

1. [LN-809](#) **VERA MAJOR ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUSTMENT**

<b>Request:</b>	Major Administrative Adjustment
<b>P&amp;Z#</b>	25-16500003
<b>Owner:</b>	1600 Federal LLC
<b>Project Location:</b>	1600 S Federal Highway
<b>Folio Number:</b>	494212000070
<b>Land Use Designation:</b>	Commercial (C)
<b>Zoning District:</b>	General Business (B-3)
<b>Commission District:</b>	1 (Audrey Fesik)
<b>Agent:</b>	Paola West
<b>Project Planner:</b>	Jonathan Cady (954-786-5578) Jonathan.cady@copbfl.com

Prior to the presentation of Item 1, Mr. Dally stated that he had not yet had an opportunity to review the additional public correspondence and requested assistance in locating the correspondence within the agenda backup materials. The Chair also explained that the presentation for item #2 would be presented first, as it aids in understanding the request of item #1, as they are related to each other.

Mr. Jonathan Cady, Development Services, explained that the application was for consideration of a Major Administrative Adjustment approval for a 24.5% reduction of the required parking spaces. The request is based on the provisions of §155.5102.D.1: Minimum Number of Off-Street Parking Spaces and §155.4202.A.2.h.v.(A), which require a total of 343 off-street and structured parking spaces, rather than the 259 parking spaces the applicant proposes, resulting in a reduction of 84 parking spaces. The maximum allowance for reducing the required parking spaces via a Major Administrative Adjustment is 40%. For the residential portion of the project, a total of 169 parking spaces are required. This calculation utilizes the parking incentives under Broward County's Affordable Housing Density Bonus Policy 2.16.4, which applies a parking formula of one space per 1,000 square feet, two spaces per three bedrooms, and one guest parking space per five dwelling units, resulting in 169 required residential parking spaces. The commercial component requires 151 parking spaces, which accounts for the existing office and bank uses as well as the proposed retail component.

The property includes a 78,734 sq ft office building and a surface parking lot. The site plan application proposes to add a 132-unit multifamily building with 3,650 sq ft of ground-floor retail space, while the existing office building would remain.

The property is located south of E. McNab Road, north of NE 65th Street/Port Royale Boulevard, and east of Federal Highway.

Mr. Cady stated that should the Board find that the application has provided competent, substantial evidence to satisfy the review standards for Major Administrative Adjustment approval, the Development Services Department recommends denial of the Major Administrative Adjustment, subject to the following conditions:

1. If this application is approved, the applicant shall record the Development Order and Administrative Adjustment document with Broward County. A copy of the recorded approval shall be submitted at time of building permit.
2. Provide designated parking spaces for all uses on the lot, for all levels including parking, clearly identifying which spaces correspond to each use, or which spaces may be shared.
3. Subject to substantial conformance to the Site Plan approved under PZ#24-12000027. According to State Statute 366.94 (Electric Vehicle Charging), It is unlawful for a person to stop, stand, or park a vehicle that is not capable of using an electrical recharging station within any parking space specifically designated for charging an electric vehicle. Ensure that sufficient

parking is available, excluding spaces designated for EV Charging only.

4. Standard Conditions of Approval and/or Specifications required prior to Building Permit / Zoning Compliance Permit issuance:
  - a. Plans are subject to compliance with all applicable Code requirements, including but not limited to DRC comments issued for this site plan.

Mr. Cady stated that staff recommended denial of the Major Administrative Adjustment, noting that the requested reduction exceeded what staff found to be appropriate based on Code standards. Mr. Cady outlined the applicable Code provisions.

Mr. Dally, Ms. Coleman, and Mr. Hartsell asked clarifying questions regarding the proposed parking reduction, including the use of compact parking spaces, the allocation of parking between the existing office building and the proposed development, and whether denial of the parking adjustment would impact the associated site plan. Mr. Cady advised that denial of the parking adjustment would require the applicant to return to the Development Review Committee to revise the site plan to comply with parking requirements. Mr. Wemyss added that the code allows applicants to utilize the compact parking spaces.

Paola West (10152 Indiantown Rd Jupiter, FL 33478), representing the applicant, introduced herself and her team and presented the following: Property Location; Project Stats; and Major Administrative Adjustment.

Ms. West stated that they are utilizing Broward County Affordable Housing Bonus Density Policy 2.16.4, which allows for a density bonus of 6 units for every 1 moderate-income unit without requiring allocation of “flexibility units.” Ms. West further stated that the parking reduction is specifically focused on the existing commercial office and not for the required parking spaces of the new residential.

Ms. West presented that the request is for a 24.5% reduction. To justify the adjustment, the applicant is utilizing three separate justifications: Transit Accessibility, Special Facilities for Bicycle Commuters, and Other Eligible Alternatives. Under the first category, Transit Accessibility, Ms. West presented information regarding nearby bus stops, which may permit a parking reduction of up to 15%. Under the second category, Special Facilities for Bicycle Commuters, the developer is proposing to provide showers and locker rooms for bicycle commuters, which may permit a 5% reduction. Under the third category, Other Eligible Alternatives, Ms. West stated that the applicant proposes dedicating one floor of the existing office building to coworking space for residents, which may permit a reduction of up to 10%.

Carl Peterson (8400 N University Dr Tamarac), Transportation Engineer with KBP Consulting, addressed the Board and summarized the parking analysis prepared for the project. Mr. Peterson discussed observed parking demand for the existing office building, referenced national parking generation data, and explained the application of shared parking principles. He stated that real-time parking observations and established industry standards support a reduced parking demand for the office component, as well as for guest parking associated with the residential units. Mr. Peterson noted that the office building is fully occupied and that the real-time observations reflect current parking demand. He further stated that since the COVID-19 pandemic, office buildings have experienced reduced parking demand, a trend supported by Urban Land Institute (ULI) parking studies.

Ms. West stated into the record the findings from three articles that reflect the current trends for office parking since the COVID pandemic. Ms. West stated that according to the articles, vacancy rates in major cities are increasing. In addition, Ms. West stated that the data shows a general increase in people working from home, and it is expected to remain long-term. Ms. West stated that the application meets

the standards set forth in the adjustment criteria, citing the city's comprehensive goals. She further highlighted that the project provides three public benefits, whereas the adjustment requires only one.

Jean Francois, IDEA Architects, explained the architectural concept for the project and stated the design was developed in close coordination with City staff to achieve a high-quality building compatible with the surrounding area. He referenced prior review by the Architectural Appearance Committee and described the building massing, façade articulation, and materials. Mr. Francois stated the design incorporated stepped height transitions to reduce visual impacts on adjacent residential areas and emphasized the intent to create an attractive mixed-use development along Federal Highway.

Ken Garden spoke about the proposed landscaping and creation of garden areas on the site. Mr. Garden discussed the intent to incorporate landscaped open space as an amenity for residents, described how the garden areas would function within the overall site design, and noted efforts to enhance the pedestrian environment and visual quality of the development.

Chair Stacer opened public comment.

Maria Kane, 1550 SE 23<sup>rd</sup> Ave Pompano Beach 33062, supported balanced improvement in the community but expressed comments related to the proposed development, including concerns and observations about site impacts and neighborhood compatibility. Ms. Kane was in opposition to the reduced parking and requested that the Board carefully consider the project's effects on the surrounding area before taking action.

Francis Trafford, 1530 SE 23<sup>rd</sup> Ave Pompano Beach 33062, opposed the parking reduction, raising concerns regarding traffic impacts, referencing congestion associated with two to three nearby developments, and discussed how additional density could exacerbate existing traffic conditions.

Sara Balotto, 1581 SE 23<sup>rd</sup> Ave Pompano Beach 33062, opposed the parking reduction and raised concerns regarding transportation and parking considerations associated with the proposed development. She referenced nearby bus stops and discussed traffic conditions along Federal Highway. Ms. Balotto expressed concern that reduced parking could negatively affect traffic flow and surrounding neighborhoods and stated that transportation impacts along Federal Highway should be carefully evaluated because work from home can go away in the future. She also spoke about homelessness, returning to work, and landscaping. Ms. Balotto expressed a desire for a barrier wall on the rear of the project for safety.

Chair Stacer closed public comment.

Mr. Fisher asked for clarification regarding the proposed parking reduction. Ms. West and Mr. Francois confirmed that residential parking would remain unchanged and that the reduction applied only to the commercial and office uses. Mr. Fisher asked about bicycle facilities and existing parking utilization. Mr. Francois confirmed the facilities were not public and that observed parking demand supported the proposed allocation. Mr. Fisher asked how spaces are currently being occupied by the office space. Mr. Peterson stated that out of the roughly 200 parking spaces, currently about half of the spaces are occupied, with the building almost fully leased.

Vice Chair Coleman asked for clarification regarding parking configuration on the approximately 2.36-acre site. Mr. Francois explained that parking included a combination of surface parking and spaces located at grade within the residential building, and clarified the breakdown of on-site parking.

Mr. Hartsell asked about the availability of nearby on-street parking and whether parking reductions related to bicycle facilities and proximity to bus stops were mandatory or discretionary. Mr. Wemyss explained that such reductions were discretionary and that staff did not support any additional reductions

beyond those already applied, citing ongoing concerns regarding parking allocation and the potential for shared parking. Mr. Wemyss further noted that applying the reductions solely to the commercial component was new to staff and alleviated some concerns regarding the residential aspect of the project; however, the applicant must propose clear measures to ensure that no shared use of parking occurs between the commercial and residential components, as it was not presented in the application or backup materials.

Mr. Hartsell asked for clarification regarding office square footage, parking designation by use, and existing occupancy. Ms. West stated the office building was over 90 percent occupied and described the primary uses as general office tenants. It was confirmed that parking requirements differed by use and that financial institutions carried a higher parking requirement than standard office uses.

Ms. King commented on prior City Commission discussions regarding parking shortages and the potential cost of future parking garages, noting concern about approving reduced parking in light of those discussions. Ms. King stated she was conflicted given ongoing Citywide concerns about parking and asked for clarification regarding the request.

Mr. Wemyss responded that the requested parking reduction was not supported by staff as submitted and explained that the request applied only to the office component. He clarified that the residential parking was already reduced under existing Code provisions and that no shared or centralized public parking garage was proposed for this district.

Chair Stacer asked about the status of parking reductions in the Atlantic and East Overlay Districts. Mr. Wemyss confirmed the reductions were sunseting, would not be extended, and that new applications must comply with the general Code, while existing approvals would remain valid.

Mr. Dally asked whether the proposed surface parking was new and questioned the adequacy of internal parking given the use of compact spaces. Ms. West explained that the site would be fully reconfigured with new surface parking and additional landscaping, confirmed compact spaces would be internal, and clarified that compact and EV spaces complied with Code requirements and could be adjusted if needed.

Mr. Fisher asked for clarification regarding the calculation of the 60,000 square feet of office space and security measures related to residential parking and bicycle facilities. Ms. West explained that the office square footage was confirmed through rent roll review due to the absence of floor plans.

Mr. Francois clarified that enclosed bicycle storage and locker facilities would be secured with key card access limited to residents and office users, consistent with conditions discussed during Architectural Appearance Committee review.

Mr. Fisher expressed concern regarding potential residential parking overflow into office spaces and asked whether security or enforcement measures would be implemented to prevent misuse.

Ms. West addressed comments raised during public comment and clarified the project proposed 132 residential units, including affordable units, not 300. Ms. West noted that properties east of the site were zoned RM-20, with adjacent areas zoned RS-2, and stated the proposal aligned with County affordable housing policy and the City's Code and Comprehensive Plan. Ms. West also responded to comments regarding bicycle facilities, stating they were intended for residents and employees only and noting the site's proximity to nearby bus stops.

Nick Polyushkin, 2880 NE 23rd Place, identified himself as one of the property owners and provided a closing statement. Mr. Polyushkin stated that he lived in Pompano Beach and understood neighborhood concerns. He explained the parking reduction request was intended to accommodate younger residents and workers who may not own cars and instead rely on bicycles, scooters, rideshare services, or public

transit. Mr. Polyushkin stated that transportation habits were changing, noted the project would still provide parking to the extent possible, and thanked the Board and residents for their comments.

Ms. West clarified that the requested parking reduction applied only to the office component of the project. She stated that discussions with staff had focused exclusively on office parking, and that the office square footage and corresponding parking demand were evaluated based on site observations and industry resources. Ms. West further noted that it may not have been clear to staff that the requested reductions did not include the residential component.

Vice Chair Coleman stated familiarity with the applicant's parking studies and agreed with Ms. King's comments regarding ongoing Citywide parking concerns. She supported the project but stated that a nearly 25 percent reduction in required parking was too significant to support, particularly outside an overlay district, due the nature of the shared parking between the two uses.

Mr. Hartsell stated agreement with Vice Chair Coleman's comments and expressed concern that the requested parking reduction was excessive. He noted that the project site was located near his neighborhood and stated that limited parking and lack of available street parking could create safety and access issues for surrounding residential streets. Mr. Hartsell indicated support for the project concept but stated that additional on-site parking would be necessary for his support.

Mr. Dally stated agreement with Vice Chair Coleman and expressed opposition to a nearly 25 percent parking reduction, noting ongoing Citywide parking concerns and indicating he would not support the request.

Chair Stacer questioned the parking calculations and stated concern that the proposed supply would not meet commercial parking demand, noting the nearly 25 percent reduction was excessive. Chair Stacer also asked about buffering between the site and adjacent RM-20 zoning, and Mr. Wemyss confirmed that required setbacks and buffers would be provided.

Assistant City Attorney Saunders asked whether a reduced parking adjustment could be approved administratively. Mr. Wemyss replied that a qualifying minor administrative adjustment could be approved by Development Services, but noted that prior reductions were not supported.

Ms. West requested that the item be tabled until the February 25, 2026, meeting. Discussion ensued about tabling the item and dates.

(1:53:47)

**MOTION** by Richard Dally, seconded by Robert Hartsell, to table the item until the February 25, 2026, meeting. All voted in favor.