




## MEMORANDUM

To: Pamela Stanton, RLA  
Urban Design Planner  
City of Pompano Beach

From: John J. McWilliams, P.E. 

Date: August 12, 2025

Subject: 2400 East Atlantic Boulevard Mixed-Use Development  
Traffic Impact Study Review Comments – 1<sup>st</sup> Review

---

Per your request, we have completed our review of the subject traffic impact study methodology/site plan resubmittal dated July 2, 2025, received on August 6, 2025. Note that the traffic impact study is based upon a revised development program of 397 mid-rise residential units, 3,560 s.f. of retail, and 7,110 s.f. of restaurant use. Note that this differs from the approved methodology. We offer the following comments on the documents:

### **Traffic Impact Analysis**

1. Revise Figure 4 to reflect the permitted northbound through movement at Atlantic Boulevard and NE 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue.
2. LOS threshold calculations for US-1/Federal Highway roadway segments. Calculated capacities appear to be 5% greater than the appropriate thresholds. The 5% increase in capacity is not applicable to multi-lane divided roadways. Note that the adjustment factors listed in the Handbook have a grammatical error. Revise accordingly.
3. For the roadway segment operating below LOS D during the daily period, determine the 'significance' (i.e. 5% rule) on the segment for the project and include it in the report.
4. Provide Synchro timing reports for all study intersections under all analysis conditions. Once this is provided, Synchro signal timings will be reviewed and verified.
5. The report recommends timing enhancements to address existing intersection deficiencies. However, no timing enhancements were examined. Analyze potential signal timing optimizations in the future with project intersection capacity analysis to determine the feasibility and impact of these optimizations.
6. Per Table 5, the project is expected to increase the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile queue of the westbound right-turn movement at the intersection of US-1/Federal Highway and Atlantic Boulevard during

- the A.M. peak hour under future project conditions. This queue is also expected to exceed the storage provided. Revise text to accurately identify this increase and clarify that this turn lane is constrained and cannot be extended further.
7. The report does not include a right-turn lane analysis at the project driveways as the project is not expected to have right-turn movements into the project driveways. Please add a note in this report section addressing this issue.

### **Site Plan**

8. The submittal should include maneuverability analyses for the loading areas, parking garage ramps, and vehicle parking areas utilizing Transoft Solutions Inc. AutoTURN software, or equivalent, and should include design plans for the ground floor and all levels of the parking garage.

*02/20/2025 Applicant response: A ground floor maneuverability analysis has been provided on Sheet SP-301. Additional analysis including all parking garage levels will be provided prior to site plan approval.*

03/04/2025 Follow-up comment: Note that all legal entering and exiting maneuvers should be shown at the project driveways as part of this analysis. The analysis should also include two-way vehicle traffic within all two-way drive aisles within the site/site parking garage to ensure sideswipe conflicts are not generated by the proposed site configuration. Additionally, the maneuverability analysis shown in SP-301 depicts sideswipe conflicts between entering and exiting vehicles in the east project driveway. Conflicts like this should be resolved when submitting the maneuverability analysis in the future.

**08/12/2025 Follow-up response: No response provided from the applicant, but plans appear revised. Comment addressed.**

9. Provide (1) a signing and pavement marking plan sheet or (2) add signing and pavement marking features to the site plan to Sheet SP-100. At minimum, the locations of stop bars and stop signs at all driveways. Furthermore, it is recommended that the residential lobby drop-off drive and service drive exits be restricted to right turns only.

*02/20/2025 Applicant response: All pavement markings and signage can be found on the Civil plans via Sheet CM-101 and CM-102. Additionally, pavement markings and signage locations are shown on the Overall Site Plan sheet, SP-100.*

03/04/2025 Follow-up comment: The subject plan sheets do not include crosswalk markings, a stop sign, and stop bar at the residential drop-off area along SE 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Also, confirm the purpose of the solid straight arrows shown on the plan. Are these intended to show traffic flow or actual pavement markings? If they are pavement markings, eliminate them at both driveways and the entry to the residential drop-off. Furthermore, the ground floor of the parking garage has numerous conflict points that warrant signing and pavement markings.

**08/12/2025 Follow-up response: No response provided from the applicant. Plans do not appear to be revised. Comment outstanding.**

10. Reconsider the curb and gutter design for both the residential lobby drive-off drive and service drive and provide flared driveway connection to allow the sidewalk elevation to remain constant through the conflict areas. Consider using bollards to separate the pedestrian areas from the vehicular areas. The current design prioritizes vehicular movements over pedestrian movements. Maintain the 11-foot sidewalks through these conflict areas.

*02/20/2025 Applicant response: The concrete sidewalks have been modified to carry through the proposed driveways, as to maintain a consistent material separation between pedestrian and vehicle circulation. Additionally, bollards have been placed prior to the pedestrian crossings to improve pedestrian safety.*

03/04/2025 Follow-up comment: SP-100 continues to show curb and gutter where the public sidewalk interfaces with residential lobby drop-off area vehicular lanes. Please provide more detail on plans showing either (1) the sidewalk will be at the same elevation as the driveway lane at these locations (where no curbing would be present) or (2) if the sidewalk will drop down to the driveway elevation (where a curb/ADA ramp would be present). The plans are not clear. Per the original comment, we recommend you consider a design that prioritizes the pedestrian paths.

**08/12/2025 Follow-up response: No response provided from the applicant, but plans appear revised. Comment addressed.**

11. Remove any on-street parking spaces on public roadways adjacent to the project within 30 feet of the stop bar at Atlantic Boulevard. Parking within 30 feet of the intersection is prohibited by Florida Statutes.

*02/20/2025 Applicant response: The project proposes on-street parking spaces only along the street frontage of the project. Existing on-street parking spaces exist on opposite sides of the right of way and are not included with this project.*

**03/04/2025 Follow-up comment: Comment addressed.**

12. The site plan appears to propose loading vehicles backing into the loading dock from the public street, which is not a desirable operation. A dockmaster may be required to ensure that vehicles along the streets will provide adequate clearances for these backing maneuvers to occur. This may be a condition of approval.

*02/20/2025 Applicant response: Acknowledged. Loading activity will primarily occur within an on-street loading zone, clear of any vehicle travel lanes, as allowed by code section 155.3501.1.3.*

03/04/2025 Follow-up comment: The maneuverability analysis provided for this area does not show a loading vehicle utilizing the east-west loading bay. If that loading bay will be utilized as indicated in the architectural ground floor plan, provide the appropriate maneuverability analysis. It appears that a loading vehicle will perform maneuvers in the public right-of-way to use this loading bay.

**08/12/2025 Follow-up response: No response provided from the applicant. Plans do not appear to be revised. Comment outstanding.**

13. 03/11/2025 Comment: Sheet CM-101 shows only a 5' sidewalk adjacent to the residential drop-off lane and is immediately adjacent to the curb inlet. Consider providing a 6' sidewalk when immediately adjacent to curb. Additionally, please indicate if there will be drop-off/pedestrian hazard at the curb inlet. It's unclear if there will be an elevation difference at this location.

**08/12/2025 Follow-up response: No response provided from the applicant. Plans do not appear to be revised. Comment outstanding.**

14. 03/11/2025 Comment: Provide one (1) dedicated turnaround parking space at the end of all terminating parking aisles within the garage. Also, clarify if the two (2) spaces north of the bicycle parking room exist as walls appear to confine that area.

**08/12/2025 Follow-up response: No response provided from the applicant, but plans appear revised. Comment addressed.**

15. 03/11/2025 Comment: Provide vehicular sight triangles in addition to the pedestrian site triangles at each project driveway and adjacent public intersections and ensure all landscaping does not conflict with these triangles.

**08/12/2025 Follow-up response: No response provided from the applicant. Plans do not appear to be revised. Comment outstanding.**

16. 03/11/2025 Comment: Review the architect's ground floor plans with Sheet CM-101 as numerous discrepancies were noted including crosswalk markings at driveways and the placement of stop bars beyond the crosswalk markings.

**08/12/2025 Follow-up response: No response provided from the applicant. Plans do not appear to be revised. Comment outstanding.**

K:\FTL\_TPTO\040985212 - PB Planning - 2400 E Atl\Correspondence\2025 08 06 TIA #1\08 12 25 Stanton memo 2400 East Atlantic TIA Review.docx