



Planning Section
6601 Main Street • Miami Lakes, Florida 33014
Office: (305) 364-6100 • Website: www.miamilakes-fl.gov

Staff Analysis and Recommendation

To: Honorable Chair and Members of the Local Planning Agency
From: Susana Alonso, AICP, Principal Planner
Subject: Aluminum and synthetic roofs on canopies and accessory buildings.
Date: October 6, 2020

AN ORDINANCE OF THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF MIAMI LAKES, FLORIDA, RELATING TO PERMITTED MATERIALS FOR TOWNHOUSE, SINGLE-FAMILY AND TWO-FAMILY CANOPIES AND ACCESSORY BUILDINGS; AMENDING CHAPTER 13, "LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE", AT ARTICLE I, "IN GENERAL", AT SECTION 13-1, "DEFINITIONS AND REFERENCES", AND AT ARTICLE IV, "ZONING DISTRICT REGULATIONS", DIVISION 3 "RU-TH TOWNHOUSE DISTRICT", AT SECTION 13-442, "DEFINITIONS", AND AT ARTICLE V, "ALLOWABLE ENCROACHMENTS INTO THE REQUIRED YARDS AND EXCEPTIONS TO THE MAXIMUM PERMITTED HEIGHTS" AT SECTION 13-1502, "ACCESSORY BUILDINGS", AND AT SECTION 13-1506, "CANOPIES" PERMITTING ALUMINUM AND SYNTHETIC MATERIALS IN A STYLE THAT RESEMBLES WOOD CONSTRUCTION; PROVIDING FOR REPEAL OF LAWS IN CONFLICT; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR INCLUSION INTO THE CODE; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE. (Jeffrey Rodriguez)

A. BACKGROUND

On August 20, 2020 Town Council of the Town of Miami Lakes directed the Town Manager to amend the Land Development Code to permit aluminum roofs for canopies and accessory buildings. The request arises out of discrepancies in the treatment of canopies attached to the main residence, which require either canvas and pipe or a construction method and roofing to "match" the main residence, and detached accessory structures, which require materials and construction methods to "match or compliment" the main residence. Under the current ordinance, an aluminum structure would be allowed if detached and complimentary to the main residence, but not allowed if attached to the main structure. There are valid concerns regarding the quality of some commercially available aluminum roofing structures, but these concerns are equally applicable for both attached and detached structures and can be alleviated by inserting appropriate language

regarding architectural compatibility. The ordinance amends Sections 13.1, 13-442, 13-1502 and 13-1506 integrating definitions and treatment of similar structures. Of note, Townhouse districts currently permit only canvas and cloth as roofing materials for canopies, and metal or aluminum is only allowed for Bahama shutters, referred to as canopy-shutters by the LDC; No changes are proposed for the Townhouse section at this time.

B. PROPOSED CHANGES

The following described elements are presented in the same order that they appear in the proposed ordinance.

Sec. 13-1. - Definitions and references. The existing definition is replaced with a definition more compatible with language both in the Townhouse section of the LDC and the building code.

DIVISION 3. - RU-TH TOWNHOUSE DISTRICT - Sec. 13-442. – Definitions. No major changes are proposed to this section, only the addition of the word “wood” as an allowable material for the supports.

13-1502. – Accessory Buildings. Language was added regarding aluminum and synthetic roofing materials in a style that resembles wood construction.

C. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on the analysis provided below and other factors contained in this report, Staff recommends approval of the ordinance amending Section 13-1608 as it relates to permitting aluminum roofing on canopies for single-family and two-family buildings.

D. ANALYSIS

The Land Development Code provides that all proposed amendments to the LDC shall be evaluated by the Administrative Official, the Local Planning Agency and the Town Council, and that, in evaluating the proposed amendment, the criteria in Subsection 13-306(b) shall be considered. All portions of this report are hereby incorporated into all portions of this analysis. The following is a staff analysis of the criteria as applied to this ordinance.

1. Whether the proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, including the adopted infrastructure minimum levels of service standards and the concurrency management program.

Analysis: The Comprehensive Development Master plan does not address roofing. The proposed ordinance has no impact on concurrency management.

Finding: Complies

2. Whether the proposal is in conformance with all applicable requirements of this Code of Ordinances, including this chapter.

Analysis: See Sections “A”, Background; and “B”, Proposed Changes, of this report. The amendment offers a roofing system to single-family and two-family homes that is more resilient than barrel or flat tile construction. The ordinance does not conflict with any other portions of the Code.

Finding: Complies.

3. **Whether, and the extent to which, land use and development conditions have changed since the effective date of the existing regulations, and whether such changes support or work against the proposed change in land use policy.**

Analysis See Sections “A”, Background; and “B”, Proposed Changes, and Criteria “2”, of this report. Generally, when a variance approval for the same subject becomes reoccurring, it becomes incumbent upon the policy makers to redress the Code and consider whether a change is appropriate. In addition to its resiliency qualities, the Planning and Zoning Board has granted three (3) variances in the last ten (10) years permitting a standing metal seam roof.

Finding: Complies.

4. **Whether, and the extent to which, the proposal would result in any incompatible land uses, considering the type and location of uses involved, the impact on adjacent or neighboring properties, consistency with existing development, as well as compatibility with existing and proposed land use.**

Analysis: See Sections “A”, Background; and “B”, Proposed Changes, and criteria “2” and “3” of this report. The proposed amendment does not change the list of permitted uses within any zoning district.

Finding: Complies.

5. **Whether, and the extent to which, the proposal would result in demands on transportation systems, public facilities and services, exceeding the capacity of such facilities and services, existing or programmed, including schools, transportation, water and wastewater services, solid waste disposal, drainage, water supply, recreation, education, emergency services, and similar necessary facilities and services.**

Analysis: See Sections “A”, Background; and “B”, Proposed Changes, of this report. The proposed ordinance does not impact the above systems.

Finding: Complies.

6. **Whether, and the extent to which, the proposal would result in adverse impacts on the natural environment, including consideration of wetland protection, preservation of any groundwater aquifers, wildlife habitats, and vegetative communities.**

Analysis: See Sections “A”, Background; and “B”, Proposed Changes, of this report. The proposed ordinance does not impact the above systems.

Finding: Complies.

- 7. Whether, and the extent to which, the proposal would adversely affect the property values in the affected area, or adversely affect the general welfare.**

Analysis: See Sections “A”, Background; and “B”, Proposed Changes, and criteria “2” and “3” of this report. Metal standing seam roofing is generally more expensive than traditional barrel or flat tile. It is also more resilient to storm events that may be experienced in South Florida. These factors contribute to the roofing style’s value. That in turn lends value to the rest of the community.

Finding: Complies.

- 8. Whether the proposal would result in an orderly and compatible land use pattern. Any positive and negative effects on such pattern shall be identified.**

Analysis: See Sections “A”, Background; and “B”, Proposed Changes; and Criteria 2, 3, and 7, of this report.

Finding: Complies.

- 9. Whether the proposal would be in conflict with the public interest, and whether it is in harmony with the purpose and intent of this chapter.**

Analysis: See Sections “A”, Background; and “B”, Proposed Changes; and Criteria 2, 3, and 7 of this report.

Finding: Complies.

- 10. Other matters which the Local Planning Agency or the Town Council, in its legislative discretion, may deem appropriate.**

Analysis: See all portions of this analysis. The Local Planning Agency and the Town Council may consider other appropriate factors to determine whether the proposed amendment is appropriate and consistent with the public interest.

Finding: As determined by the Town Council.