historic Preservation Board

TO: Chairperson and Members  
Historic Preservation Board

DATE: September 8, 2015

FROM: Thomas R. Mooney, AICP  
Planning Director



SUBJECT: HPB File No. 7559, **6084 Collins Avenue.**

The applicant, Harding Hotel, LLC, is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a new ground level swimming pool, including variances to reduce the required front setback for a pool, pool deck and paving for driveway.

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Approval with conditions

### EXISTING STRUCTURES

#### **Lot 1 – Mt. Vernon Hotel**

Local Historic District:	North Beach Resort
Status:	Contributing
Original Construction Date:	1946
Original Architect:	J.J. De Brita & A. Kononoff

#### **Lots 24 & 25 – Monticello (Harding) Hotel**

Local Historic District:	North Beach Resort
Status:	Contributing
Original Construction Date:	1946
Original Architect:	J.J. De Brita & A. Kononoff

### ZONING / SITE DATA

Legal Description:	Lot 1 & Lots 22 through 25, Lyle G Hall Subdivision, According to the Plat Thereof, as Recorded in Plat Book 40, Page 5, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.
--------------------	---

Zoning:	RM-2, Residential Multifamily, Medium Intensity
Future Land Use Designation:	RM-2, Residential Multifamily, Medium Intensity
Lot Size:	12,774 S.F.
Existing Use/Condition:	Hotel
Proposed Use:	Same

## **THE PROJECT**

The applicant has submitted plans entitled “Harding Hotel” as prepared by JD Engineering & Construction Corp., signed and sealed July 22, 2015.

**The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the introduction of a new ground level swimming pool and a variance to reduce the required front setback for driveway and variances from the required front setback for a pool and pool deck.**

The applicant is requesting the following variance(s):

1. A variance to eliminate all required front setback of 20' for parking to retain an existing driveway encroaching the front yard of the property.

- Variance requested from:

**Sec. 142-218. Setback requirements.**

*The setback requirements in the RM-2 residential multifamily, medium intensity district are as follows:*

*At-grade parking lot on the same lot except where (c) below is applicable, Front: 20 feet*

The property is a unified hotel development that includes 4 buildings constructed between 1940 and 1946. As part of the proposed improvements, the applicant is seeking to retain an existing driveway located at the corner of Indian Creek and 63<sup>rd</sup> Street. This driveway, within the Public Right of Way also extends into the front yard of the property. A front setback variance is required to retain the portion located within the property.

The existing contributing buildings will be restored and considering that the open space of the property, is very limited, staff has no objection to this request which will benefit the operation of the hotel development. However, the applicant would have to obtain approval from all governmental agencies having jurisdiction in order to repair or reconstruct this driveway when is primarily within the public-right-of-way.

2. A variance to exceed by 62.5% (12'-6") the maximum allowable projection of 25% (5'-0") of the required front yard in order to construct the pool deck with 87.5% projection in the front yard at 2'-6" from the front property line.

- Variance requested from:

*(o) Projections. In all districts, every part of a required yard shall be open to the sky, except as authorized by these land development regulations. The following may project into a required yard for a distance not to exceed 25 percent of the required yard up to a maximum projection of six feet, unless otherwise noted.*

*(6) Porches, platforms and terraces (up to 30 inches above the elevation of the lot, as defined in subsection 142-105(a)(1)e.*

A pool is proposed as a new amenity for the hotel development serving guests of all four structures. Because all buildings will be restored and retained, the pool is located in the only location that would allow its construction without affecting the existing buildings. A deck could project up to 25% of the front 20 feet of setback or 5'-0". The proposed pool deck is setback only 2'-6" from the front property line for 87.5% of projection. Landscape is proposed along the

front to reduce visibility from the street as required by the City Code.

Staff is supportive of this variance because it is the minimum necessary in order to provide a pool deck for the hotel and not adversely impact the existing contributing buildings. However, staff recommends that the proposed paving around the site and in front of the porch at the main entrance be substantially reduced to provide more landscape area, subject to the review and approval of staff.

3. A variance to reduce by 5'-0" the minimum required front setback of 20'-0", in order to construct a pool at 15'-0" from the front property line.

- Variance requested from:

**Sec. 142-1133. Swimming pools.**

*This section applies to swimming pools in all districts, except where specified. Accessory swimming pools, open and enclosed, or covered by a screen enclosure, or screen enclosure not covering a swimming pool, may only occupy a required rear or side yard, provided:*

**Sec. 142-218. Setback requirements.**

*The setback requirements in the RM-2 residential multifamily, medium intensity district are as follows:*

*Front pedestal: 20 feet*

A pool is not permitted within the front 20 feet of the property. Pools can only be located in the rear or side yards of a commercial property. In this case, the rear and side yards would not allow the construction of the proposed pool. The limitations on the available open space on the site and the existing buildings to be retained are special conditions that contribute to the request of this variance. Staff recommends approval of the variance based on the existing site conditions that would impose unnecessary hardship for the applicant unless a variance to construct the pool in the front is granted.

**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. **In this case the requested variances are necessary in order to satisfy the Certificate of Appropriateness criteria and to not adversely impact the existing contributing buildings.**

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. The applicant shall obtain all applicable permits and approvals from all agencies having jurisdiction on the portion of the property containing the front driveway.
2. The deck extending up to the front property line in front of the main entrance exceeds the maximum projection for paving and would have to be reduced, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff.

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 2025 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

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

**COMPLIANCE WITH CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CRITERIA:**

A decision on an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness shall be based upon the following:

- I. Evaluation of the compatibility of the physical alteration or improvement with surrounding properties and where applicable, compliance with the following criteria pursuant to Section 118-564(a)(1) of the Miami Beach Code (it is recommended that the listed criteria be found Satisfied, Not Satisfied or Not Applicable, as so noted):
  - a. The Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings as revised from time to time.  
**Satisfied**

- b. Other guidelines/policies/plans adopted or approved by Resolution or Ordinance by the City Commission.  
**Satisfied**
- II. In determining whether a particular application is compatible with surrounding properties, the Board shall consider the following criteria pursuant to Section 118-564(a)(2) of the Miami Beach Code (it is recommended that the listed criteria be found Satisfied, Not Satisfied or Not Applicable, as so noted):
- a. Exterior architectural features.  
**Satisfied**
  - b. General design, scale, massing and arrangement.  
**Satisfied**
  - c. Texture and material and color.  
**Not Satisfied**  
**Material samples for the pool deck pavers have not been submitted.**
  - d. The relationship of a, b, c, above, to other structures and features of the district.  
**Satisfied**
  - e. The purpose for which the district was created.  
**Satisfied**
  - f. The relationship of the size, design and siting of any new or reconstructed structure to the landscape of the district.  
**Satisfied**
  - g. An historic resources report, containing all available data and historic documentation regarding the building, site or feature.  
**Satisfied**
  - h. The original architectural design or any subsequent modifications that have acquired significance.  
**Satisfied**
- III. The examination of architectural drawings for consistency with the criteria pursuant to Section 118-564(a)(3) of the Miami Beach Code and stated below, with regard to the aesthetics, appearances, safety, and function of any new or existing structure, public interior space and physical attributes of the project in relation to the site, adjacent structures and properties, and surrounding community. The criteria referenced above are as follows (it is recommended that the listed criteria be found Satisfied, Not Satisfied or Not Applicable, as so noted):
- a. 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**

- b. 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**  
**Variances have been requested to reduce the minimum front yard setback.**
- c. The color, design, surface finishes and selection of landscape materials and architectural elements of the exterior of all buildings and structures and primary public interior areas for developments requiring a building permit in areas of the city identified in section 118-503.  
**Satisfied**
- d. The proposed structure, and/or additions to an existing structure is appropriate to and compatible with the environment and adjacent structures, and enhances the appearance of the surrounding properties, or the purposes for which the district was created.  
**Satisfied**
- e. The design and layout of the proposed site plan, as well as all new and existing buildings and public interior spaces 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 preserving historic character of the neighborhood and district, contiguous and adjacent buildings and lands, pedestrian sight lines and view corridors.  
**Satisfied**
- f. 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 any driveways and parking spaces are usable, safely and conveniently arranged and have a minimal impact on pedestrian circulation throughout the site. Access to the site from adjacent roads shall be designed so as to interfere as little as possible with vehicular traffic flow on these roads and pedestrian movement onto and within the site, as well as permit both pedestrians and vehicles a safe ingress and egress to the site.  
**Satisfied**
- g. 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 and consistent with a City master plan, where applicable.  
**Not Satisfied**  
**A lighting plan for the pool area has not been submitted.**
- h. Landscape and paving materials shall be reviewed to ensure an adequate relationship with and enhancement of the overall site plan design.  
**Satisfied**

- i. 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**
- j. Any proposed new structure shall have 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**
- k. All buildings shall have, to the greatest extent possible, space in that part of the ground floor fronting a sidewalk, 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 sidewalk street, or streets shall have residential or commercial spaces, or shall have the appearance of being a residential or commercial space or shall have an architectural treatment which shall buffer the appearance of a parking structure from the surrounding area and is integrated with the overall appearance of the project.  
**Satisfied**
- l. All buildings shall have an appropriate and fully integrated rooftop architectural treatment which substantially screens all mechanical equipment, stairs and elevator towers.  
**Satisfied**
- m. Any 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**
- n. All portions of a project fronting a street or sidewalk shall incorporate an amount of transparency at the first level necessary to achieve pedestrian compatibility.  
**Satisfied**
- o. 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.  
**Satisfied**

### **ANALYSIS**

Staff would note that on March 11, 2014, the Historic Preservation Board reviewed and approved the partial demolition, renovation and restoration of the existing Mt. Vernon Hotel including the construction of a new rooftop addition, as part of a single building development project (HPB File 7410). Since that time that property has been sold. The current owner has also acquired the adjacent Harding Hotel site and two properties located immediately to the south of the Harding Hotel site along Indian Creek Drive.

The subject site currently includes four individual parcels that have been combined through a unity of title. Two of these parcels contain the Mt. Vernon and Harding Hotels, both listed as 'Contributing' structures within the North Beach Resort Local Historic District. The other two parcels are not located within any local historic district.

Since the properties were sold, the owner has applied for and obtained building permits for the renovation of both 'Contributing' buildings. Staff would also note that at this time, the current owner is not contemplating the construction of the rooftop addition previously approved for the Mount Vernon Hotel.

As part of the redevelopment of these properties, the applicant is currently proposing to construct a new swimming pool within the existing Harding Hotel courtyard fronting on Indian Creek Drive, along with new perimeter fencing, hardscape, and landscaping. Staff is confident that the introduction of the swimming pool in this location will not have any adverse impact on either of the 'Contributing' buildings or the surrounding historic district, as it has been sited in manner that will not obscure any of the significant architectural features of the Harding Hotel.

### **Variance Analysis**

The site contains 4 buildings with non-conforming front, side and rear setbacks. The buildings did not have a pool as originally constructed and vehicular access to the site is very limited. Only the two contributing buildings have the space for vehicular pick-up and drop-off. Variances for the front driveway and a new pool and pool deck are requested as part of the improvements to the property.

Staff recommends approval of variances number 1, number 2 and number 3 as these are the minimum variances possible to make a reasonable use of the property with a pool and driveway and preserve the existing buildings.

Staff is extremely enthusiastic with regard to the proposed restoration of the historic Mt. Vernon and Harding Hotels and looks forward to seeing new life and activity at these highly visible but long-vacant properties.

### **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 Certificate of Appropriateness criteria and Practical Difficulty and Hardship criteria, as applicable.

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
City of Miami Beach, Florida**

MEETING DATE: September 8, 2015

FILE NO: 7559

PROPERTY: 6084 Collins Avenue

APPLICANT: Harding Hotel, LLC.

LEGAL: Lot 1, Lyle G Hall Subdivision, According to the Plat Thereof, as Recorded in Plat Book 40, Page 5, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

IN RE: The Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a new ground pool including variances to reduce the required front setback for driveway and variances from the required front setback for a pool and pool deck.

**ORDER**

The City of Miami Beach Historic Preservation 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:

**In accordance with Section 118-537, the applicant, the owner(s) of the subject property, the City Manager, Miami Design Preservation League, Dade Heritage Trust, or an affected person may appeal the Board's decision on a Certificate of Appropriateness to a special master appointed by the City Commission.**

**I. Certificate of Appropriateness**

- A. The subject site is located within the North Beach Resort Local Historic District.
- 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:

1. Is consistent with the Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria in Section 118-564(a)(1) of the Miami Beach Code.
  2. Is not consistent with Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria 'c' in Section 118-564(a)(2) of the Miami Beach Code.
  3. Is not consistent with Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria 'b' & 'g' in Section 118-564(a)(3) of the Miami Beach Code.
- C. The project would be consistent with the criteria and requirements of section 118-564 if the following conditions are met:
1. Revised elevation, site plan and floor plan drawings shall be submitted and, at a minimum, such drawings shall incorporate the following:
    - a. Any proposed fence shall be aluminum picket. The final design, details and location of the fence shall be submitted, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria and/or the directions from the Board.
    - b. Final design and details for the proposed pool deck, including material samples shall be submitted, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria and/or the directions from the Board.
    - c. The existing structures on site shall be fully renovated and restored, in a manner consistent with available historical documentation, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria and/or the directions from the Board.
  2. A revised landscape plan, prepared by a Professional Landscape Architect, registered in the State of Florida, 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. The utilization of root barriers and/or Silva Cells, as applicable, shall be clearly delineated on the final revised landscape plan.
    - b. 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.

## II. Variance(s)

- A. The applicant filed an application with the Planning Department for the following variance(s):

1. A variance to eliminate all required front setback of 20' for parking to retain an existing driveway encroaching the front yard of the property.
  2. A variance to exceed by 62.5% (12'-6") the maximum allowable projection of 25% (5'-0") of the required front yard in order to construct the pool deck with 87.5% projection in the front yard at 2'-6" from the front property line.
  3. A variance to reduce by 5'-0" the minimum required front setback of 20'-0", in order to construct a pool at 15'-0" from the front 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 condition 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.
2. In order to retain the existing driveway in the public right-of-way in front of the property all necessary permits and approvals from all agencies having jurisdiction shall be obtained.
3. Paving in the front yard located in front of the hotel main entrance shall be reduced, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff.

**III. General Terms and Conditions applying to both 'I. Certificate of Appropriateness' 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 an 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 applicant shall submit a Hold Harmless Covenant Running with the Land to the City Attorney's Office in a form acceptable to the City Attorney indemnifying and holding harmless the city against any claim or loss in the event of an accident involving a motor vehicle or other instrumentality due to the proximity of the pool to the adjacent right-of-ways.
- D. Applicant agrees that in the event Code Compliance receives complaints of unreasonably loud noise from mechanical and/or electrical equipment, and determines the complaints to be valid, even if the equipment is operating pursuant to manufacturer specifications, the applicant shall take such steps to mitigate the noise with noise attenuating materials as reviewed and verified by an acoustic engineer, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Certificate of Appropriateness 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. The Final Order shall be recorded in the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.
- G. 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.

- H. 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.
- I. The conditions of approval herein are binding on the applicant, the property's owners, operators, and all successors in interest and assigns.
- J. 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 "Harding Hotel" as prepared by JD Engineering & Construction Corp., signed and sealed July 22, 2015, as approved by the Historic Preservation 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\_\_.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
THE CITY OF MIAMI BEACH, FLORIDA

BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
DEBORAH TACKETT  
PRESERVATION AND DESIGN 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 Tackett, Preservation and Design 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 Historic Preservation Board on \_\_\_\_\_ (                    ) )