MIAMIBEACH
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
Staff Report & Recommendation

Design Review Board

TO: DRB Chairperson and Members

DATE: October 06, 2015

FROM: Thomas R. Mooney, AICP
Planning Director

SUBJECT: Design Review File No. 23190
1000 West Avenue – Mirador South

The applicant, Mirador 1000 Condominium Association, is requesting Design Review Approval for façade modifications of an existing sixteen-story building. Specifically, to replace concrete balcony railings on all sides of the building with glass railings.

Recommendation:
Modified Approval with conditions

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
The South 150' of Lot 9 and all of Lot 10, Block 80, a subdivision of Block Eighty of the Alton Beach Realty Company, A part of the Alton Beach Bay Front Subdivision , According to the Plat Thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 6 at Page 12, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

HISTORY:
On July 07, 2015, the application was continued to the September 01, 2015 meeting at the request of the Board for alternative designs of the proposed balcony replacement. At the September 01, 2015 meeting the applicant requested a second continuance in order to work with the condominium owners.

SITE DATA:
Zoning: RM-3
Future Land Use: RM

EXISTING STRUCTURE:
Sixteen-story multifamily building (1965 Melvin Grossman)

LAND USES:
East: Vacant and five-story multifamily building
North: Fourteen-story multifamily building (Mondrian Hotel)
South: Fourteen-story multifamily building (Southgate Towers)
West: Biscayne Bay

THE PROJECT:
The applicant has submitted revised plans and renderings entitled "Mirador 1000 West Avenue Balcony Design Proposal" as prepared by design architects **Gonzalez Architecture** signed, sealed and dated July 27, 2015.

The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing concrete portion of existing balcony railings throughout the building, and replace same with glass railings and a metal panel component.

COMPLIANCE WITH ZONING CODE:
A preliminary review of the project indicates that the application, as proposed, appears to be consistent with the City Code. The above noted comments shall not be considered final zoning review or approval. These and all zoning matters shall require final review and verification by the Zoning Administrator prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.

COMPLIANCE WITH DESIGN REVIEW CRITERIA:
Design Review encompasses the examination of architectural drawings for consistency with the criteria stated below with regard to the aesthetics, appearances, safety, and function of the structure or proposed structures in relation to the site, adjacent structures and surrounding community. Staff recommends that the following criteria are found to be satisfied, not satisfied or not applicable, as hereto indicated:

1. The existing and proposed conditions of the lot, including but not necessarily limited to topography, vegetation, trees, drainage, and waterways.
   Satisfied

2. The location of all existing and proposed buildings, drives, parking spaces, walkways, means of ingress and egress, drainage facilities, utility services, landscaping structures, signs, and lighting and screening devices.
   Satisfied

3. The dimensions of all buildings, structures, setbacks, parking spaces, floor area ratio, height, lot coverage and any other information that may be reasonably necessary to determine compliance with the requirements of the underlying zoning district, and any applicable overlays, for a particular application or project.
   Satisfied

4. The color, design, selection of landscape materials and architectural elements of Exterior Building surfaces and primary public interior areas for Developments requiring a Building Permit in areas of the City identified in section 118-252.
   Not Satisfied; See Staff Analysis

5. The proposed site plan, and the location, appearance and design of new and existing Buildings and Structures are in conformity with the standards of this Ordinance and other applicable ordinances, architectural and design guidelines as adopted and amended periodically by the Design Review Board and Historic Preservation Boards, and all pertinent master plans.
   Satisfied

6. The proposed Structure, and/or additions or modifications to an existing structure, indicates a sensitivity to and is compatible with the environment and adjacent Structures, and enhances the appearance of the surrounding properties.
   Satisfied

7. The design and layout of the proposed site plan, as well as all new and existing buildings shall be reviewed so as to provide an efficient arrangement of land uses. Particular attention shall be given to safety, crime prevention and fire protection, relationship to the

surrounding neighborhood, impact on contiguous and adjacent Buildings and lands, pedestrian sight lines and view corridors.
Not Applicable

8. Pedestrian and vehicular traffic movement within and adjacent to the site shall be reviewed to ensure that clearly defined, segregated pedestrian access to the site and all buildings is provided for and that all parking spaces are usable and are safely and conveniently arranged; pedestrian furniture and bike racks shall be considered. Access to the Site from adjacent roads shall be designed so as to interfere as little as possible with traffic flow on these roads and to permit vehicles a rapid and safe ingress and egress to the Site.
Not Applicable

9. Lighting shall be reviewed to ensure safe movement of persons and vehicles and reflection on public property for security purposes and to minimize glare and reflection on adjacent properties. Lighting shall be reviewed to assure that it enhances the appearance of structures at night.
Not Applicable

10. Landscape and paving materials shall be reviewed to ensure an adequate relationship with and enhancement of the overall Site Plan design.
Not Applicable

11. Buffering materials shall be reviewed to ensure that headlights of vehicles, noise, and light from structures are adequately shielded from public view, adjacent properties and pedestrian areas.
Not Applicable

12. The proposed structure has an orientation and massing which is sensitive to and compatible with the building site and surrounding area and which creates or maintains important view corridor(s).
Not Applicable

13. The building has, where feasible, space in that part of the ground floor fronting a street or streets which is to be occupied for residential or commercial uses; likewise, the upper floors of the pedestal portion of the proposed building fronting a street, or streets shall have residential or commercial spaces, shall have the appearance of being a residential or commercial space or shall have an architectural treatment which shall buffer the appearance of the parking structure from the surrounding area and is integrated with the overall appearance of the project.
Not Applicable

14. The building shall have an appropriate and fully integrated rooftop architectural treatment which substantially screens all mechanical equipment, stairs and elevator towers.
Not Applicable

15. An addition on a building site shall be designed, sited and massed in a manner which is sensitive to and compatible with the existing improvement(s).
Not Applicable

16. All portions of a project fronting a street or sidewalk shall incorporate an architecturally appropriate amount of transparency at the first level in order to achieve pedestrian compatibility and adequate visual interest.
Not Applicable

17. The location, design, screening and buffering of all required service bays, delivery bays, trash and refuse receptacles, as well as trash rooms shall be arranged so as to have a minimal impact on adjacent properties.
Not Applicable

STAFF ANALYSIS:

On July 07, 2015, the application was continued to the September 01, 2015 meeting at the request of the Board for alternative designs of the proposed balcony replacement. The applicant had requested a second continuance to the October 15th meeting in order to work with the condominium owners on the design. Although staff would prefer to maintain the original balcony designs throughout the buildings, it is understandable that the applicant would want to replace the concrete railing balconies on the predominately western facing elevations of the buildings with glass railings in order to take advantage of Bay views. Consequently, staff does not object to the proposed glass railing replacements on the waterside building elevations which do not face the street.

However, on the east elevations the solid balconies act as important framing elements to the central expanse of glazing, and staff believes that replacing these balconies is not beneficial to the defining architectural character of these elevations of the existing buildings. As most of the existing balconies are located on the west elevations where they are not visible from West Avenue, this will have a limited impact on the applicant's proposal.

Staff had previously recommended that those portions of the balconies containing solid concrete incorporate a matte finished white glass panel in order to break up the scale of the building and evoke the original design of the balconies. Now the applicant is proposing a solid raised metal panel, in a powder coated white, along those portions of the balconies containing solid concrete that face West Avenue, in order to break up the scale of the building and evoke the original design of the balconies, and more importantly, to maintain the depth and shadow lines of the original design.

Staff has concerns with the maintenance of the proposed glass and metal panel systems. The practicality of cleaning and replacing components where the metal panels are applied in front of the glass railings pose a potential conflict and a future problematic situation for the condominium.

Further, the installation of such panels, over time, has proven to be problematic from a long term attachment standpoint on other hi-rise condominium buildings in the City. Staff would suggest that a future maintenance and structural problem not be built into this approval. Finally, staff recommends that the previous version that consisted of clear glass railings with a matte finished white glass in areas that were previously concrete be approved for the waterside (west) elevation and staff would recommend that the concrete railings remain along all elevations that face the street (east).

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/or Practical Difficulty and Hardship criteria.

TRM/JGM

F:\PLAN\$DRB\DRB15\10-06-2015\OCT Staff Reports\DRB 23190 1000 West Ave.OCT15.doc

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
City of Miami Beach, Florida

MEETING DATE: October 06, 2015

FILE NO: 23190

PROPERTY: **1000 West Avenue – Mirador South**

APPLICANT: Mirador 1000 Condominium Association

LEGAL: The South 150' of Lot 9 and all of Lot 10, Block 80, a subdivision of Block Eighty of the Alton Beach Realty Company, A part of the Alton Beach Bay Front Subdivision , According to the Plat Thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 6 at Page 12, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

IN RE: The Application for Design Review Approval for façade modifications of an existing sixteen-story building. Specifically, to replace concrete balcony railings on all sides of the building with glass railings.

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 4 in Section 118-251 of the Miami Beach Code.

C. The project would remain consistent with the criteria and requirements of section 118-251 if the following conditions are met:

1. Revised elevation, site plan and floor plan drawings shall be submitted to and approved by staff; at a minimum, such drawings shall incorporate the following:

   a. On the east elevations where the solid balconies act as framing elements to the central expanse of glazing, glass railings shall not be permitted.

   b. On the other non-street front facing elevations where the balconies currently contain concrete railings, those portions shall incorporate a matte finished white glass panel, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff.

   c. Fully and carefully designed details for the proposed balconies shall be submitted; the method of railing connection to the slab, as well material finishes and dimensions shall be provided, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff.

   d. Color samples for the glass railing shall be submitted for the review and approval of staff.

   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. No variance(s) were filed as part of this application.

III. General Terms and Conditions applying to both 'I. *Design Review Approval* and 'II. *Variances'* noted above.

A. 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.

DRAFT

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 "Mirador 1000 West Avenue Balcony Design Proposal" as prepared by design architects **Gonzalez Architecture** signed, sealed and dated July 27, 2015, 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

DRAFT

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 _____ ( )