Chair LaPlant inquired if there were and objections from Staff, the Applicant, the Board, or the Public to hear Agenda Items 5 and 6 together, as they were related, and there were no objections.

5. **MAINSTREET @ COCONUT CREEK BLOCK 8:** A SITE PLAN APPLICATION TO CONSTRUCT ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY TWO (152) SINGLE-FAMILY TOWNHOMES AND VILLAS WITHIN BLOCK 8 OF THE MAINSTREET AT COCONUT CREEK DEVELOPMENT. (QUASI-JUDICIAL)(PUBLIC HEARING)

6. **MAINSTREET @ COCONUT CREEK PARKS AND OPEN SPACES:** A SITE PLAN APPLICATION TO CONSTRUCT PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PARKS, OPEN SPACES, AND OTHER HARDSCAPE ELEMENTS FOR THE MAINSTREET AT COCONUT CREEK DEVELOPMENT. (QUASI-JUDICIAL)(PUBLIC HEARING)

Deputy City Attorney Mehaffey asked if there were any disclosures or ex-parte communications related to Agenda Items 5 and 6, and there were no disclosures.

Sustainable Development Assistant Director Lizet Aguiar presented the item summarizing the applications for site plan approval for Block 8, including 60 single-family townhomes and 92 villas, as well as for the parks and open spaces. She discussed the applicant's ongoing public engagement and noted these requests were also contingent upon final adoption of the MainStreet at Coconut Creek Development Agreement by the City Commission. She advised that staff found the site plans complied with the site plan application review standards, the MainStreet Planned MainStreet Development District, MainStreet Master Plan, MainStreet Design Standards, the City's Land Development Code, and the City's Comprehensive Plan, and recommend approval subject to the conditions as outlined in the staff reports.

Scott Backman, Miskel Backman, LLP, representing Johns Family Partners, LLLP, shared a *PowerPoint* presentation, including an overview of the MainStreet area. He highlighted the allowable and proposed densities and the intent to focus on neighborhood design. He shared elevations and renderings and commented on features of the townhomes and villas briefly, and reviewed images of the proposed parks, open spaces, and other hardscape elements of the project. He advised that the applicant would work through the conditions of approval and finalize them prior to review of the application by the City Commission.

Chair LaPlant opened the public hearing on the item. There were no questions or comments from the public, and Chair LaPlant closed the public hearing.

Mr. Light asked for clarification on plans for the Homeowners Association (HOA) for Block 8. Mr. Backman stated there would be associations throughout the development, and Block 8 would likely have its own association. Mr. Light noted the trail system and asked if there was a system planned for separating pedestrians from bicyclists for safety. Mr. Backman advised the paths were a minimum of twelve (12) feet wide and in some

instances substantially larger.

Mr. Escoriaza referenced the renderings for Block 8 and asked if it would be gated. Mr. Backman confirmed it was a gated block. Mr. Escoriaza asked about access to on-street parking. Mr. Backman explained further. Mr. Escoriaza asked about the purpose served by the water tower and windmill. Ms. Aguiar discussed the historical representation of the windmill. She noted the cistern was intended to function as a water collection and distribution system. Mr. Escoriaza commented on the inclusion of bus shelters. Mr. Backman stated there were plans for proposed transportation internal to the project. He noted Broward County requirements were met in other areas. Mr. Escoriaza stated the canopy was prevalent, and asked if there were renderings of how the park areas would look at night. Mr. Backman responded that there were not renderings prepared for this purpose, but lighting would meet the requirements of City Code and the Police Department. Mr. Escoriaza asked about usage of the village green and defined recreation areas. Ms. Aguiar and Mr. Backman responded briefly.

Mr. Briks asked for clarification on the use of the term “dedication” and whether this included improvements. Mr. Backman stated two (2) acres were being given to the City as part of the development requirements. He advised that the City and applicant were now in final negotiations regarding the improvements to be included in the Development Agreement.

Vice Chair Barker inquired about parking for the townhouse units. He noted the internal dimensions of the garages was challenging and an increase in width should be considered so the garages were actually used to keep cars off the street. He suggested that staff review the requirements in the Code. Mr. Backman stated the depth of the garages had been increased and pointed out there was a condition of approval that required the developer to enforce use of the garages for parking.

Chair LaPlant asked about a commitment to pickleball courts. She stated there would be a lot of young people living in the development and pickleball was a hugely popular sport. Mr. Backman noted there were discussions with the City to introduce pickleball as a recreational/commercial activity adjacent to the village green within MainStreet although a final decision had not been made, He added that there would be courts within the apartment communities, though those would be limited to residents of those communities. Chair LaPlant asked about the number of electric vehicle (EV) charging stations in Block 8. Mr. Backman advised that in addition to the marked spaces, each garage was EV-ready. Chair LaPlant expressed concern with the parking available for visitors. Mr. Backman stated throughout the MainStreet area, there was a significant amount of parallel on street parking, none of which was counted toward parking requirements for the individual blocks. Chair LaPlant commented that there should be a market within MainStreet. Mr. Backman commented that there was an area of Block 3 that was designed to bring in a market if an appropriate partner was interested. He stated the opportunity had also been created to allow for future development of corner stores should it become appropriate.

MOTION: Barker/Light – To recommend approval of Agenda Item 5, as presented.

Upon roll call, the Motion passed by a 5-0 vote.

MOTION: Barker/Escoriaza – To recommend approval of Agenda Item 6, as presented.

Upon roll call, the Motion passed by a 5-0 vote.

DRAFT