



City of Pompano Beach Planning & Zoning Board

Commission Chambers
100 West Atlantic Blvd.
Pompano Beach, FL
33060

MINUTES

Wednesday, November 20, 2024

6:00 PM

(00:20)

A. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Stacer at 6:06 PM.

(00:25)

B. ROLL CALL

Richard Dally
Paul Fisher
Robert Hartsell
Tundra King
Keriann Worley
Carla Coleman
Fred Stacer

Also in Attendance:
James Saunders, Assistant City Attorney
Bobby Adkins
Diego Guevara
Max Wemyss

intentionally blocked / see relevant items below

intentionally blocked / see relevant items below

(1:34:34)

4. [LN-623](#)

TEXT AMENDMENT TO ZONING CODE RELATED TO THE MEASUREMENT OF THE HEIGHT OF STRUCTURES

Request:	Text Amendment (Staff Initiated)
P&Z#	N/A
Owner:	N/A
Project Location:	N/A
Folio Number:	N/A
Land Use Designation:	N/A
Zoning District:	N/A
Commission District:	N/A
Agent:	N/A
Project Planner:	Max Wemyss

Mr. Max Wemyss, Project Planner, introduced himself to the Board. He began his presentation and reviewed the following: Amendment Overview; Text Amendments – The Measurement of Height; Residential Zoning Districts; Community Distribute (B-2); Marine Zoning Districts; Transit Oriented (T.O.) Zoning Districts; Fences and Walls.

Vice Chair Coleman asked about the potential for requiring a transparent fence, referencing a previous case where a condominium installed a glass fence to address neighbor concerns. Mr. Wemyss clarified that current code does not mandate transparency for fences and that the option to request a transparent fence remains available under the existing regulations.

Mr. Hartsell asked about the impact of fences when one lot is elevated three feet to meet FEMA standards, creating a fence that appears nine feet tall to a neighboring property. Mr. Wemyss explained that while front and rear yard fence heights are limited to four and six feet respectively, elevation changes can create significant disparities. He acknowledged the challenge of balancing flood adaptation requirements with existing conditions and suggested that clearer language or limits on fill height could help address these issues. For now, he supported the current approach as the best way to meet development and regulatory needs.

Mr. Dally asked if a property’s height cap would increase with added fill. Mr. Wemyss clarified that while the 105-foot height limit remains unchanged, the measurement point changes. If measured from finished floor elevation, the height is capped consistently, but if measured from grade, added fill could artificially raise the starting point, effectively increasing total height. He cited a past project where underground parking and fill created additional height above the street, causing issues. He supported using FEMA’s required finished floor elevation as the baseline to prevent misuse while accommodating flood requirements. Mr. Dally agreed, stating it ensures fairness and clarity.

Vice Chair Coleman asked about setting a maximum fill limit, citing concerns with new elevated properties along the Intracoastal and canals impacting existing homes. Mr. Wemyss explained that while some communities set minimal

maximum fill limits to address such concerns, fill can add long-term value in flood-prone areas, especially for broader redevelopment. He noted that limiting fill could reduce flexibility for property owners and highlighted the risk of water runoff onto lower neighboring properties. He suggested retaining walls and requiring water to remain on-site as potential solutions and recommended monitoring impacts before imposing a fill cap.

MOTION by Carla Coleman and seconded by Paul Fisher that the Board recommends approval of the text amendment as it finds the proposed revisions consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and meets the review standards for a zoning code text amendment. All voted in favor. The motion was approved.

intentionally blocked