



City of Pompano Beach Planning & Zoning Board

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

MINUTES

Wednesday, September 25, 2024

6:00 PM

(00:19)

A. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Stacer at 6:01 PM.

(00:20)

B. ROLL CALL

Marianne Edge
Paul Fisher
Robert Hartsell
Tundra King
Keriann Worley
Carla Coleman
Fred Stacer

Also in Attendance:
James Saunders, Assistant City Attorney
Bobby Adkins
Saul Umana
Max Wemyss
Jean Dolan

(0:55)

C. MOMENT OF SILENCE

The Board observed a brief moment of silence.

(01:25)

D. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

MOTION by Robert Hartsell and seconded by Carla Coleman to approve the minutes of the July 24, 2024 meeting, as amended. All voted in favor.

(02:15)

E. INDIVIDUALS TESTIFYING PLACED UNDER OATH

Individuals testifying in front of the Board were placed under oath by Bobby Adkins, Planning Aide and Notary Public in the State of Florida.

F. NEW BUSINESS

(02:30)

1. [LN-537](#) 200 PARK CENTRAL

Request: Major Site Plan
P&Z# 23-12000034

Owner: 200 Park Central LLC
Project Location: 200 Park Central Blvd
Folio Number: 484222200030
Land Use Designation: I (Industrial)
Zoning District: O-IP (Office Industrial Park)
Commission District: 4 (Beverly Perkins)
Agent: Damon Ricks
Project Planner: Saul Umana

Mr. Saul Umana, Project Planner, introduced himself to the Board. He stated that the applicant is requesting approval for improvements to an existing manufacturing, warehousing, and distribution development. The site spans 261,931 square feet (6.0 acres) and features a 59,000-square-foot single-story building used for manufacturing, warehousing, and distribution. The project includes removing a 28,700-square-foot section of the existing building on the south side and constructing two new single-story buildings, each 35 feet tall, for industrial, warehousing, and distribution purposes. Proposed Building A will cover 32,445 square feet, and Proposed Building B will cover 45,960 square feet, for a total new building area of 78,405 square feet. When added to the remaining 30,300 square feet of the existing building, the overall total building area will be 108,705 square feet (40% lot coverage).

Additionally, the project proposes to fill the northern portion of the canal to create 103 parking spaces. The project scope includes vacating four existing easements as follows: a 20' drainage easement per ORB 11108/111 BCR, a 20' drainage easement per ORB 11438/231 BCR, a 24' access easement per Plat, and a 10' FPL easement.

The site plan was reviewed by the Development Review Committee on December 6, 2023, April 17, 2024, and July 3, 2024. The project was also approved by the Architectural Appearance Committee on August 6, 2024 with one condition.

The property is located north of Copans Road, west of North Andrews Avenue, and south of Park Central Boulevard.

Mr. Umana stated that should the Board find that the application has provided competent, substantial evidence to satisfy the review standards for Major Site Plan approval, the Development Services Department recommends approval of the Major Site Plan subject to the following comments and conditions:

1. Prior to building permit approval, provide evidence that all easements referenced in the Staff Report have been abandoned and recorded.
2. Correct the following sheets:
 - a. SP-1 Site Plan: update the setback and parking data tables to accurately reflect the proposed work on the site plan; and
 - b. Sheet A-1 Architectural 1st Floor Plan - Building A: correct the proposed floor area square footage.
3. Revise the plans to include a bronze aluminum picket fence along the south and west perimeter to match the proposed gates.
4. Standard Conditions of Approval and/or Specifications required prior to Building Permit / Zoning Compliance Permit issuance:
 - a. The applicant shall provide evidence of compliance for the 12 points used for the Sustainability Narrative as submitted to the DRC in accordance with Table 155.5802: Sustainable Development Options and Points at the time of building permit review.
 - b. Plans are subject to compliance with all applicable Code requirements, including but not limited to DRC comments issued for this site plan.
 - c. Landscape and Irrigation Plans must comply with all Zoning Code requirements as verified by the City's Urban Forestry Division.
 - d. Provide a photometric plan that complies with Code Section 155.5401: General Exterior Lighting Standards.

- e. A copy of the CPTED plan approved by the Broward Sheriff’s Office must be submitted for Building / Zoning Compliance Permit approval.

Ms. Stephanie Toothaker, 501 SW 2nd Avenue, Fort Lauderdale introduced herself on behalf of the applicant as well as the applicant and additional project team members. She began her presentation and reviewed the following: Site Location; Future Land Use & Zoning Designations; Existing Site; Site Plan; Existing and New Views; and Renderings. She agreed to the staff conditions.

Chair Stacer asked the Board if there were any questions for staff. There were none.

Chair Stacer opened the public hearing. No one came forth to speak. Chair Stacer closed the public hearing.

MOTION by Carla Coleman and seconded by Tundra King that the Board finds that competent, substantial evidence has been presented for the Major Site Plan that satisfies the review criteria and move approval of the item, subject to the four condition provided by staff voted in favor. The motion was approved.

(12:30)

2. [LN-646](#)

SCRIVENER’S ERRORS CORRECTIONS- TEXT AMENDMENT

Request:	Text Amendment
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:	Saul Umana

Mr. Saul Umana, Project Planner, introduced himself to the Board and reviewed the corrections proposed in the Text Amendments. He explained that the text amendments to Chapter 155 were intended to correct errors in the city's code due to Scrivener’s mistakes or oversights from previous amendments, emphasizing that no new uses were being introduced. He outlined corrections to the table of contents to align section titles with actual headings, such as changing "reserved" to "measurements for properties abutting the beach." In the downtown overlay district, an inconsistency regarding residential use in the transit core district was corrected, updating the table to show that residential use is optional on all floors. He discussed updates to Section 8.2, clarifying abbreviations like "P" (permitted), blank spaces (not permitted), and "S" (special exception needed) and the addition of language on the transit-oriented district. Most corrections focused on Appendix A, including updating the table of uses to distinguish between convenience stores and grocery stores, which had been amended in 2018 but not reflected in the appendix.

Given the information provided to the Board, the Development Services Department provides the following alternative motion options, which may be revisited or modified at the Board’s discretion:

Alternative Motion I

The Board recommends approval of the code amendment as it finds the proposed text amendment consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and meets the review standards for a zoning code text amendment.

Alternative Motion II

The Board recommends the item be tabled to give Staff time to address issues raised by the Board, Staff, or the general public.

Staff recommends Alternative Motion I.

Vice Chair Coleman asked about healthcare uses and questioned if the city had any PD-TO (Planned Development – Transit Oriented) districts. Max Wemyss clarified Pompano Beach does not have any PD-TOs to date.

Mr. Hartsell asked if any pending projects would be approved with the proposed amendments. Mr. Umana replied no.

Chair Stacer opened the public hearing. No one came forth to speak. Chair Stacer closed the public hearing.

MOTION by Tundra King and seconded by Keriann Worley that the Board finds that competent, substantial evidence has been presented for the Text Amendment that satisfies the review criteria and move approval of Alternative Motion I. All voted in favor. The motion was approved.

(20:35)

3. [LN-647](#)

TEXT AMENDMENT - OUTDOOR STORAGE / OUTDOOR ACTIVITY

Request:	Text Amendment
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:	Lauren Gratzer

Max Wemyss, Project Planner, introduced himself to the Board and reviewed the corrections to the Text Amendments. He explained the text amendment to Article Four, which focused on outdoor activities and uses. He clarified that the goal was to codify existing practices to reduce confusion among applicants and staff. The amendment aimed to distinguish between outdoor business activities during operating hours and permanent outdoor storage of goods, which is a defined use in the code. Specific updates included clarifying permitted retail showrooms and adding standards for outdoor activity in categories such as boat and marine uses, motor vehicle uses, and government maintenance facilities. He also introduced a new automotive use for vinyl wrapping and tinting facilities, which would now be permitted by right in the B-3 district without requiring a special exception. In the industrial services category, updates clarified that outdoor storage is permitted for fuel oil and bottled gas distribution. Other uses, such as heavy equipment establishments and boat manufacturing, were also addressed to allow outdoor activity under specific standards. Wemyss emphasized that the changes would not extend to new areas but would only apply to zones where such activities were already permitted. Finally, the amendment clarified the status of fleets and cargo in warehousing and freight movement, ensuring proper regulations for outdoor storage.

Given the information provided to the Board, the Development Services Department provides the following alternative motion options, which may be revisited or modified at the Board’s discretion:

Alternative Motion I

The Board recommends approval of the code amendment as it finds the proposed revisions consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and meets the review standards for a zoning code text amendment.

Alternative Motion II

The Board recommends the item be tabled to give Staff time to address issues raised by the Board, Staff, or the general public.

Staff recommends Alternative Motion I.

Chair Stacer asked the Board if there were any questions for staff.

Vice Chair Coleman asked if any of the proposed changes would affect the buffer requirements for residential areas, specifically if they would remain as strict as the code had previously required. Mr. Wemyss confirmed that the buffer requirements would not change. He explained that the standard remains a type B buffer for motor vehicle and marine uses, unless a perimeter buffer is required for the property. Perimeter buffers are still required when commercial or industrial uses are adjacent to residential properties, and those buffer standards remain unchanged.

Mr. Hartsell asked if any pending projects would be approved with the proposed amendments. Mr. Wemyss responded that he was not aware of any such projects and clarified that the amendments were primarily focused on housekeeping updates.

Ms. Edge asked about tinting and vinyl wrapping services, noting there were no specific conditions for outdoor storage. Mr. Wemyss explained that vehicles could be temporarily parked in designated spaces, but long-term storage would follow existing outdoor storage rules. He confirmed that outdoor storage would cover equipment and supplies as well and emphasized that outdoor activity was only allowed where permitted with no special exceptions.

Ms. Edge asked Mr. Wemyss to clarify the existing screening requirements and how they apply without the need for special exceptions. Mr. Wemyss explained that outdoor storage requires a Type C buffer, which includes a 10-foot-wide buffer with an 8-foot masonry wall and landscaping. For less restrictive areas, a Type B buffer with a 6-foot fence and landscaping is used. He noted that these buffers are applied based on the property's location, with flexibility for interior and street sides.

Chair Stacer asked Mr. Wemyss about the tallest wall allowed in an industrial zone like I-1X. Mr. Wemyss responded that the maximum wall height permitted is 10 feet for outdoor storage, and materials stored outside must be shorter than the screening wall. He noted that exceptions exist for heavy equipment and industrial manufacturing sites, such as recycling plants, where taller items may be visible from outside.

Chair Stacer followed up by asking about large equipment and the role of site plans. Mr. Wemyss explained that while the city buffers industrial properties, there are cases where older properties were never formally site planned. When businesses change, the city uses that opportunity to enforce compliance with current standards, ensuring the site is appropriate for its new use. If a property cannot meet the specific standards, the application or site plan would be denied.

MOTION by Carla Coleman and seconded by Tundra King that the Board recommends approval of the code 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.

(38:16)

H. AUDIENCE TO BE HEARD

There was none.

(38:24)

I. OTHER BUSINESS

1. REPORTS BY STAFF

Ms. Jean Dolan, Development Services, shared the results of a poll on how cities handle site plan reviews. Only three cities (Oakland Park, unincorporated Broward County, and Coral Springs) review site plans administratively without involving boards. Lighthouse Point and Plantation follow a similar process as Pompano Beach by taking site plans to the Planning and Zoning Board, while cities like Lauderhill send major plans to city commission. Twelve cities, including larger ones like Miramar and Davie, take all site plans to their city commissions. Ms. Dolan noted developers appreciate Pompano's clear and structured review process.

A brief discussion ensued about the information.

2. BOARD MEMBERS DISCUSSION

Mr. Hartsell requested a cheat sheet for motion. City Attorney Saunders agreed.

(46:52)

J. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Committee, **MOTION** by all to adjourn the meeting at 6:47 PM.

Signed by:

A7709CDFAFBC46B...
Fred Stacer, Chair