

Plan Review - Review Comments Report

Project Name: **PZ25-13000003**
Workflow Started: **10/14/2025 5:38:04 PM**
Report Generated: **11/20/2025 02:53 PM**

REVIEW COMMENTS						
REF #	CYCLE	REVIEWED BY	TYPE	FILENAME	DISCUSSION	STATUS
1	1	BSO Anthony Russo 11/13/25 11:08 AM	Comment Development Review Committee Date Reviewed: 11-13-2025 Subject: CPTED and Security Strengthening Report: PZ#: 25-13000003 Name: ADDERLY COVE / HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF POMPANO BEACH Address / Folio: 1600 NW 6th Avenue, Pompano Beach, FL Type: Re-zoning Request Reviewer: BSO Deputy T. Russo for the City of Pompano Beach Reviewer: BSO Deputy D. Cappellazo for the City of Pompano Beach anthony_russo@sheriff.org M-(561) 917-4556 (Send Text & Email; No Voicemail) Tuesday Friday; 8 AM 3 PM BSO comments will be provided when a Security Strengthening & CPTED plan is submitted for review.			Info Only
2	1	UTILITIES Nathaniel Watson 11/17/25 7:47 PM	Comment 1. Additional comments may be forthcoming contingent upon future submittals to the PAM and/or DRC review process.			Info Only
3	1	UTILITIES Nathaniel Watson 11/17/25 7:47 PM	Comment 2. An existing City Wastewater Lift Station adjacent to NW 6 Avenue, located along the southwest area of the lot, requires a utility easement. The asset serves the subject area and property.			Info Only
4	1	UTILITIES Nathaniel Watson 11/17/25 7:47 PM	Comment 3. With the exception of comment #2, the City Utilities Dept. has no comment regarding the rezoning approval.			Info Only
5	1	PLANNING Jean Dolan 11/19/25 7:45 AM	Comment 1. The site is eligible for the use of policy 2.16.3 with the provision of affordable units. Define the affordable housing level using the language in Policy 2.16.3. Specify if the units to be deed restricted to affordable for 30-years will be moderate income (does not exceed 120% of median) or low income (not to exceed 80% of median income). Right now, your narrative just says "80% of median income" so the units could be considered moderate income when you're really serving the 50-80% of income range (low income). The difference is a considerable amount of bonus units (not all of which you need). The moderate income restriction (not to exceed 120% of median) gives you 6 bonus units for every moderate income unit while the low income restriction (not to exceed 80% of median) gives you 9 bonus units for every such unit. If all 41 of the units by right will be deed restricted			Unresolved



Plan Review - Review Comments Report

Project Name: **PZ25-13000003**

Workflow Started: **10/14/2025 5:38:04 PM**

Report Generated: **11/20/2025 02:53 PM**

			to affordable (as we assume all units will be since it is Housing Authority property), the moderate income restriction would yield 246 bonus units (41x6) which is considerably more than the total units requested.			
6	1	PLANNING Jean Dolan 11/19/25 7:45 AM	Comment 2. This parcel is surrounded by Kendall Lakes to the north and east; Liberty Park to the north, and Sanders Park to the south. The parcel directly west of the site is part of the same Blanche Ely plat as the subject parcel. The 12 du/ac proposed is higher than the surrounding properties which are all Low 5 land use and RS-4 Zoning to the north and south, RS-3 to the east and RD-1 to the west. Compatibility with adjacent properties can be established with the proposed building heights not to exceed 35 and given the size of the property, there is adequate space for additional buffering for this relatively higher density.			Info Only
7	1	PLANNING Jean Dolan 11/19/25 7:46 AM	Comment 3. It does not appear that RPUD zoning is necessary for this parcel. Rezoning to RM 12 would require less upfront design (which has not yet been done adequately to meet the requirements of a RPUD Master Plan) and is less restrictive than the lot standards defined by the Applicant in the current RPUD Application (the Applicant can volunteer to be more restrictive than the RM-12 standards at time of site plan, if desired). The additional entitlements through 2.16.3 can be issued via the rezoning ordinance to RM-12 so there is no need to propose an RPUD.			Unresolved
8	1	PLANNING Jean Dolan 11/19/25 7:47 AM	Comment 4. Based on the use of Policy 2.16.3, the incentives in 155.4202 apply to the project and therefore are not deviations from the Code as noted in the RPUD document provided as part of this submittal.			Info Only
9	1	PLANNING Jean Dolan 11/19/25 7:49 AM	Comment 5. The other proposed deviations are so minor as to not require codification through a RPUD and can be achieved through administrative methods and given the land area available for landscaping, deviations from landscape code may not be needed or justifiable.			Unresolved
10	1	PLANNING Jean Dolan 11/19/25 7:49 AM	Comment 6. The review standards for a rezoning to a standard zoning district are below. Staff’s opinion that a rezoning to RM-12 could be justified under these standards. Please revise your request accordingly. SITE-SPECIFIC ZONING MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING) REVIEW STANDARDS In determining whether to adopt or deny a proposed Zoning Map Amendment, the City shall weigh the relevance of information submitted by the applicant and consider the extent to which the proposed amendment is consistent with the Future Land Use Category and any applicable goals, objectives and policies of the Comprehensive Plan. Accordingly, the review criteria for a Site-Specific Rezoning Application are as follows:			Unresolved



Plan Review - Review Comments Report

Project Name: **PZ25-13000003**

Workflow Started: **10/14/2025 5:38:04 PM**

Report Generated: **11/20/2025 02:53 PM**

			<p>Section 155.2404.C, Site-Specific Zoning Map Amendment Review Standards</p> <p>1. The applicant has provided, as part of the record of the public hearing on the application, competent substantial evidence that the proposed amendment:</p> <p>a. Is consistent with the Future Land Use Category and any applicable goals, objectives, and policies of the comprehensive plan and all other applicable city-adopted plans.</p> <p>A. Along with general policies requiring the availability of public services and facilities (water and wastewater), the following policies of the Comprehensive Plan that are generally considered when reviewing a rezoning request:</p> <p>Policy 01.03.12 The following criteria may be used in evaluating rezoning requests:</p> <p>A. Density; B. Design; C. Distance to similar development; D. Existing adjoining uses; E. Proposed adjoining uses; F. Readiness for redevelopment of surrounding uses; and. G. Proximity to mass transit.</p> <p>Policy 01.08.01 Follow the recommendation of the Community Redevelopment Plans in all Land Use Plan amendments and rezonings.</p> <p>Policy 01.06.01 Consider and minimize the impacts that land use amendments, rezonings or site plan approvals have on natural resources, including wetlands, and culturally, historically, archaeologically and paleontologically significant resources.</p> <p>Policy 01.06.12 Review all land use plan map amendments, rezonings and site plan applications to ensure that there is sufficient wastewater collection and treatment facilities, potable water resources available and if reuse water is available, require it be used, and that they pose no noxious impacts to the Biscayne Aquifer.</p>			
11	1	LANDSCAPE REVIEW Mark Brumet 11/19/25 12:03 PM	<p>Comment</p> <p>1. Comments will be rendered at time of site plan submittal.</p>			Unresolved



Plan Review - Review Comments Report

Project Name: **PZ25-13000003**

Workflow Started: **10/14/2025 5:38:04 PM**

Report Generated: **11/20/2025 02:53 PM**

12	1	LANDSCAPE REVIEW Mark Brumet 11/19/25 12:03 PM	Comment 3. Provide landscape plans in accordance with 155.5203 for the entire site.			Unresolved
13	1	LANDSCAPE REVIEW Mark Brumet 11/19/25 12:10 PM	Comment 2. Based on staff discussion, the recommendation is to follow a different approach; see Planning comments. Additionally, if the current approach remains, justification for the proposed deviations as noted on table H shall be required.			Unresolved
14	1	ZONING Max Wemyss 11/20/25 11:06 AM	<p>Comment</p> <p>Narrative emphasizes "eyes on the street" as an aspect of the innovative neighborhood design. The only support for this (other than the fact that the front of the houses will face the street) is that "most of the units will have front porches." How is that further supported or required by the planned development? Unit types/locations/layout/etc have not been provided.</p> <p>Narrative references a wellness track on the perimeter of the site, which is not shown on the concept plan. Wellness track to feature a 5-foot sidewalk in a 20-foot-wide green space. Provide a specific plan with hardscape and landscape.</p> <p>The narrative states that the surrounding neighborhood will feature a greenbelt, specifically excluding rear yards. Please clarify how this distinction between private yards and public green spaces will be clearly defined and required.</p> <p>"The Greens" as a community benefit/amenity. Show on a plan as "shared front yards".</p> <p>The layout provided on the concept plan does not demonstrate a level of detail to justify the necessity of a planned development. Either the development is planned, showing why general code compliance is not feasible, or the property is rezoned to a general zoning designation.</p> <p>The conflicts with the general code that have resulted in the requested deviations are not reasonably demonstrated; therefore, the requested deviations and their justifications are difficult to support.</p> <p>Use of 2.16.3 (for additional land use density) can be applied with a standard rezoning application by a declaration of restrictive covenants recorded for the unified development site. Site Plan(s) or individual building permits to follow based on the scope of the proposal.</p> <p>Survey shows a lift station that is not otherwise acknowledged. Appears to conflict with "secondary fire access". Show on the master plan.</p>			Unresolved

