



# City of Pompano Beach



## Cycle 1 DRC Comment Responses January 25, 2023 – PZ22-13000004

PZ22-13000004  
03/01/2023

---

**File #:** LN-355

---

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE  
Meeting Date: OCTOBER 19, 2022

### POMPANO CITI CENTRE PCD AMENDMENT

**Request:** Rezoning  
**P&Z#** 22-13000004  
**Owner:** SVAP POMPANO CITI CENTRE LP  
**Project Location:** 1400-1460 NE 23 ST  
**Folio Number:** Multiple Folios  
**Land Use Designation:** C (Commercial)  
**Zoning District:** PCD (Planned Commercial Development)  
**Commission District:** 2 (Rhonda Eaton)  
**Agent:** Shane Zalonis (954-527-6258)  
**Project Planner:** Jean Dolan (954-786-4045 / jean.dolan@copbfl.com)

#### PLANNING

**Plan Reviewer:** Jean E. Dolan, AICP, CFM  
**Status:** Review Complete, Resubmittal Required

**Introduction:** This is a PD amendment for the Citi Centre Mall to accommodate the residential community being built on the Macy's building and parking field in the rear of the property. The 12.15 acre residential property being removed from the PCD has a 29.5 acre Irregular density allowing 356 units. The remainder of the Citi Centre PCD being revised is a 47.7 acre site with a Commercial land use designation and a B-3/PCD zoning.

#### Planning

Comments on PCD Narrative:

The numbered items are the principles referenced in City Code Section 155.3601.A and the comments are staff's response to the Applicant's narrative relevant to these principles:

1. Reducing or diminishing the inflexibility or uniform design that sometimes results from strict application of zoning and development standards designed primarily for individual lots;

Staff's comments on narrative response: The reference to the zoning district is outdated. The current and proposes zoning designation is B-3/PCD.

The Applicant's response focuses on the integration of the new residential community, however, the residential has not

been integrated but appears to be entirely fenced off and disconnected. There is no sign of integration of the residential on the PCD master plan. Landscaped pedestrian connectivity through the parking lots to the retail space is missing.

**DRC**

PZ22-13000004

03/01/2023

There does not appear to be sidewalks between the residential and commercial uses on either the PCD or the site plan for the residential.

PZ22-13000004  
03/01/2023

Please revise the PCD master plan to show pleasant and direct pedestrian connectivity between the two uses.

Response: The PCD master plan and residential site plan have been revised to show pleasant and direct pedestrian connectivity between the two uses.

2. Allowing greater freedom in selecting the means of providing access, open space, and design amenities;

Staff's comments on the narrative response: As noted in #1 above, the minimum expectation is for pedestrian connections between the residential and the mall. There are no obvious breaks in the fence around the residential for people to easily walk to the mall. No landscaped path is provided. The people can't get to the pedestrian walkway around the Airpark because it's entirely fenced off. The residential development does not appear integrated into the site.

Both the PCD Master Plan and the residential site plan should show internal and external pedestrian connections that do not require walking through parking lots and provide efficient connections to the internal and external amenities and uses.

Response: The PCD master plan and residential site plan have been revised to show internal and external pedestrian connectivity which provide efficient connections to the internal and external amenities and uses.

3. Allowing greater freedom in providing a well-integrated mix of residential and nonresidential land uses in the same development, including a mix of housing types, lot sizes, and densities;

Staff's comments on the narrative response: Staff cannot detect the referenced interface or integration with the residential. It is cut off and treated as a hard-line between uses which does not encourage pedestrian activity to the mall. The emergency exit opens into a parking row that provides access to back-out parking spaces.

At a minimum, the revised "perimeter road" should be a real street with sidewalks and landscaping and striping with no direct access to back-out parking. At best, the "emergency exit" should be a second location for ingress and egress opening onto a "real perimeter road" that takes residential traffic directly to the intersection where the traffic study shows half of the peak hour traffic exiting onto Federal Highway.

Response: Per applicants meeting with staff on 11/17/2022, the revised plan addresses staff comments and concerns.

4. Allowing more efficient use of land, with smaller networks of streets and utilities and thereby lowering development and housing costs; and

Staff's comments on the narrative response: There is no connectivity and there are no streets associated with either the PCD amendment or the new residential community. There is no "shared parking". There's a fence around the entire residential parcel. The PCD and site plan for the residential should be modified to show a pleasant pedestrian experience both on and off the residential site.

Response: The PCD master plan and residential site plan have been revised to show connectivity and a pleasant pedestrian experience both on and off the residential site.

5. Promoting quality design and environmentally sensitive development that respects surrounding established land use character and respects and takes advantage of a site's natural and man-made features, such as trees, wetlands, floodplains, and historic features.

Staff's comments on the narrative response: It is impossible to review the PCD Master Plan without also looking at the residential site plan. One of the notable man-made features of the area is the walking trail around the Airpark which is a tremendous asset for this residential project yet the path is completely fenced off. Access to the internal amenities, such as the dog park and the dog wash, requires traversing parking lots as does walking to the adjacent mall.

The narrative references sustainable mixed use development. The proposed design does not meet the design guidelines to be defined as a "Sustainable mixed use development" which is characterized by the following per the City and County Comprehensive Plan policies:

*The design guidelines for Mixed Use Residential shall promote an urban form which creates well integrated land use combinations, balances intensity and density, promotes the safe, interconnectivity of vehicular, pedestrian and other non-motorized movement and promotes the public realm. These guidelines may include:*

- *Buildings should front the street. (ero or minimum setbacks are preferable).*
- *Vehicle parking strategies which lessen conflicts with bicycles and pedestrians and promote transit usage. (i.e. parking structures, off-site parking, reduced parking ratios, shared parking facilities and parking which does not front the street).*
- *Other design features which promote transit (e.g. integrated transit stop, shelter or station on site).*
- *A circulation system designed to strengthen bicycle and pedestrian connectivity to all areas of the site/area, including recreation areas, parks, adjacent uses, transit facilities and activity nodes.*
- *Integration of the public realm through open space or urban public plazas and/or recreational areas.*
- *The physical separation, such as walling off neighborhoods from adjacent development or roadways, is discouraged where it disrupts the connectivity of compatible uses, pedestrian and/or bicycle access. If a buffer is necessary, adequate landscaping could be used in place of a continuous wall.*

*Design guidelines shall ensure a mixed use development is compatible with surrounding land uses and/or adjacent adopted Future Land Use Plan designations. These guidelines should address the following:*

- *Complement and support adjacent existing land uses and/or adopted Future Land Use Plan designations through the effective use of density, massing and other design elements.*
- *Protect the integrity of existing single-family neighborhoods through design elements which maintain consistency and/or improve the aesthetic quality of the neighborhood. (i.e. maintaining an architectural style or quality of building materials and construction predominant in the neighborhood).*
- *Promote connectivity, open space, pedestrian and other non-motorized networks and landscaped streetscapes.*
- *Incorporate designs which are environmentally sensitive (i.e. reduction of impervious surfaces, alternative material for spillover parking).*

#### **US 1 Corridor Study References:**

- The US 1 corridor study adopted in 2013 identified areas where "pedestrian emphasis streets" should be considered. The "streets" associated with Citi Centre were on this list of recommended locations. The features of these streets is what staff would like to see on the PCD Master Plan connecting the residential to the mall ( enhanced sidewalks with lighting, shade trees and pedestrian amenities such as benches, on-road sharrows for bicycles, and bulb outs or other traffic calming measures at intersections.)

#### **Excerpt from the US 1 Corridor Study PEDESTRIAN EMPHASIS STREETS**

While called pedestrian emphasis streets, these roads also typically accommodate on-road bicycle travel because of lower automobile speeds and volumes. Marking them with sharrows and signs to create a bicycle route system and incorporating traffic calming techniques, thereby creating "bicycle boulevards", is important to creating an active transportation culture and provide mobility and access to jobs, goods and services through means other than by

automobile.

PZ22-13000004

03/01/2023

- Designate pedestrian emphasis streets that are important to move people through non-automobile means, namely walking and bicycling, and prioritize capital improvement projects to enhance the bicyclist and pedestrian experience. These streets provide key connections between residential neighborhoods and Federal Highway/US 1, allowing for safe and convenient non-motorized forms of transportation to reach key destinations - shopping, dining, recreation, or employment. While some of these streets have existing sidewalks, the condition is typically less than ideal and there is a lack of pedestrian amenities, such as shade trees or adequate widths to support a comfortable pedestrian experience. Improvements should consist of some or all of the following treatments: enhanced sidewalks with lighting, shade trees and pedestrian amenities such as benches, on-road sharrows for bicycles, and bulb outs or other traffic calming measures at intersections.

- Along the Federal Highway/US 1 corridor, the following pedestrian emphasis streets are prioritized for implementation due to their role as:

- a) major access points to the corridor from surrounding neighborhoods,
  - b) locations providing access to high activity destinations, or
  - c) areas in proximity of schools, parks or other uses that generate pedestrian and bicycle activity.
- NE 33rd Street, west of Federal Highway/US 1
  - Perimeter road surrounding Citi Centre\*
  - Two access roads from Copans Road to Citi Centre\*
  - Access road from Federal Highway/US 1 to Citi Centre\*
  - Access road from western perimeter road to Citi Centre\*
  - NE 18th Street, east of Federal Highway/US 1 (across from Citi Centre perimeter road)
  - NE 14th Street, east of Federal Highway/US 1
  - NE 10th Street, east and west of Federal Highway/US 1
  - NE 6th Street, east and west of Federal Highway/US 1
  - SE 2nd Street, east and west of Federal Highway/US 1
  - McNab Road, east and west of Federal Highway/US 1

*\*The asterisk notes streets that are not public and will require coordination with the landowner and modification of the development/site plan*

Note that the following statement was also made about the desired future of Citi Centre in the US 1 corridor study. Broward County Policy 2.16.4 could be used to generate residential entitlements by right for the PCD enabling mixed use buildings along the US 1 and Copans Road frontages to implement this vision without the need for a Comprehensive Plan amendment:

*Retrofit existing shopping centers, including Citi Centre, to line these centers with commercial and retail uses closer to the street.*

[Response: Per applicants meeting with staff on 11/17/2022, the revised plan addresses staff comments and concerns.](#)

#### Comments on the PCD Master Plan:

(1) The request made at the PreApplication conference to improve the internal circulation, particularly among the northern outparcels has not been addressed. That will continue to be an issue with the Planning and Zoning Board. Improvements to this circulation may not be made immediately but if shown on the revised PCD Master Plan, staff will be able to encourage those improvements to be built over time when the subject areas are requesting improvements in the future.

Response: Applicant understands the issues and concerns raised by staff and would be willing to work with staff to come up with a future plan to address these concerns. Applicant is not in a position currently to implement any changes as part of this approval.

PZ22-13000004  
09/01/2023

(2) The circulation plan submitted in response to the PreApp comments that shows external connections to Copans and Federal is not related to improving internal circulation.

Response: Please see comment above.

(3) In addition to landscaped pedestrian connections from the residential to the mall, pedestrian connections should be shown on the PCD Master Plan to the external bus stops from the mall and the residential property. The residential site plan should then follow suit and show the internal pedestrian connections to the external pedestrian connections to the mall and bus stops.

Response: Per applicants meeting on with staff on 11/17/2022, the revised plan addresses staff comments and concerns. A pedestrian connection is now shown which provides access to both bus stops from the residential site plan.

(4) Building M and Building K are existing (they are shown as proposed on the PCD Master Plan).

Response: Plan has been updated.

(5) The notes on this PCD Master Plan were cut and paste from the 2006 PCD Master Plan and thus are outdated. The City adopted a new Code in 2013 which revamps the way PCDs are accomplished. A table of "deviations" from all applicable code standards should replace this list of conditions to explain the unique design elements of the PCD. See zoning comments for specific code sections that apply.

Response: This is an existing PCD and the proposed amendment affects only a portion of the original PCD. The master developer does not have plans to redevelop the entire PCD at this time. The Applicant requests that the the existing development be governed by the deviations granted in the prior PCD approval. When major redevelopment of the PCD is proposed, a new set of deviations may be proposed and implemented.

(6) Specific issues with the old notes include the following: Response: Notes were revised to update information and remove those that are no longer applicable. A deviation table was added to address those deviations approved previously.

Note 1 - the existing and proposed zoning district is B-3/PCD.

Note 3 - this is outdated since there is no food court and there are multiple restaurants in the mall.

Note re: Perimeter Buffer (B) - this does not apply in the current context since the loop road is being totally reconfigured to accommodate the residential project.

Note 6 - where is a parking structure planned or is this just old language? Structured parking would be an improvement.

Note 8 - Stormwater. We are not aware of any adjacent City owned property that can be used to accommodate the stormwater management for this site.

Note 9 and Note 20 - There is no unified control and because of that, there is no Master Sign Program. Note 10 and 11 - there is no phasing associated with this PD and the property is already platted. There's no need to list platting requirements on the PD Master Plan since those regulations apply outside of the PD regulatory structure.

Note 12 - it is unclear how the parking space size and drive-isle widths result in additional landscaping and pedestrian gathering areas, however, if this PD is not meeting the B-3 parking design requirements, that can be addressed in the deviations table.

**ZONING****Plan Reviewer: Pamela Stanton****Review Status: Review Complete, Resubmittal Required**

1. Provide written responses to comments.
2. Broward County Land Use Plan Policy 2.16.3 is currently being amended (expected adoption is December 2022 or January 2023) and will allow density bonuses up to 50 du/ac for the provision of affordable housing (which the project has already committed to providing). The Applicant could be entitled to 607 units (+251 units compared to current entitlements (+70%)) on this property with the provision of 87 moderate income units deed restricted for 30 -years. The math formula is as follows: 87 moderate income units X 6 bonus units each = 522 bonus units + 87 moderate income units = 609 units. The property at 12.15 acres @50 du/ac would allow for 607 units so that would be the maximum allowed under the new policy. It should also be noted, however, that due to the project's location on Copans and Federal, more than 50 du/ac could be allowed if the Applicant was interested. This increase in units would be accomplished through a rezoning to RPUD. If this increased density would allow the Applicant to consider a more urban design with structured parking and compact building design to enable better integration of the residential site with the mall and the golf course with additional open space and better access to amenities for future residents, staff would certainly support an increase in density using this County policy.
3. Provide a table in the amended PCD that compares the proposed Code modifications to current Code requirements, with the exception of modifications to design standards that are prohibited in Table 155.3604.

Response: This is an existing PCD and the proposed amendment affects only a portion of the original PCD. The master developer does not have plans to redevelop the entire PCD at this time. The Applicant requests that the the existing development be governed by the deviations granted in the prior PCD approval. When major redevelopment of the PCD is proposed, a new set of deviations may be proposed and implemented.

4. The City's Transportation Corridor Study Transformation Plan identifies the perimeter road surrounding the City Centre as a "pedestrian emphasis street," which accommodates on-road bicycle travel (sharrows), enhanced sidewalks with lighting, shade trees and pedestrian amenities such as benches, and bulb outs or other traffic calming measures. On the Master Site Plan, address the loop road to conform to the Corridor Study for pedestrian emphasis street.

Response: The plan has been revised consistent with meetings and input from City Staff.

5. Provide a regulation in the PCD that addresses pedestrian connectivity by requiring pedestrian walkways to be installed through the parking areas between at least every three parking bays or at intervals not less than 200 feet apart, whichever is less, and that provides clearly identified pedestrian routes between parking areas and primary pedestrian entrances to the buildings served by the parking areas. Include a provision that requires walkways providing pedestrian access between parking area and associated buildings to be extended to provide connections to abutting street sidewalks and to adjoining development.

Response: The plan has been revised consistent with meetings and input from City Staff.

6. The PD Plan must include all applicable uses permitted (principal & accessory) in the development. Refer to Appendix A, Consolidated use table & identify those uses that are permitted within an PCD to select which uses will be permitted principal & accessory uses in this district.



Response: PD plan has been updated.

PZ22-13000004

03/01/2023

7. Project Note 4, sheet MP1, refers to the “loop road.” However, the Master Site Plan shows a drive aisle, not a loop road, with back-out parking along various segments of the road/drive aisle.

Response: The plan has been revised consistent with meetings and input from City Staff.

8. Project Note 4 states “Due to existing alignment of the ‘loop’ road, no additional perimeter buffering is required; except when new pavement is provided along the property line and adjacent to ‘bike path’.” The note appears to be carried over from the previously approved PCD Master Site Plan, and not adjusted or revised to address the proposed re-alignment that would result from the proposed residential development.

Response: note updated (to include 10ft landscape buffer)

9. Note 4(B) states that the perimeter buffer shall average 10 feet and be no less than 7 feet in width. However, the proposed Master Site Plan appears to depict sections of the proposed perimeter buffer at less than 7 feet. The response to a pre-application Zoning comment states that the new buffers along the new ring road are wider than 7 feet and is in compliance with the original PCD. Address this discrepancy.

Response: plan has been updated to show perimeter buffer.

10. Interior Note (A) states that the required landscape between the building and the vehicular use area is relocated to the plaza area in the form of a hardscape as a pedestrian amenity. Hardscape material is not considered landscape area and is not pervious. Address this issue.

Response: This note was part of the previous approvals and the applicant requests that the prior deviations remain in place.

11. Note 12 states that the majority of parking spaces will be 9 feet x 18 feet. Clarify what number or percentage of spaces will be in the majority, and what the proposed dimensions for the alternate parking spaces that will not be 9 feet x 18 feet.

Response: All spaces are 9x18.

12. Note 15: The Master Site Plan does not indicate where or how the outdoor storage for the home improvement store will occur. Provide clarification for this note.

Response: Master Site Plan has been updated to indicate where the outdoor storage area is for the home improvement store.

13. Note 16 states that a master site plan will be provided in accordance with the City of Pompano Beach Ordinances. However, the master site plan that was found is not in accordance with the City Ordinances.

Response: This is an existing PCD and the proposed amendment affects only a portion of the original PCD. The master developer does not have plans to redevelop the entire PCD at this time. The Applicant requests that the the existing development be governed by the deviations granted in the prior PCD approval. When major redevelopment of the PCD is proposed, a new set of deviations may be proposed and implemented.



14. Note 20 states that a Master Sign Program and Tenant Signage Criteria Manual will be incorporated into the PCD approval. However this document was not found in the submittal.

Response: This note was part of the previous approvals. A master sign program and tenant signage criteria manual has been incorporated into the original approval. The residential component follow the master sign program and criteria.

15. Note 21 states that all parking spaces will be single striped. However, the Handicap parking stall detail depicts double striping. Please address this inconsistency.

Response: This note has been updated.

16. Sheet MP2: Under "Area Breakdowns," the total site area (2,076,505.2 square feet) is inconsistent with the total of the pervious and impervious areas on same sheet. Verify the figures.

Response: This note has been verified.

17. Submit the Parking Demand Study for the PCD Amendment.

Response: Parking demand study has been included in our submittal.

18. Sheet MP2: the parking requirements indicate 3,219 spaces are required. The Parking Demand Study that was submitted for the residential site plan application concludes that the overall peak season maximum parking demand is 1,058, and the 1,241 spaces available are expected to be sufficient to accommodate the proposed changes to Pompano Citi Centre. Address the inconsistency between sheet MP2 and the Study.

Response: These figures have been updated.

19. Sheet MP2: the interior landscape calculations appear to include the paved area, which is not considered to be landscape.

Response: This calculation was part of the previous approvals.

## LANDSCAPE

Plan Reviewer: Wade Collum

Review Status: Review Complete pending Development Order

- (1) Show any deviations from the landscape code that apply to this PCD Master Plan and that will apply to future

site plans on the required PCD deviations table.

**PZ22-13000004**  
**03/01/2023**

- (2) Required landscaping that is currently missing from the existing buffers and the interior paved areas needs to be replaced.

## **WASTE MANAGEMENT**

**Plan Reviewer: Beth Dubow**

**Review Status: Review Complete pending Development Order**

Comments:

REVIEW COMPLETE; NO OBJECTION TO REZONING APPLICATION  
RESIDENTIAL SITE PLAN COMMENTS STILL NOT ADDRESSED.

NOTE: As stated in the Pompano Beach Code of Ordinances, Chapter 96, including Section 96.12(D)(1), all construction and demolition debris removal is the responsibility of the owner. All solid waste generated within the geographic boundaries of Pompano Beach shall be collected by the franchise collector (Waste Management at the time of this writing) and disposed of as directed by the city disposal agreement. All materials shall be generated from the property on which the materials are placed for removal. Information regarding container size and hauling costs may be found in Chapter 96, Section 96.13.

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.

## **ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT**

**Plan Reviewer: David McGirr**

**Review Status: Review Complete pending Development Order**

No Comments.

## **BSO**

**Plan Reviewer: Scott Longo**

**Review Status: Review Complete pending Development Order**

No Comments

\*\*\* ATTENTION IMPORTANT \*\*\*

The services of an independent, and highly experienced, qualified and certified Security Crime Prevention/ CPTED Consultant are highly recommended to achieve and maintain objective credible security review integrity, and to expedite processing.

Disclaimer:

This safety and security review does not guarantee a crime will never occur; it is an effort to mitigate opportunities for crime and to help avoid any present and future security deficiencies, conflicts, threats, breaches, or liabilities that might occur without any review.

## **UTILITIES**

**Nathaniel Watson**

**Review Status: Review Complete pending Development Order**

Comments:

1. Please note that additional comments may be forth coming contingent upon future submittals.
2. The subject property is located within the City's utility service area.

**File #:** LN-355

3. The City of Pompano Beach Utilities Dept. has no comment at this time for the requested rezoning PCD Amendment.

PZ22-130000-04  
03/01/2023

## **BUILDING DIVISION**

**Plan Reviewer:** James DeMars

**Review Status:** Review Complete pending Development Order

No comments.

## **FIRE DEPARTMENT**

**Jim Galloway**

**Review Status:** Review Complete pending Development Order

### **Comments:**

This P&Z application is able to meet all of the Fire Department requirements at this time for REZONING ONLY. Site plan approval will be required, maintaining all proper fire department access and water supply requirements as per chapter 18 of NFPA 1 as amended from time to time.

\*Additional comments may follow throughout the remainder of the permitting process. The buildings shall be in compliance with All NFPA Standards prior to receiving Fire Department approval.