

August 31, 2022

City of Pompano Beach
Planning and Zoning Board
100 West Atlantic Boulevard
Pompano Beach, FL 33060

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE
Meeting Date: AUGUST 3, 2022

BROWARD PARTNERSHIP FOR THE HOMELESS INC LUPA

Request: Local-Only LUPA
P&Z#: 22-92000003
Owner: Broward County Board of County Commissioners
Project Location: 1700 NW 30 Avenue (Blount Road)
Folio Number: 484228250050
Land Use Designation: Industrial
Zoning District: CF (Community Facility)
Commission District: 4 (Beverly Perkins)
Agent: John Rinaldi (954-788-3400)
Project Planner: Jean Dolan (954-786-4045 /jean.dolan@copbfl.com)

DRC COMMENTS:

PLANNING

Reviewer: Jean E. Dolan, AICP, CFM
Status: Resubmittal Required

Planning Comments (for clarity, see actual comment bubbles on pdf of Application submitted for DRC.

Page: 4

Number: 1 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 1:55:33 PM

City Staff was told by Broward Partnership Staff (Tom Campbell) that this is not a rapid rehousing program and is a "permanent supportive" housing program. Please revise your response to this question to accurately reflect the programming of this tax credit housing development. Please also describe the recurring source of funding for the "supportive permanent housing" programming. Describe how residents of the homeless shelter will be transitioned to the supportive permanent housing and what ongoing case management support will be provided including but certainly not limited to transportation services.

RESPONSE: The applicant is requesting a City only LUPA to allow for the construction of up to 138 affordable residential units. This residential apartment building will increase the supply of affordable housing for very low- and low-income families and individuals. Broward Partnership prides itself with being a good neighbor and believes that the proposed addition

DRC

of affordable residential apartments would be ideally suited due to the close proximity of major employers benefiting residents. This project will consist of 100% Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) units will be restricted to meet the 80% AMI income limit threshold. The Florida Housing Finance Corporation (FHFC) funding application further requires that a minimum of 15% of the units be at the extremely Low Income (ELI) AMI set aside which is currently 28% for Broward County. Half of all units would be set aside for formerly "Homeless Households", as defined by Florida Housing Finance Corporation which includes formerly homeless and at-risk of homelessness individuals and families". Therefore, only 15% of the total households would be limited to the 28% AMI income limit.

Currently, Broward Partnership deliver more than 200 emergency beds for the homeless individuals and families within the adjoining County shelter, which is and will remain a completely separate purpose and operation. In no circumstance would any units within this residential apartment project be utilized for emergency housing or for services that are provided in the County's adjacent Homeless Assistance Center for homeless clientele.

Page: 5

Number: 1 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 1:35:39 PM

The impact analysis needs to reflect the intended residential use of the property. Leave the commercial impact analysis as shown and add the demands of the 138 residential units, total population, and include in the impact analysis to demonstrate the higher impact (residential or commercial) in every impact category. Address schools and park impacts.

RESPONSE: The table has been revised to add 138 units as a separate line item for comparison. A SCAD letter has been requested and park calculations provided.

Number: 2 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 1:38:03 PM

The character of this area is not "mixed use". It is industrial. Please remove this statement as well as all references to "rapid rehousing".

RESPONSE: Mixed use removed as well as any mention of rapid rehousing.

Number: 3 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 2:03:42 PM

The housing development area is a little over 1/2 mile to either Copans to the north of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard. This is double (in either direction) to what is typically considered an "easy" walking distance (1/4 mile).

RESPONSE: While the adjacent trafficways are a ½ mile this is common place in established infill areas. The project residents do own automobiles and can travel over ½ mile for essential services. There is also a bus stop at the site to connect to outside areas.

Page: 7

Number: 1 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 2:32:22 PM

The Commercial FAR is 6. The total SF allowed would be 1,829,520 SF. That is the number you should use in your impact analysis. This will be compared to the Industrial land use maximum entitlements (65% lot coverage, 45 ft height = Max 2.6 FAR which is if it's a 4-story building). Existing uses are not relevant to the impact analysis in a Comprehensive Plan amendment. It just compares maximum entitlements between what the plan currently permits and what is being proposed. In this case, 138 units is what is being proposed so that should be analyzed along with



the maximum commercial entitlements recognizing that if the tax credits are not awarded to this site, the City will have still entitled this property to the maximum commercial development allowed by land use policy 01.07.17.

RESPONSE: The tables have been revised to reflect commercial @ 1,829,520SF and Industrial @ 792,792 SF, as well as the 138 units.

Number: 2 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 2:22:40 PM
Future Land Use Element Policy 01.07.17 dictates intensity in the land use categories.

RESPONSE: The application has been modified to reflect policy.

Number: 3 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 2:41:52 PM

It is true that Industrial Warehouse use is likely to be only 2 stories (35' warehouse height with 1 floor mezzanine with 10' ceiling height), however, if a 45' tall building with 4 stories due to typical ceiling heights was proposed, it would be approved based on the intensity standards in Policy 1.07.17. Assuming the warehouse style development for this impact analysis is increasing the net increase in public facility impacts in your impact analysis. This should still be compared to the impact of 138 residential units to see which has more impact on each of the public facilities analyzed.

RESPONSE:

Number: 4 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 2:42:13 PM

7 acres of commercial at an FAR of 6 is 1,829,520 and 7 acres of industrial with an FAR of 2.6 equals 792,792 SF for a net change of 1,036,728. You are analyzing 40% more net change than necessary. You should still analyze the 138 units in each impact category to determine which creates greater impacts, commercial or residential. If any of the results are close, you can reduce your commercial entitlements to the correct number which is about 3% less than what you're assuming and you can double your industrial development rights.

RESPONSE: The tables have been revised to reflect commercial @ 1,829,520SF and Industrial @ 792,792 SF, as well as the 138 units.

Number: 5 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 2:42:57 PM

Eliminate this footnote since your impact analysis does not include this residential facility and is not required to.

RESPONSE: Footnote removed.

Number: 6 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 3:39:40 PM

Service provider letter should confirm this is BCWWS District 1 which is the one that has that LOS.

RESPONSE: Confirmation has been requested

Page: 8

Number: 1 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 3:40:42 PM

Provide confirmation from the County Utilities Division that this is correct

RESPONSE: Confirmation has been requested.

Number: 2 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 3:44:25 PM



So, looks like you're assuming ground floor commercial (retail) and upper floor office which is fine (your numbers are still higher than mine, I get 182,952 per floor so that much commercial and 1,646,568 SF office). Add the total water demand of the 138 units to show how it compares to your commercial/office mix.

RESPONSE: The tables have been revised to reflect commercial @ 1,829,520SF and Industrial @ 792,792 SF, as well as the 138 units.

Number: 3 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 3:45:52 PM
Provide service provider letter before P&Z.

RESPONSE: Conformation has been requested.

Page: 9

Number: 1 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 3:50:09 PM
Add total demand by 138 units for comparison purposes.

RESPONSE: The tables have been revised to reflect commercial @ 1,829,520SF and Industrial @ 792,792 SF, as well as the 138 units.

Number: 2 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 3:50:27 PM
Provide service provider letter before P&Z

RESPONSE: Conformation has been requested and acknowledged

Page: 10

Number: 1 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 4:00:01 PM
Last correspondence we've gotten from Waste Management dated June, 2022 says 8 years of capacity left at current demand (2030).

RESPONSE: Date has been modified to reflect 8 years.

Page: 11

Number: 1 Author: DolJea Subject: 7/13/2022 4:00:35 PM
Provide service provider letter before P&Z.

RESPONSE: Conformation has been requested.

Page: 12

Number: 1 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 1:25:07 PM
Provide these permits and explain the role the wetland proposed to be filled serves to accomplish water quality and quantity requirements and how these requirements will be met once the wetlands are eliminated.

RESPONSE: Permits for the site have been included in the revised submittal. The area on the permitted plans refer to the area as retention and not a wetland. See attached revised survey and email discussion with the surveyor which reflects that the area of concern was not a jurisdictional wetland. No wetlands exist on site. Water quality and quantity for the existing permits will be accommodated on adjacent county property. New development will address permit regulations independently and submitted as part of the site plan review process.

Number: 2 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 1:26:38 PM
Based on the conceptual site plan provided with the concurrent flex application, there is no



DRC

PZ22-92000003
10/5/2022

Engineering Inspired Design.

significant pervious retention areas left after the proposed redevelopment so explain the structural drainage features proposed to accommodate water quality and quantity requirements for future stormwater permitting.

RESPONSE: Permits for the site have been included in the revised submittal. Site is not a wetland, but a drainage retention area.

Number: 3 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 4:02:58 PM

Include correspondence with Carlos Adorisio to explain how this project will be able to obtain a stormwater permit based on the conceptual plan.

RESPONSE: Applicant has been in contact with Mr. Adorisio and explained the proposed stormwater management system which he will review at time of site plan approval.

Number: 4 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 1:20:30 PM

The city's LOS is 5 acres per 1,000 without the subcategories. Refer to Policy 04.01.01 in the Park and Recreation Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

RESPONSE: Revised to indicate 5ac/1,000 population.

Page: 13

Number: 1 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 1:20:27 PM

The purpose of this LUPA is to create an underlying land use (Commercial) that will support residential development (per the concurrent flex application). Provide an analysis of the population expected to reside in the project and what on-site recreational amenities will be provided. This area is isolated in a large industrial area. Identify the closest city parks and how the residents without private cars can reasonably access those parks.

RESPONSE: Based on new figures of 2.49 per unit the project will generate 344 people and is included in the park inventory calculations. There are several parks within short distance in the city and adjacent areas for the majority of people that will have automobiles. Project design will incorporate open areas for both adults and children. Plans for these opportunities will be included in the site plan applications.

This comment applies to E. 1-4. The buildout population estimate in the parks inventory needs to be updated to include the population in this proposed development.

Page: 19

Number: 1 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/22 4:05:56 PM

Show how this compares to the 138 units actually proposed to be built.

RESPONSE: The table has been revised to reflect the 138 units for comparison.

Page: 20

Number: 1 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 1:01:00 PM

Lack of mass transit is directly contrary to Comp Plan policy 01.04.01 which notes flex units should only be awarded on corridors supported by mass transit. Explain the transportation services that will be offered by the housing operator to compensate for the lack of transit availability.

RESPONSE: Site is serviced by the Blue Route which connects to the Northeast Transit Center, which fulfills the requirement.

Number: 2 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 1:02:36 PM



DRC

PZ22-92000003
10/5/2022

The Applicant has a concurrent flex application in-house for a residential project. A SCAD letter will be required as the Applicant has specified that the housing complex will not be deed restricted to adults only.

RESPONSE: SCAD has been received and included.

Page: 21

Number: 1 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 1:04:28 PM

Provide the required letter from the Department of State confirming that a record search was conducted for historic and archaeological sites with no findings.

RESPONSE: The surveyor identified an areas on the survey as wetlands. This was an error. A revised survey as well as the discussion with the surveyor have been provided. There is no need to have the department of state review this request for wetland concerns. At this time, there are no jurisdictional wetlands on this property

Number: 2 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 12:24:37 PM

The survey shows the entire area intended to be developed as the tax credit housing project is a wetland. Please provide correspondence from the County and State permitting agencies addressing the requirements for development in this wetland. Note City Comprehensive Plan policies discourage development of wetlands including: 1.06.01, 10.02.12, 10.03.11 and 10.06.02. If these wetlands are permitted for development, mitigation will be required per policy 10.06.02.

RESPONSE: Site is not a wetland, but a drainage retention area. Therefore, policies on development in a wetland do not apply.

Number: 3 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 1:07:11 PM

Provide the assessment by a qualified biologist or other evidence of a biological survey that determined this conclusion given that the development area is a wetland.

RESPONSE: Site is not a wetland, but a drainage retention area.

Page: 22

Number: 1 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 1:07:43 PM

Provide an environmental assessment by a qualified biologist or other evidence of a biological survey that determined this conclusion given that the development area is a wetland.

RESPONSE: Site is not a wetland, but a drainage retention area.

Number: 2 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 4:32:08 PM

Wetland soils are not suitable for development. Provide an analysis of the depth of wetland soils in the development area and how that will be removed, disposed of and replaced with a suitable base for development and explain how the drainage of the site will function when this wetland/retention area is eliminated. Describe mitigation for the loss of groundwater recharge resulting from the wetland elimination.

RESPONSE: The area on the permitted plans refer to the area as retention and not a wetland. No wetlands or soils exist on site. Water quality and quantity for the existing permits will be accommodated on adjacent county property. New development will address permit regulations independently and submitted as part of the site plan review process.

DRC



Number: 3 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 4:33:12 PM

Your project is 138 affordable housing units. You can certainly say that here and accomplish compliance with 2.16.2.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

Number: 4 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 4:42:02 PM

The land use change is to commercial but the proposed project described in this application and the concurrent flex application is not commercial. The proposal is for a 138 unit tax credit housing project. You need to look at project design and speak to the relationship between the homeless shelter and this "permanent supportive" housing to create the justification for placing permanent housing in an industrial area in wetlands which is not considered compatible by the City's Comp Plan GOPs including: 01.01.13, 01.03.11, 01.03.08, 01.06.01, 01.06.12, 10.02.12, 10.03.11, 10.06.02.

RESPONSE: This residential apartment building will increase the supply of affordable housing for very low- and low-income families and individuals. Broward Partnership prides itself with being a good neighbor and believes that the proposed addition of affordable residential apartments would be ideally suited due to the close proximity of major employers benefiting residents. This project will consist of 100% Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) units will be restricted to meet the 80% AMI income limit threshold. The Florida Housing Finance Corporation (FHFC) funding application further requires that a minimum of 15% of the units be at the extremely Low Income (ELI) AMI set aside which is currently 28% for Broward County. Half of all units would be set aside for formerly "Homeless Households", as defined by Florida Housing Finance Corporation which includes formerly homeless and at-risk of homelessness individuals and families". Therefore, only 15% of the total households would be limited to the 28% AMI income limit.

Currently, Broward Partnership deliver more than 200 emergency beds for the homeless individuals and families within the adjoining County shelter, which is and will remain a completely separate purpose and operation. In no circumstance would any units within this residential apartment project be utilized for emergency housing or for services that are provided in the County's adjacent Homeless Assistance Center for homeless clientele.

GOPs response:

01.01.13- use is consistent with adjacent HAC, adjacent employment opportunities, and required site buffers at site plan. The site has available school capacity, and has no impact on environmentally sensitive lands.

01.03.11- Use will be compatible with existing HAC and designed with proper buffers for adjacent land uses.

01.03.08- Site plan review and building design will be utilized to mitigate any adjacent impacts.

01.06.01- Site is not a wetland or contain any significant resources.

01.06.12- Sufficient potable water, sanitary sewer and site poses no noxious impacts.



DRC

PZ22-92000003
10/5/2022

10.02.12- No wetlands on site.

10.03.11- No wetlands on site.

10.06.02-No wetland on site.

Number: 1 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 4:42:51 PM
Please meet with the District Commissioner prior to P&Z.

RESPONSE: Understand will be accomplished.

Number: 2 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 6:15:16 PM
Add Housing Element objective and policy: 03.01.00 and 03.01.04.

RESPONSE: Added to document.

Number: 3 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 4:44:56 PM
Please focus on mitigation to justify how the project can better address GOPs that are not supportive of the project such as: 01.01.13, 01.03.11, 01.03.08, 01.03.09, 01.23.01, 01.04.01, and 01.06.01, 01.06.12, 10.02.12, 10.03.11, 10.06.02.

RESPONSE: Those GOPs not mentioned above:

01.03.09- Planning theory is constantly evolving and current practice is to integrate jobs and people in proximity.

01.23.01- This policy is similar to above, only added in people to balance out policy.

01.04.01- Mass transit is available to the site and in the future will be expanded.

Number: 4 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 4:54:05 PM
Eliminate this policy. This amendment is not looking at cumulative impacts of new development.

RESPONSE: Removed.

Number: 5 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 4:53:16 PM
This is only relevant to explain why a County LUPA is not required for this amendment.

RESPONSE: Policy is only there to illustrate County does not distinguish between Industrial and Commercial.

Number: 6 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 4:47:07 PM
To claim this policy is met by the project will require some explanation of the proposed mitigation for the loss of wetlands. This one may need to be deleted.

RESPONSE: No wetlands on site.

Page: 25

Number: 1 Author: DolJea Subject: Sticky Note Date: 7/13/2022 5:28:29 PM
Please provide a detailed narrative on how the homeless shelter and the tax credit project will work in tandem to address the homeless problem in Pompano Beach and any safeguards to



prevent the attraction of more homeless to Pompano Beach to qualify to access these units. Explain the support services that will be provided to the population in the permanent housing to ensure long-term success and the recurring source of funding for these services. Explain any criteria that requires the residents be homeless to qualify to live in the housing. Explain how the project will be made livable (open spaces, dog park/walking area, cleaning up sidewalk in front of shelter, walkability of Blount Road especially adjacent to and south of the prison. Look at distances to nearest grocery store and other life-supporting services and explain how residents will be supported by transportation services provided by the housing management company.

RESPONSE: This residential apartment building will increase the supply of affordable housing for very low- and low-income families and individuals. Broward Partnership prides itself with being a good neighbor and believes that the proposed addition of affordable residential apartments would be ideally suited due to the close proximity of major employers benefiting residents. This project will consist of 100% Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) units will be restricted to meet the 80% AMI income limit threshold. The Florida Housing Finance Corporation (FHFC) funding application further requires that a minimum of 15% of the units be at the extremely Low Income (ELI) AMI set aside which is currently 28% for Broward County. Half of all units would be set aside for formerly "Homeless Households", as defined by Florida Housing Finance Corporation which includes formerly homeless and at-risk of homelessness individuals and families". Therefore, only 15% of the total households would be limited to the 28% AMI income limit.

Currently, Broward Partnership deliver more than 200 emergency beds for the homeless individuals and families within the adjoining County shelter, which is and will remain a completely separate purpose and operation. In no circumstance would any units within this residential apartment project be utilized for emergency housing or for services that are provided in the County's adjacent Homeless Assistance Center for homeless clientele.

The site is located on a Broward County Trafficways. Site has transit opportunities directly in front of the site. The City operated community bus provides a direct connection to the Northeast Transit Center. BPHI is along in negotiations with Broward County mass transit to alter one of the existing bus routes to traverse Blount Road directly in front of the project. If approved the route could coincide with the completion of the project.

The applicant agrees that balanced communities should have neighborhood serving retail and office within industrial areas. Market demands usually dictate the location of retail and office. One way of getting more retail and office is to allow residential in the area to create the demand. Allowing residential is consistent with other goals, objectives and policies in the comprehensive plan and could help implement this policy with future developments. Providing low and moderate housing opportunities is consistent with good planning principles.

Page: 27

Number: 1 A e: 7/13/2022 12:56:12 PM

Survey shows entire area is a wetland.

RESPONSE: The survey has been revised to remove the wetlands note.

DRC



UTILITIES

Reviewer: Nathaniel Watson

Status: Review Complete, Pending Development Order

1. Please note that additional comments may be forth coming contingent upon future submittals.

RESPONSE: Understood

2. The City of Pompano Beach Utilities Dept. has no comment at this time for the requested LUPA/FLEX approval.

RESPONSE: NA

3. Broward County Water & Wastewater service area.

RESPONSE: See attached letter

LANDSCAPING

Wade Collum

Status: Review Complete, Pending Development Order

Comments will be rendered at time of site plan submittal.
Provide landscape plans in accordance with 155.5203 for the site.

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES/WASTE

Reviewer: Beth Dubow

Status: Review Complete. Pending Development Order

The Environmental Services Department has no objections to the proposed land use plan amendment. The conceptual site plan submitted with this application appears to have possible conflicts with regard to garbage truck access to the dumpsters. It will be more thoroughly reviewed when the site plan is submitted for approval.

RESPONSE; Site plans will take into consideration location of dumpsters and access.

NOTE: Additional comments may be necessary based upon revisions, additional plans and/or documents. Contact Beth Dubow at 954-545-7047 or beth.dubow@copbfl.com should you have any questions or concerns regarding this review.

CRA

Reviewer: Kim Vazquez

Status: Review Complete. Pending Development Order

The area is zoned Industrial.

The CRA supports and promotes mixed use including residential and commercial uses along major traffic corridors, where mass transit is available, through the allocation of flex and redevelopment units and approval of land use plan map amendments allowing for mixed use and residential developments.

The residential apartments proposed are in the middle of a heavy Industrial area where there are no services available nearby or within walking distance, and no mass transit options.



RESPONSE: The applicant respectfully disagrees. The site is located on a Broward County Trafficways. The site has transit opportunities directly in front of the site. The City operated community bus provides a direct connection to the Northeast Transit Center. BPHI is along in negotiations with Broward County mass transit to alter one of the existing bus routes to traverse Blount Road directly in front of the project. If approved the route could coincide with the completion of the project. This policy exactly describes the end goal of this project. To supply affordable housing within walking and biking distance to employment centers. The surrounding uses in the area are more warehousing and employment center uses than heavy manufacturing. This city has established buffer required between the proposed residential uses and surrounding warehouse/employment center uses. The site will comply with those compatibility buffer requirements.

ENGINEERING

Reviewer: Dave McGirr

Status: Review Complete. No comments.

No comments. 7-6-22

BUILDING

Reviewer: James DeMars

Status: Review Complete. No comments

No Comments. 7-12-22 LUPA

ZONING

Reviewer: Lauren Gratzner

Status: Review Complete. No comments.

From Industrial land use to Commercial land use.

No comments.

DRC

