



We advocate for Residents of Miami Beach! If you find this newsletter useful, please click [here to join us](#). Your membership helps support these efforts to inform the electorate on important quality of life issues year-round, and we can't do it without you. After all, there's no MBU without U!

---

---



**EVERYTHING YOU NEED TO KNOW ABOUT**

## REGISTERING TO VOTE & EARLY VOTING

Click [here](#) to REGISTER TO VOTE; this must be done by October 11, 2022.

Click [here](#) for EARLY VOTING DATES, TIMES, LOCATIONS

Click [here](#) for info on VOTING BY MAIL - request due by October 29, 2022 by 5 p.m.

Click [here](#) for a SAMPLE BALLOT

Have other election questions? Click [here](#).

## TL:DR - LOOKING FOR THE CRIB SHEET?

Here you go - detailed explanations are below this section.

### 2022 NOVEMBER BALLOT QUESTIONS

Red headers = vote no

Green headers = vote yes

1. North Beach Oceanside Resort Overlay District (the "Overlay") Floor Area Ratio ("FAR") Increase - Increasing density from 3.0 to 4.5 on the former Deauville site - **VOTE NO**
2. \$159 million General Obligation Bond Issue For Arts and Cultural Facilities - **VOTE NO**
3. Amend Charter Section 1.03(b): Require Voter Approval of Sale/Lease of Certain City Owned Property - **VOTE YES**
4. Approval of Use of Rent Payments Received by City from Lincoln Road Parking Lot Leases - **VOTE NO**
5. Charter approval: Lease of City Property at 1664 Meridian Avenue - **VOTE NO**
6. City Charter Approval: Lease of City Property at 1080 Lincoln Lane North/1688 Lenox Avenue - **VOTE NO**
7. RPS4 District - South of Fifth Street FAR Incentive to Convert Existing Hotels into Residential Use - **VOTE YES**
8. FAR Incentive for Residential and Office Uses on Washington Avenue Between 1st and 2nd Street - **VOTE NO**

[Click here to view City Commission documents pertaining to each question](#), or you may contact the Office of the City Clerk at 305.673.7411 to request.

## November 2022 Ballot Questions Explained Including Miami Beach United's Positions:

**BALLOT QUESTION 1:**  
North Beach Oceanside Resort Overlay District (the "Overlay") Floor Area Ratio ("FAR") Increase -

# Increasing density from 3.0 to 4.5 on the former Deauville site

## Ballot Question:

Floor area ratio ("FAR") regulates building size. Under the City Charter, FAR increases require voter approval.

Shall City increase FAR in Overlay (oceanfront properties from 6605-6757 Collins Avenue) from 2.25 to 3.0, where not already permitted, and provide FAR incentive from 3.0 to 4.5 for projects meeting following criteria:

- hotel with minimum 150 rooms,
- 150,000 square feet minimum lot size,
- 50% reduction from maximum density,
- owner provides public recreational facility and beach access.

## Miami Beach United DOES NOT SUPPORT this initiative.

### Executive Summary:

A developer proposes to build a project with details not shared fully with the community or stakeholders, which is predicated on voters agreeing to Ballot Question 1, creating an Overlay which would allow up to a 50% increase of FAR, going from 3.0 to 4.5. This is being communicated to voters as a necessary measure to "repurpose" the site, which was allowed to be demolished by neglect after many years.

While we are all eager to see this portion of North Beach revitalized, we have serious issues with this proposal. The most significant question is why the developer cannot do everything he is proposing within the existing zoning and density regulations? He has done nothing to demonstrate a compelling need for such egregious upzoning in a historic district, since there has been no engagement with the community to discuss plans. Were this developer to succeed in this quest for upzoning, it is inevitable that others would follow the same playbook of intentional demolition by neglect, leading to a change in the scale of the North Beach Historic District, which has not been presented to, nor approved, by voters.

### Why It Matters:

Miami Beach United, along with the rest of the city, is eager to see the North Beach community surrounding the Deauville property restored to bustling commerce for residents, tourists, and business owners. However, we OPPOSE this proposed overlay for a number of reasons:

- **This Overlay undermines that historic designation and would irreversibly change the district.** As the City writes on its own website, "Receiving local historic designation in 2005, the North Beach Historic Resort District stretches from 63 to 71 Streets along Collins Avenue. After World War II, when hoteliers were given the official go-ahead by the City to present live performances, this area developed into a major tourist and entertainment attraction populated by large, luxurious resort hotels fronting the Atlantic Ocean." .
- **There is no requirement the historic Deauville Hotel, nor even any requirements to preserve any part of the historic tower or other architecturally significant elements.** This amounts to a profound step backward in the laws protecting historic properties and the proper redevelopment process in the City.
- **To date there has been no project data presented which might warrant a dramatic 50% increase in FAR.**
- **The City is asking for the electorate to make this important decision with no critical facts** - no renderings of a proposal have been provided to illustrate what the possible impacts to sight lines, skylines, shade, etc. might be on the surrounding neighborhood from the ocean and the street sides, or for the neighbors to the north and south.
- **The ballot question has been rushed to the voters without the proper process of sharing plans with the community, getting public input, and creating a set of guidelines that is supported by the community; nor going through the vetting process of the various City Boards before bringing it to the voting electorate.** There is no justification to provide the developer carte blanche before a single rendering of a

project has been shared. Further, in too many cases in the past, when a project of significant impact is put to the voters without details being laid out, developers come back after initial approval has been granted and make changes that create further impacts without public benefit.

- **The developer has not explained why a successful project cannot be built within existing zoning, since buildable square footage allowed under the current FAR of 3.0 as of right already allows for a significantly larger development** than currently sits on the land within the proposed overlay district (approximately 6489k sq. ft.). Increasing the allowable FAR to an excessive 4.5 would result in an enormous project that is approximately 1 million sq. ft.+.
- **The developer claims that moneys would be contributed to a “new” affordable housing fund, funds would be generated for the North Beach CRA, and that there would be improved beach access and a number of permanent jobs offered. We believe those public benefits could still be granted were the project to proceed at the current permissible zoning of 3.0 FAR.** Moreover, when asked to contribute \$25 million in concurrently built workforce/affordable housing, the developer declined. And it is nonsensical to promise to build a new community center when over \$107 million taxpayer-funded dollars are already committed to building a new parking structure, Olympic pool, library facility, and other mixed-use state of the art community amenity at 72nd and Collins Ave.

**Miami Beach United position:**

**Miami Beach United DOES NOT SUPPORT this initiative.**

## BALLOT QUESTION 2: \$159 million General Obligation Bond Issue For Arts and Cultural Facilities

**Ballot Question:**

To improve facilities for resiliency of arts and cultural institutions throughout the City, including museums, performance venues, artistic playgrounds, senior/cultural centers, botanical garden, aquatic sculpture park, and related artists/workforce housing, shall City be authorized to issue general obligation bonds, from time to time, not exceeding \$159,000,000 aggregate principal amount, payable from unlimited ad valorem taxes, bearing interest not exceeding maximum legal interest rate, maturing no later than 30 years from issuance date?

**Miami Beach United DOES NOT SUPPORT this initiative.**

**Executive Summary**

The City Commission is asking voters to support an additional \$159 million in G.O. bonds at a time when residents' resources are stretched and without having provided the electorate many of the facts necessary to consider the proposal. Our voters supported a \$439 million G.O. Bond just a few years ago in 2018, now the City claims we must further obligate ourselves to support a number of cultural institutions, including two which are not City-owned properties, which have costly infrastructure needs.

**Why It Matters**

This is a frustrating question, as most would generally agree that more money spent on cultural institutions is a good thing. However, unlike the 2018 G.O. Bond process, until just recently there has been relatively little public outreach and engagement to explain the nature of the arts and culture projects or determine which projects have significant community support. Proponents say the investment in arts will attract high end tourists, but there is no proof that this will reduce the crime and chaos experienced during Spring Break or other chaotic high impact periods.

**The City should plan for and manage costs for assets from within its budget, which is currently estimated to be over \$800 million.**

Given historically high current housing costs, it seems like poor judgment to ask Miami Beach taxpayers to pay higher taxes at this time for anything that isn't absolutely necessary, no matter how worthy the project may be. The best-practices method to manage the City's finances dictates that the necessary funds for worthy projects be appropriated through the annual budget process, and not as part of an issuance of bonds.

**Miami Beach United position:**

**Miami Beach United DOES NOT SUPPORT this initiative.**

## BALLOT QUESTION 3: Amend Charter Section 1.03(b): Require Voter Approval of Sale/Lease of Certain City Owned Property

**Ballot Question:**

Charter Sections 1.03(b)1 and (b)2 require majority voter approval for the sale or lease of ten years or more of waterfront, park, and certain other City-owned properties.

Shall Charter be amended to also require such majority voter approval for any sale or lease of ten years or more of City-owned property located between West 43rd Street and West 40th Street, from Pine Tree Drive on the east to Alton Road on the west?

**Miami Beach United SUPPORTS this initiative.**

**Executive Summary**

This question asks whether there should be an additional protection included in our Charter so that City-owned property in the areas identified above are not sold or leased without voters' approval.

**Why It Matters**

Miami Beach United SUPPORTS asking the electorate for voter approval regarding the sale or lease of ten years or more of City-owned property located between 43rd St and 40th St, mostly comprised of parking lots supporting the business district on 41st St. The sale or lease of these parking lots could severely impact businesses in this district driving away customers who are unable to find parking a comfortable walking distance from shops, banks, offices, and medical buildings. Construction on these lots would further increase congestion during school drop-off/pick-up hours. Frankly, not every lot owned by the City needs to be sold for commercial development.

Finally, we would like to see this additional protection of any City-owned land applied citywide.

**Miami Beach United position:**

**Miami Beach United SUPPORTS this initiative.**

## BALLOT QUESTION 4: Approval of Use of Rent Payments Received by City from Lincoln Road Parking Lot Leases

## BALLOT QUESTION 5: City Charter approval: Lease of City Property at 1664 Meridian Avenue

## BALLOT QUESTION 6: RSA Article I: Board of Adjustment - Changing “Architecture” Membership Category from Permissible to Required Membership

### **Ballot Question 4:**

If voters approve the leases of City-owned surface parking lots with 1664 Meridian, LLC and/or Lincoln Road Property Owner, LP to diversify the Lincoln Road corridor with additional Class-A office projects, shall City dedicate the guaranteed rent payments received by City under the leases, totaling up to \$355,793,085, in equal portions, solely for the following public purposes:

- resiliency and sustainability infrastructure Initiatives,
- workforce housing, and
- public safety and crime prevention measures?

### **Ballot Question 5:**

Should City lease parking lot at 1664 Meridian Avenue (1.36 acres) to 1664 Meridian, LLC, for 99 years, requiring, per Resolution 2022-32245:

- replacing all existing public parking, plus additional parking,
- Class-A office, retail, and residential project near Lincoln Road,
- 0.40 acre (approximately 30% of site) of landscaped public space,
- 6-story building, restricted to height of 100 feet,
- no City funding, and
- \$145,704,144 minimum guaranteed rent to City, among other revenues?

### **Ballot Question 6:**

Should City lease parking lots at 1688 Lenox Avenue (0.86 acres) and 1080 Lincoln Lane North (1.10 acres) to Lincoln Road Property Owner, LP, for 99 years, requiring, per Resolution 2022-32242:

- additional parking and replacement of all existing public parking,
- 0.79 acres of landscaped public space,
- 2 Class-A office/retail buildings, restricted to height of 100 feet,
- minimum guaranteed rent to City \$210,088,941 (both leases), plus other revenues, and
- no City funding?

**Miami Beach United DOES NOT SUPPORT ANY of these three initiatives.**

### **Executive Summary for Questions 4, 5, and 6**

These three ballot questions are all related. Questions Five and Six seek approval to lease City-owned surface level parking lots to private developers for 99 years in order to allow the construction of new Class A office space, which would include replacing all existing public parking, some limited other amenities, and a minimum guarantee of rent revenues generated for the City. Question Four asks how that rent money the City would collect should be spent.

### **Why It Matters**

Miami Beach United does not support ANY of these three interrelated ballot questions which seem to be misleading in a number of ways.

**First, the ballot language in Ballot Question 4 seeks to impress voters with a reference to \$355 million in guaranteed lease payments. But the ballot language neglects to make clear that these rent payments are to be received over 99 years, and the annual rent payments received will average \$3.5 million per year, which doesn't seem like a lot of money for 3 acres of property adjacent to Lincoln Road.**



Second, the ballot language states that the proceeds are to be used "solely for resiliency & sustainability infrastructure purposes, workforce housing, and public safety and crime prevention." This use of proceeds promise is also misleading because the City already considers the funding needs for these initiatives during the annual budget process and funds them using property taxes, bonds and/or other revenue sources. There is nothing that prevents the City from using the funding from these long term leases to offset what would have otherwise been funded from the usual sources, and then using the freed up funds for any other projects the Commission chooses to spend your tax money on. In other words, this does not guarantee spending more than what would otherwise have been budgeted for the worthwhile initiatives of resiliency, workforce housing and public safety. Miami Beach United opposes these leases and the proposed developments.

As for **Referendum #5 and #6**, while we applaud efforts to diversify our economy away from our historic over-reliance on the hospitality industry, and we recognize that although Lincoln Road, still one of the best amenities in South Beach, needs creative revitalization, **we do not believe these projects offer enough benefits to outweigh the significant risks to residents' quality of life.**

- **These projects on the surface parking lots represent overdevelopment which will create negative impacts:** significantly congest the Lincoln Road area, cause much more traffic which the public hates, and make it much more difficult for the public to park when they want to go to Lincoln Road.
- **There is already significant vacancy at 1601 Washington** where Lennar used to occupy most of the building. The Miami Beach absorption rate for new office space has historically been relatively slow, unless a large, single corporate tenant surfaces, that wants to rent a significant portion of one of the buildings.
- **There already are privately developed office projects underway**, notable at Terminal Island, Sunset Harbor, on Alton/18th, and in the old Epicure space with a beautiful Norman Foster Design.
- **The City should not be in the business of competing with the private sector for office tenants with these speculative office spaces, built on City land.** As it stands, it is debatable how beneficial the financial terms the City has negotiated really are vs. what they could be; and even so, the developer will always be able to renegotiate better terms with the City if things don't work out for them. There is very little risk for the developer in these projects. The City always ends up being the backstop, with little upside.
- **Using the limited public space we have for speculative office space is bad planning policy, bad economic development policy and bad public policy.** The City should be looking to creatively activate these parcels to either build upon the vision of Miami Beach as an arts and culture destination (a reimagining of the type of attraction provided by the late lamented South Florida Arts Center), or partner with workforce housing specialists to build affordable apartments that our professional staff, teachers, emergency services/health workers, and other "missing middle" members of our community could afford to rent or buy (not microunits) in a centrally-located non-waterfront area that already has density that could absorb more, and create a thriving hub that could reinvigorate the surrounding retail areas (Lincoln Road, Washington, etc.).

**Miami Beach United position:**

**Miami Beach United DOES NOT SUPPORT ANY of these three initiatives.**

## BALLOT QUESTION 7: RPS4 District - South of Fifth Street FAR Incentive to Convert Existing Hotels into Residential Use

**Ballot Question:**

City Charter requires voter approval before increasing a property's floor area ratio ("FAR") (City's method of regulating building size).

The RPS4 District lies within the South of Fifth Neighborhood, which is predominantly residential.

Shall City increase maximum FAR from 2.0 to 2.75 in RPS4 District as an incentive for the conversion of existing hotel properties into residential use, if the property owner records a covenant prohibiting short-term rentals on the property?

**Miami Beach United DOES SUPPORT this initiative.**

**Executive Summary**

This zoning change, which is supported by the South of Fifth Neighborhood Association (SOFNA), will enable the property owner to replace the existing 224 room Marriott Stanton Hotel with a new, approximately 39-unit residential building, with the same square footage and height of the existing structure. Short term rentals would be prohibited.

**Why It Matters**

We believe this is a good change in service of incentivizing residential units that cannot be used as short-term rentals. Our City is plagued by short term rentals properties which encourage irresponsible guests to visit and contribute to what can often become chaotic behavior affecting other visitors, residents, and businesses.

- We are in agreement with SOFNA, when they discuss in their resolution the benefits of a reduction in the number of transients in this predominantly residential area.
- While we are generally leery of incentivizing new development with increased F.A.R., this proposal is going before the electorate as required, and makes sense since zoning was changed from an FAR of 3.0 to an FAR of 2.0 after the original building was constructed in 2002, and a 2.75 FAR is needed to maintain the same footprint for a new building and not penalize the property owner for this desirable change.

**Miami Beach United position:**

**Miami Beach United DOES SUPPORT this initiative.**

## BALLOT QUESTION 8: FAR Incentive for Residential and Office Uses on Washington Avenue Between 1st and 2nd Street

**Ballot Question:**

City Charter requires voter approval before increasing a property's floor area ratio ("FAR") (how City regulates building size).

FAR in 1st Street Overlay (located east side of Washington Avenue between 1st and 2nd Streets) is 1.0, although previously FAR was 2.0.

Shall City increase FAR from 1.0 to 2.0 in 1st Street Overlay, with FAR incentive from 2.0 to 2.7 for redevelopments that include residential or office uses, and prohibit hotels and short-term rentals?

**Miami Beach United DOES NOT SUPPORT this initiative.**

**Executive Summary**

This item seeks to gauge voter's interest in increasing allowable F.A.R. in South of Fifth Neighborhood in service of incentivizing existing residential or office use properties. This asks voters to decide if they want to increase the possible allowable far from 1.0 up to 2.7, with the prohibition of hotels and short-term rentals in this overlay.

**Why It Matters**

We oppose the proposed F.A.R. change in the South of Fifth neighborhood which appears to be designed primarily to allow the existing office building at 119 Washington Avenue to enclose outdoor spaces for the addition of more offices.

- The building under the original zoning was built to an FAR of 2.0 and this request would increase its FAR above even what was allowed before downzoning to an FAR of 1.0.



- The current zoning is intended to preserve the low-scale character of the interior sections of the South of Fifth neighborhood.
- Current zoning should be respected.

**Miami Beach United position:**

**Miami Beach United DOES NOT SUPPORT this initiative.**



**Our Mission** Dedicated to improving the quality of life for Miami Beach residents, managed and measured growth of our city, and ethical leadership of government – for a vibrant city rooted in history, its people, resources and neighborhoods, with focus on the future – by providing educational and analytical focus on the organization, structure, policies and performance of Miami Beach government. We share our newsletters with almost 20,000 subscribers, the

majority of whom are registered Miami Beach voters.

Miami Beach United | Streamline Properties, 1125 Washington Avenue, Miami Beach, FL 33139 by [info@miamibeachunited.org](mailto:info@miamibeachunited.org) powered by