

# MIAMI BEACH

## PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Staff Report & Recommendation

Historic Preservation Board

TO: Chairperson and Members  
Historic Preservation Board

DATE: November 10, 2015

FROM: Thomas R. Mooney, AICP  
Planning Director



SUBJECT: HPB File No. 7580, **3193 Royal Palm Avenue.**

The applicant, Adam Greenberg, is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the partial demolition of the existing individually designated historic 2-story single family home and the construction of a partial 1-story rooftop addition.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Approval with conditions

### **EXISTING STRUCTURE**

Status:	Historic Single Family Home
Original Construction Date:	1934
Original Architect:	L. Murray Dixon

The single-family residence at 3193 Royal Palm Avenue is an excellent example of the Streamline Moderne style of architecture. The distinctive two story residence is characterized by an asymmetric street façade with flat roof, articulated chimney and strong horizontal massing accentuated at the ground level by continuous horizontal banding. The second level of the structure is set back on three sides creating a roof deck with ships railings, recalling the deck of an ocean liner. Three vertical glazing bays with recessed panels above characterize the north elevation of second level. Shortly after the original house was built, two additions designed by architect David T. Ellis in keeping with the Streamline Moderne style, were constructed. In 1937 a semi-circular living room with seven vertical window bays was constructed at the north-west corner of the home. In 1938 a two car garage with distinctive port-hole window, was added at the east end of the home.

### **BACKGROUND**

On April 13, 2010, the Historic Preservation Board reviewed and approved a request for the individual designation of the single-family property located at 3193 Royal Palm Avenue as an historic structure. At the same meeting the Board reviewed and approved a Certificate of Appropriateness for the partial demolition, renovation and restoration of the existing home and the construction of a new addition (HPB File No. 7070).

Subsequent to the approval of the application, a building permit (B1100804) was issued for the interior and exterior renovation and restoration of the existing single family home. The following improvements were completed in 2012:

- Removal of non-original exterior broken tile
- Restoration of fluted panels located above the second story window and door openings.
- Door and window replacement
- Replacement of all HVAC, plumbing and electrical systems
- Roof replacement
- Interior renovation

At that time, the property owner decided to eliminate the construction of the rooftop addition from the scope of work.

**ZONING / SITE DATA**

Legal Description: Lot 13 in Block 45 of Orchard Subdivision No. 1, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 6 at Page 111 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

Zoning: RS-4, Residential, Single Family  
Future Land Use Designation: RS, Residential, Single Family  
Lot Size: 7,451 S.F.  
Existing Lot Coverage: 2,116 S.F. / 28.4%  
Proposed Lot Coverage: 2,116 S.F. / 28.4%  
Existing Unit Size: 2116 S.F. / 28.4%  
Proposed Unit Size: 3,286 S.F. / 44.0%

Lot Coverage  
Existing: 2,116 S.F. / 28.4%  
Proposed: 2,116 S.F. / 28.4%  
Maximum: 2,980 S.F. / 40.0%

Unit size:  
Existing: 2,754 SF / 37.0%  
Proposed: 3,277 S.F. / 44.0%  
Maximum: 4,470 S.F. / 60.0%

2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Volume to 1<sup>st</sup>: 54.9%

Height:  
Existing: 17'-3" / 2-stories  
Proposed: 19'-5" / 2-stories  
Maximum: 24'-0" / 2-stories

Existing Use: Single Family  
Proposed Use: No Change

**THE PROJECT**

The applicant has submitted plans titled "Greenberg Residence", as prepared by Mossdrop Associates, dated 09-21-15.

**The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the partial demolition of the existing individually designated historic 2-story single family home and the construction of a partial 1-story rooftop addition.**

**CONSISTENCY WITH 2025 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

A preliminary review of the project indicates that the existing **single family residential use is consistent** with the Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan.

**COMPLIANCE WITH ZONING CODE**

A preliminary review of the project indicates that the application, with the exception of the variances requested herein, 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 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.  
**Not Satisfied**  
**Although the majority of significant architectural features of the historic home have been restored, the existing pipe railing located at the roof terrace is proposed to be replaced with a new glass railing that is inconsistent with the Streamline Moderne style of architecture.**
  - 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.  
**Partially Satisfied**  
**Although the proposed rooftop addition has been designed in a manner which complements the historic structure, the proposed glass railings at the roof terrace are inconsistent with the Streamline Moderne architecture.**
  - b. General design, scale, massing and arrangement.

**Satisfied**

**The proposed rooftop addition has been designed in a manner which is compatible to the proportion, scale, and massing, directional emphasis, rhythm of openings and materials of the historic structure.**

- c. Texture and material and color.

**Satisfied**

- d. The relationship of a, b, c, above, to other structures and features of the district.

**Not Applicable**

**The subject property is not located within any local historic district.**

- e. The purpose for which the district was created.

**Not Applicable**

**The subject property is not located within any local historic district.**

- f. The relationship of the size, design and siting of any new or reconstructed structure to the landscape of the district.

**Not Applicable**

**The subject property is not located within any local historic district.**

- 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.

**Not Satisfied**

**Although the majority of significant architectural features of the historic home have been restored, the existing pipe railing located at the roof terrace is proposed to be replaced with new glass railings that are inconsistent with the Streamline Moderne style of architecture.**

- 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.

**Satisfied**

- 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**

**The proposed rooftop addition has been designed in a manner which complements the historic structure.**

- 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**

**The proposed addition will have no adverse impact on pedestrian sight lines or view corridors.**

- 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.

**Satisfied**

- 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.

**Not Applicable**

- 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**

**The proposed addition has been setback approximately 74'-0" from the front property line and approximately 21'-0" from the street facing side.**

- 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.

**Not Applicable**

**Rooftop mechanical equipment is not proposed**

- 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**

**The proposed addition has been setback approximately 74'-0" from the front property line and approximately 21'-0" from the street facing side.**

**Further, the addition oriented in a manner which minimizes its impact on the historic structure.**

- 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.

**Not Applicable**

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR DEMOLITION EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Section 118-564 (f)(4) of the Land Development Regulations of the Miami Beach Code provides criteria by which the Historic Preservation Board evaluates requests for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition. The following is an analysis of the request based upon these criteria:

1. The Building, Structure, Improvement, or Site is designated on either a national or state level as a part of an Historic Preservation District or as a Historic Architectural Landmark

or Site, or is designated pursuant to Division 4, Article X, Chapter 118 of the Miami Beach Code as a Historic Building, Historic Structure or Historic Site, Historic Improvement, Historic Landscape Feature, historic interior or the Structure is of such historic/architectural interest or quality that it would reasonably meet national, state or local criteria for such designation.

**Satisfied**

**The existing structure is individually designated as an Historic Single Family Home.**

2. The Building, Structure, Improvement, or Site is of such design, craftsmanship, or material that it could be reproduced only with great difficulty and/or expense.

**Satisfied**

**The existing structure would be difficult and inordinately expensive to reproduce.**

3. The Building, Structure, Improvement, or Site is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the country, or the region, or is a distinctive example of an architectural or design style which contributes to the character of the district.

**Satisfied**

**The existing single family home is one of the last remaining examples of its kind.**

4. The building, structure, improvement, or site is a contributing building, structure, improvement, site or landscape feature rather than a noncontributing building, structure, improvement, site or landscape feature in a historic district as defined in section 114-1, or is an architecturally significant feature of a public area of the interior of a historic or contributing building.

**Not Applicable**

**The subject structure is not located within any local historic district and contains no public interior areas.**

5. Retention of the Building, Structure, Improvement, Landscape Feature or Site promotes the general welfare of the City by providing an opportunity for study of local history, architecture, and design or by developing an understanding of the importance and value of a particular culture and heritage.

**Satisfied**

**The retention of the subject structure is critical to developing an understanding of an important Miami Beach architectural style.**

6. If the proposed demolition is for the purpose of constructing a parking garage, the Board shall consider it if the parking garage is designed in a manner that is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, U.S. Department of the Interior (1983), as amended, and/or the design review guidelines for that particular district.

**Not Applicable**

**The partial demolition proposed in the subject application is not for the purpose of constructing a parking garage.**

7. In the event an applicant or property owner proposes the total demolition of a contributing structure, historic structure or architecturally significant feature, there shall be definite plans presented to the board for the reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is approved and carried out.

**Not Applicable**

**The applicant is not proposing the total demolition of the home.**

8. The Dade County Unsafe Structures Board has ordered the demolition of a Structure without option.

**Not Applicable**

**The Miami-Dade County Unsafe Structures Board has not ordered the demolition of any part of the subject building.**

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

The existing historic single family home on the subject site was constructed in 1934 and designed by architect L. Murray Dixon in the Streamline Moderne style of architecture. The applicant is proposing to construct a 523 square foot, 1-story rooftop addition that will serve as a new master bedroom.

Many alterations to the home had been made over the years, which had diminished the sleek streamline character of the original architecture. Fortunately an early photo from 1934 was found, and the applicant was able to substantially restore the homes original features, including the removal of non-original exterior broken tile and the restoration of fluted panels located above the second story window and door openings.

The proposed rooftop addition will expand the existing second story, and has been well designed in a manner that is complimentary to the home's original architecture yet slightly differentiated to distinguish itself as an addition. Further, staff would note that the lot coverage and unit size proposed for the site are 28.4% and 44.0%, respectively. Both of these percentages are well below the maximum permitted by Code.

In order to accommodate the new addition, the applicant is requesting approval for the demolition of an existing concrete eyebrow located on the east façade of the existing 2-story portion of the home. It is unclear if this architectural feature is part of the original design of the home. No original plans have been found within the City's Building Department records. However, an early postcard of the house depicts what appears to be a pipe and canvas awning in this location.

Staff has only one minor concern with the proposed project with regard to the proposed railing replacement at the roof terrace. The existing railing strongly recalls the original ships railing shown in historical documentation. This significant architectural feature references the railing design often found on the decks of ocean liners during the 1930s. Staff believes that the proposed glass replacement railings are inconsistent with the Streamline Moderne style of architecture, and would recommend that any replacement railing be as close as possible to the original railing design. Staff is confident this minor change can be addressed administratively and recommends approval as stated below.

**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.

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

MEETING DATE: November 10, 2015

FILE NO: 7580

PROPERTY: 3193 Royal Palm Avenue

APPLICANT: Adam Greenberg

LEGAL: Lot 13 in Block 45 of Orchard Subdivision No. 1, according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 6 at Page 111 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida.

IN RE: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the partial demolition of the existing individually designated historic 2-story single family home and the construction of a partial 1-story rooftop addition.

**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:

**I. Certificate of Appropriateness**

- A. The subject structure is individually designated as an Historic Single Family Home.
- 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 not consistent with the Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria 'a' in Section 118-564(a)(1) of the Miami Beach Code.
  2. Is not consistent with Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria 'h' in Section 118-564(a)(2) of the Miami Beach Code.

3. Is consistent with Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria in Section 118-564(a)(3) of the Miami Beach Code.
  4. Is consistent with Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria for Demolition in Section 118-564(f)(4) 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. The design for any new railings at the roof terrace shall match the original railing design to the greatest extent possible in accordance 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.
    - b. 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 Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria and/or the directions from the Board.
    - c. Final details of all proposed windows shall be provided, and the color and finishes of all new windows shall match those of the original windows, 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, 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 applicant shall submit a covenant recorded in the Miami-Dade County records agreeing to maintain the existing podocarpus hedge located along the north and west property lines at a maximum height of approximately 4'-0".

**II. Variance(s)**

- A. No Variances were requested as a part of this application.

**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. 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.
- D. 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.
- E. The Final Order shall be recorded in the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.
- F. 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.
- G. 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.
- H. The conditions of approval herein are binding on the applicant, the property's owners, operators, and all successors in interest and assigns.
- I. 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 "Greenberg Residence", as prepared by Mossdrop Associates, dated 09-21-15, as approved by the Historic Preservation Board, as determined by staff.



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 \_\_\_\_\_ ( )

F:\PLAN\SHPB\15HPB\11-10-2015\Draft Orders\HPB 7580\_3193 Royal Palm Av.Nov15.FO.DRAFT.docx

DRAFT