



MIAMI BEACH

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD STAFF REPORT

FROM: Richard G. Lorber, AICP, LEED AP,
Acting Planning Director *William Cury for RGL*

DATE: November 6, 2012 Meeting

RE: Design Review File No. 22920
4701 North Meridian Avenue – Former Miami Heart Institute.

The applicant, 4701 North Meridian, LLC., is requesting a preliminary evaluation for the partial demolition, renovation, and adaptive re-use of the former hospital site as a new multifamily residential development, retaining existing nonconforming height, setbacks, floor area, and off-street parking.

HISTORY:

The application for a preliminary evaluation came before the Board on October 2, 2012, and was continued to a date certain of November 6, 2012 at the request of the applicant.

THE PROJECT:

The Design Review Board Section of the Miami Beach Code (Section 118-253), allows for the Design Review Board to give preliminary guidance to an applicant, prior to the submission of a formal application. In this regard, the applicant is seeking preliminary comments regarding a proposal for the partial demolition, renovation, and adaptive re-use of the former hospital site as a new multifamily residential development, retaining existing nonconforming height, setbacks, floor area, and off-street parking.

Preliminary evaluations by the Board are for informational purposes only, and shall not constitute a binding approval, nor shall any comments, feedback, information or guidance provided by the Board be binding upon the Board during subsequent review of the preliminary application or a related final application. The Board may provide general comment, feedback, information and guidance during the initial hearing on the application for preliminary evaluations, and may continue discussion on a preliminary evaluation to subsequent meetings in order for the applicant to better address any specific concerns raised by the Board or staff, or may elect to terminate the preliminary evaluation process after providing general comments.

Preliminary evaluation applications shall not constitute a completed application meeting all submission requirements for Design Review approval, and therefore an applicant acquires no vested rights or protections of any kind, type or nature based upon the filing of the preliminary evaluation application (e.g., no vested right to develop a project in accordance with the Code in effect on the date of submission of a completed preliminary evaluation application). The Board will not issue an order either approving or denying a project or take any formal action on preliminary evaluation applications. Preliminary evaluations shall not entitle applicants to any of

the benefits accorded to applicants pursuant to completed applications, inclusive of appeals or rehearings.

STAFF ANALYSIS/RECOMMENDATION:

The applicant is proposing a very ambitious project to convert the abandoned medical facility into a residential project. Large portions of building mass will be removed in order to create a structure that is more conducive to a residential project. However, the large parking structures located at the east and west ends will be largely retained as parking for the project. Because the site is not located in a dense area, but in the middle of a low-scale residential neighborhood, all elevations of the building will be highly visible for great distances within the surrounding area, including from the nearby Flamingo Waterway Historic District.

No formal action is required of the Board and a Final Order relative to any comments from Board Members will not be issued. However, Staff would suggest, at a minimum, that the following threshold issues be addressed:

1. The adaptive re-use and redesign of the architecture from an institutional use to a multi-family use in an area that is surrounded by single family homes.
2. The proposed architectural approach, which includes a more individual architectural vocabulary for the various building masses, versus the alternative of providing a more singular, highly developed vocabulary to be used throughout the project.
3. The variety of materials and finishes proposed, including decorative garage screening elements and their relationship with the architecture of the project as a whole, as well as the surrounding neighborhood.
4. The location, height and massing of the resulting structure and its relationship to the as-built context of the immediate area.
5. The addition of residential balconies, including the quantity and effectiveness of their location in helping to break down the massing of the building.
6. The appropriateness of a pool and roof deck at the fourth level, and its potential impact on the surrounding single family district.