



DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE

File #: **LN-486**Project address: **324 NW 6 ST Pompano Beach**

Review Comments List Date: 6/4/2025

06/05/2025**URBAN FORESTRY**

1. Ref. # 55, LANDSCAPE REVIEW, Mark Brumet, 3/19/25 5:56 PM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

Comment: 1. Site layout has changed but all plans don't match. Coordinate all plans to reflect the same site conditions.

Reviewer Response: Mark Brumet - 6/3/25 5:36 PM

6/3/25 Comment not addressed. Site plan A101 does not match the rest of the plans in the submittal. Correct plan to match.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 3:29 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 2:55 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Response. **The site plan have been updated in all plans.**

2. Ref. # 57, LANDSCAPE REVIEW, Mark Brumet, 3/19/25 6:57 PM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

Comment: 3. Mitigation table on sheet L-101 does not align with code calculations for mitigation; correct mitigation table to be in line with mitigation requirements to be per code section 155.5204.E.

Reviewer Response: Mark Brumet - 6/3/25 5:38 PM

6/3/25 Comment not addressed. Mitigation proposed does not meet requirements, will not fit in the proposed area, is not commercially available, and required trees cannot count towards mitigation requirements.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 3:29 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 2:55 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Response. The proposed mitigation has been adjusted. Please refer to L-101 sheet.

3. Ref. # 58, LANDSCAPE REVIEW, Mark Brumet, 3/19/25 6:58 PM, Cycle 2, Unresolved



Comment: 4. Provide a separate suspended pavement systems sheet showing the highlighted location and the scaled out required soil volume of a minimum of 1200 cubic feet per tree for large medium canopy trees. Separate sheet provided but suspended pavement area not delineated nor dimensions provided.

Reviewer Response: Mark Brumet - 6/3/25 5:39 PM

6/3/25 Comment not addressed. Remove landscaping shown on the suspended pavement plan. Specifically depict areas to have suspended pavement systems.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 3:29 PM Address in Post DRC.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 2:55 PM Address in Post DRC.

Response. The suspend pavement plan has been adjusted without landscaping. Please refer to L-105 sheet.

4. Ref. # 59, LANDSCAPE REVIEW, Mark Brumet, 3/19/25 6:58 PM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

Comment: 5. As per 155.3501.J.3 a. Suspended pavement systems must be specified for trees in landscape areas directly abutting paved areas. Required tree soil volume shall be provided in accordance with Figure 155.3501.J.3.a: Required Tree to Soil Volume Ratio Graph. Separate sheet provided but suspended pavement area not delineated nor dimensions provided.

Reviewer Response: Mark Brumet - 6/3/25 5:39 PM

6/3/25 Comment not addressed. Provide actual cubic feet calculations per proposed suspended pavement area section. Additional suspended pavement area will be required on the east side of the interior parking area, and on the north side of the building between the on street parking and the building.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 3:29 PM Address in Post DRC.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 2:55 PM Address in Post DRC.

Response. The suspend pavement areas has been adjusted and calculations are shown on plan. Please refer to L-105 sheet.

5. Ref. # 60, LANDSCAPE REVIEW, Mark Brumet, 3/19/25 6:58 PM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

Comment: 6. Please provide a staggered grouping of palms at the street facing corners to soften the building and create sense of scale as it pertains to the pedestrian realm. Cluster of palms was not provided.

Reviewer Response: Mark Brumet - 6/3/25 5:40 PM



6/3/25 Comment not addressed. Clearly define specifications for the proposed Alexander palms. Palms shall be a minimum of 22' OA.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 3:29 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 2:55 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Response. The height of Cluster of Alexander palms has been adjusted to 22' OA, 24' OA AND 26' OA. Please refer to Plant list on L-102 sheet.

6. Ref. # 61, LANDSCAPE REVIEW, Mark Brumet, 3/19/25 6:58 PM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

Comment: 7. Provide a separate sheet suspended pavement for this and include on the civil plans. Suspended pavement locations not identified on civil plans.

Reviewer Response: Mark Brumet - 6/3/25 5:41 PM

6/3/25 Comment not addressed. Show all suspended pavement areas on the civil plans.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 3:29 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 2:55 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Response. **The civil plans show suspended pavement areas.**

7. Ref. # 63, LANDSCAPE REVIEW, Mark Brumet, 3/19/25 6:58 PM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

Comment: 9. Provide VUA requirements as per 155.5203.D along the perimeters @ 1:40 along the West, East and South perimeters. This is currently not being shown.

Reviewer Response: Mark Brumet - 6/3/25 5:41 PM

6/3/25 Comment not addressed. SW corner shows relocated palms trees where canopy trees belong, and canopy trees under the proposed structure. Correct sheet L-102.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 3:29 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 2:55 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Response. The landscape design on SW corners has been adjusted only in Open to Sky area.



8. Ref. # 64, LANDSCAPE REVIEW, Mark Brumet, 3/19/25 6:59 PM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

Comment: 10. As per 155.3501.K.5.d correct Oak tree street tree size to be at the time of planting, the shade tree shall be a minimum of 24 feet in height with 8 feet clear trunk at 1:30, only the Oaks should be in the ROW swale. Remove or relocate everything else out of there. Provide street trees per 155.5203.

Reviewer Response: Mark Brumet - 6/3/25 5:42 PM

6/3/25 Comment not addressed. Plan proposes on 3 street trees where 5 are required at 1:30 linear feet. Also correct caliper to be 6" to meet industry standards.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 3:29 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 2:55 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Response. We propose 3 street trees are proposed because there is no more space and the other 2 street trees will be cover by tree fund.

9. Ref. # 65, LANDSCAPE REVIEW, Mark Brumet, 3/19/25 6:59 PM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

Comment: 11. Show how requirements as per 155.5203.E., Building Base Plantings are being met.

Reviewer Response: Mark Brumet - 6/3/25 5:42 PM

6/3/25 Comment not addressed. Provide required landscape area between roll up door and entry drive on north side.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 3:29 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 2:55 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Response. New landscape area between roll up door and entry drive on north side is proposed.

10. Ref. # 66, LANDSCAPE REVIEW, Mark Brumet, 3/19/25 6:59 PM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

Comment: 12. Provide a cross section detail of the proposed building footers / slab as it appears that it will encroach into the required foundation landscaping soil space at the footers of the building. Provide drawings and verification of the use of monolithic slabs as it relates to these areas. Clarify location of footers as it related not only to landscaping but to suspended pavement systems.

Reviewer Response: Mark Brumet - 6/3/25 5:42 PM



6/3/25 Comment not addressed. There are trees in close proximity to the building and suspended pavement cell areas. Show footers on plan and verify that they do not affect the required landscape and suspended pavement cell areas.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 3:29 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 2:55 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Response. The note: "Foundation footers shall not be in conflict with required landscaping requirements and suspend pavement cell areas." Has been added to the Landscape plans

11. Ref. # 67, LANDSCAPE REVIEW, Mark Brumet, 3/19/25 6:59 PM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

Comment: 13. As per 155.5203.D.4., a landscaped island shall be provided at each end of every row of parking spaces and per every 10 spaces. Landscape parking islands are to be a minimum 5 wide and contain trees, sod and irrigation. Suspended pavement or structural soil shall be used in this application.

Reviewer Response: Mark Brumet - 6/3/25 5:42 PM

6/3/25 Comment not addressed. Shift one Green Buttonwood tree into the SE corner island to meet requirement.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 3:29 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 2:55 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Response. The landscape design on SE corner has been adjusted and shift one Green Buttonwood into the island.

12. Ref. # 70, LANDSCAPE REVIEW, Mark Brumet, 3/19/25 7:00 PM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

Comment: 16. As per 155.5203.B.5.a thru e: Provide a scaled Irrigation Plan illustrating a rust free, automatic underground irrigation system installed in accordance with requirements of the Building Code, include a rain-sensing cutoff device, providing 100% coverage with 50% overlap, and reuse water wherever practicable and available. Including ROW swale area and please note rust free. Comment not fully addressed. Provide irrigation in the ROW swale area.

Reviewer Response: Mark Brumet - 6/3/25 5:43 PM

6/3/25 Comment not addressed. Provide irrigation to the landscape island on the south perimeter.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 3:29 PM



Address in Post DRC.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 2:55 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Response. Irrigation design has been adjusted to cover all landscape areas. Please refer to IR-101 sheet.

13. Ref. # 73, LANDSCAPE REVIEW, Mark Brumet, 3/19/25 7:00 PM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

Comment: 19. Summary table for mitigation shall provide the following information: total appraised value of specimen trees removed, total dbh inches of non-specimen trees removed, total value of palms removed, total value of relocated palms and total value of relocated hardwoods. Correct information provided.

Reviewer Response: Mark Brumet - 6/3/25 5:43 PM

6/3/25 Comment not addressed. Mitigation summary table is incomplete. Provide the following information: total dbh inches of non-specimen trees removed, total value of palms removed, total value of relocated palms and total value of relocated hardwoods.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 3:30 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 2:55 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Response. Mitigation summary has been adjusted and updated to show all required information.

14. Ref. # 74, LANDSCAPE REVIEW, Mark Brumet, 3/19/25 7:00 PM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

Comment: 20. Clearly define proposed method of mitigation for trees and palms identified to be removed. All mitigation trees shall be labeled as such. Mitigation is above and beyond the minimum requirements for the site.

Reviewer Response: Mark Brumet - 6/3/25 5:43 PM

6/3/25 Comment not addressed. Clearly define proposed method of mitigation for trees and palms identified to be removed. All mitigation trees shall be labeled as such. Mitigation is above and beyond the minimum requirements for the site.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 3:30 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 2:55 PM

Address in Post DRC.



15. Ref. # 77, LANDSCAPE REVIEW, Mark Brumet, 3/19/25 7:01 PM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

Comment: 23. Correct tree planting details to reflect only bio-degradable material attached to the trunk and provide a note on the plan.

Reviewer Response: Mark Brumet - 6/3/25 5:44 PM

6/3/25 Comment not addressed. Tree planting detail shows nylon strap attached to the trunk, correct details.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 3:30 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 2:55 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Response. The material attached to the trunk has been changed to bio-degradable.

16. Ref. # 78, LANDSCAPE REVIEW, Mark Brumet, 3/19/25 7:01 PM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

Comment: 24. Data table on sheet L-103 is incorrect, lot area based on BCPA is 22,718 sqft and table indicates 19707 sqft. Provide correct information based on requirements for properties in this particular zoning district.

Reviewer Response: Mark Brumet - 6/3/25 5:44 PM

6/3/25 Comment not addressed. Correct data table information to meet code requirements.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 3:30 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 2:55 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Response. The sq ft of lot area has been change to 19,707 sq ft to meet requirements code.

17. Ref. # 80, LANDSCAPE REVIEW, Mark Brumet, 3/19/25 7:01 PM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

Comment: 26. Provide complete landscape notes on sheet L-103.

Reviewer Response: Mark Brumet - 6/3/25 5:44 PM

6/3/25 Provide replacement soil specifications.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 3:30 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 2:55 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Response. The replacement soil specifications have been added to the Landscape notes. Please refer to L-103 sheet.



18. Ref. # 81, LANDSCAPE REVIEW, Mark Brumet, 3/19/25 7:01 PM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

Comment: 27. Minimum landscape perimeter width is required to be 5 clear measurement per code section 155.5203. Correct to meet this requirement.

Reviewer Response: Mark Brumet - 6/3/25 5:45 PM

6/3/25 Clarify walkway path on the west side of the project.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 3:30 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 2:55 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Response. EGRESS PATHWAY SHALL MEET ALL REQUIREMENTS FOR NFPA 101 CHAP. 7 EGRESS SURFACE & LIGHTING ALL THE WAY TO PUBLIC ROW. The note has been added to Landscape notes.

19. Ref. # 84, LANDSCAPE REVIEW, Mark Brumet, 3/19/25 7:02 PM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

Comment: 30. Provide a comment response sheet as to specifically how comments have been addressed at time of resubmittal. Provided but does not accurately address comments.

Reviewer Response: Mark Brumet - 6/3/25 5:45 PM

6/3/25 Comment not addressed. Comments response provided did not fully address comments.

Provide a complete comments response.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 3:30 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 2:55 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Response. The response letter shows how each resolved comment is addressed

20. Ref. # 85, LANDSCAPE REVIEW, Mark Brumet, 3/19/25 7:02 PM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

Comment: 31. Additional comments may be rendered upon re-submittal.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 3:30 PM

Address in Post DRC.

Responded by: Frank Manusky - 5/28/25 2:55 PM

Address in Post DRC.