



**City of Coconut Creek
Planning and Zoning Board Meeting
July 10, 2019
Minutes – Excerpt**

AGENDA ITEMS

Deputy City Attorney Kathryn Mehaffey gave an overview of the quasi-judicial procedures that would be applied to Agenda Items 4 through 8. City Clerk Leslie Wallace May confirmed that the public notice requirements were met for Agenda Items 4 through 8 and swore-in the witnesses.

Chair Poole asked if there were any objections from the board, applicant, or staff to hear Agenda Items 6, 7, and 8 together as they were related, and there were no objections. He noted that the three items included a rezoning application, a special land use application, and a site plan application to construct a free-standing Chick-Fil-A restaurant with a dual drive-thru lane to be located in the Village Shoppes of Coconut Creek shopping plaza at the northeast corner of Wiles Road and State Road 7. Deputy City Attorney Mehaffey asked if there were any disclosures and/or ex parte communications from the board, and there were no disclosures made by the board members.

6. *CHICK-FIL-A: A REZONING APPLICATION TO MODIFY AN EXISTING PLANNED COMMERCE DISTRICT (PCD) IN ORDER TO ACCOMMODATE THE CONSTRUCTION OF A CHICK-FIL-A RESTAURANT WITH A DUAL DRIVE-THRU LANE LOCATED IN THE VILLAGE SHOPPES OF COCONUT CREEK AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF WILES ROAD AND STATE ROAD 7(US 441). (QUASI-JUDICIAL)(PUBLIC HEARING)
7. *CHICK-FIL-A: A SPECIAL LAND USE APPLICATION TO PERMIT A CHICK-FIL-A RESTAURANT WITH A DUAL DRIVE-THRU LANE TO BE LOCATED IN THE VILLAGE SHOPPES OF COCONUT CREEK AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF WILES ROAD AND STATE ROAD 7 (US 441). (QUASI-JUDICIAL)(PUBLIC HEARING)
8. *CHICK-FIL-A: A SITE PLAN APPLICATION FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A FREE STANDING CHICK-FIL-A RESTAURANT WITH A DUAL DRIVE-THRU LANE LOCATED IN VILLAGE SHOPPES OF COCONUT CREEK AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF WILES ROAD AND STATE ROAD 7 (US 441). (QUASI-JUDICIAL)(PUBLIC HEARING)

Mr. Stoudenmire introduced each of the three items into the record and then summarized why the project was back before the Planning and Zoning Board. He noted that in September 2018, the board recommended, by a 4-1 vote, to move the project forward to the City Commission. In October 2018, the City Commission expressed concerns primarily with traffic flow, access, and parking and directed the applicant to consider an alternate option that included inverting the entire building. He explained that the three items were tabled to a time certain in December, and the applicant came back and presented Alternative 2, depicting the inverted building; however, Alternative 2 had not gone through the Development Review Committee (DRC) for technical review by staff. He further explained that the City Commission opted to approve the PCD modification application and the Special Land Use application on first reading and took no action on the Site Plan because it had not been fully vetted by staff. He said the applicant then worked with staff on the Alternative 2 option of the inverted building. He added that due to Alternative 2 evolving and because so much time had passed since the board reviewed the project, the City determined that it was best to send both alternatives back to the board.

Mr. Hall questioned the need for the rezoning application, and Mr. Stoudenmire explained the reasoning. Mr. Barker asked if the item would go back before the Commission for first reading or for second reading, and Mr. Stoudenmire explained that the project was starting back at first reading. The board inquired about the issues the City Commission had with the project. Ms. Rose explained that the principle concerns focused on the volume of the driveway traffic and potential back-up onto State Road 7 and the number of conflicts along the interior drive aisle.

Linda Whitman, Senior Planner, proceeded with a technical overview of the two alternatives presented in the back-up materials and summarized the differences between the two. Discussion ensued relating to circulation of traffic, parking and traffic conflict zones, landscape separation of traffic from the adjacent playground, handicap and pedestrian access, and turning radiuses.

Dwayne Dickerson of Dunay, Miskel, and Backman, 14 South East 4 Street, Boca Raton, on behalf of the applicant, introduced his team members who were present, which included Jason Pociask, Chick-Fil-A Development Manager; Bill Pfeffer of Bowman Consulting Group, Civil Engineer of Record; and Karl Peterson of KBP Consulting, Traffic Engineer of Record.

Mr. Dickerson gave a brief reiteration of the chronology of the project. He noted that the items were tabled by the City Commission in October, but in December the City Commission did approve the two ordinances on first reading and tabled the resolution for the site plan. He proceeded with reading the motion made at the December 13, 2018, Commission meeting. He explained that it was his team's understanding that they would work with staff on the changes recommended by the Commission and then go back and have the second reading on the ordinances and the one final reading of the site plan. He noted that they respectfully disagreed with the City's position to start all over again.

Mr. Dickerson began a *PowerPoint* presentation, summarizing the project and the three applications requesting site plan approval, special land use approval for a drive-thru facility, and a rezoning to modify the existing PCD. He noted that the size of the restaurant was the same in both alternatives and continued with summarizing the differences between the two. He stated that the reason why a majority of the Commission liked Alternative 2 was because any conflicts that there might be, would be internal to the Chick-Fil-A site and not external on the drive aisle or within the shopping center. He stated that both alternatives function very well and are efficient and noted that Alternative 2 took away five parking spaces to provide for the landscaping buffer in front of the adjacent playground. He continued to review the changes they made in working with staff on Alternative 2.

Karl Peterson of KBP Consulting, Traffic Engineer of Record, presented on the reduced parking in Alternative 2 and its effect on the project. He explained the process taken with conducting the traffic study at the Deerfield Beach location and noted that it was done in January, which is a peak period for retail, and it still yielded a surplus of parking spaces.

Mr. Dickerson explained that he asked the civil engineer to provide a plan showing how vehicles would move throughout the site.

Bill Pfeffer of Bowman Consulting Group, Engineer of Record, summarized the Auto Turn Analysis he conducted, which is an AutoCAD design that uses templates based on the American Traffic Associations' turning radius for different types of vehicles. He explained that this information was used to determine that the site could accommodate different types and sizes of vehicles. He explained that Chick-Fil-A also buffers their drive-thru to eliminate conflicts and utilizes attendants in the drive-thru to help direct the traffic.

Mr. Dickerson continued his presentation summarizing the changes made to accommodate

improvements with traffic ingress and egress and the different agencies they met with regarding this development. He explained that 60 percent of Chick-Fil-A's operations take place in the drive-thru, and the national average of speed of service is 45 seconds from placement to pick-up of an order, which ensures their need to get customers quickly through the driveway. He explained the efficiency improvements Chick-Fil-A has made over the years to its restaurants. He summarized the public outreach they conducted and the additional notification to the tenants within the plaza. He noted that the feedback he received was all positive comments, and pointed out that the City also had not received any negative feedback on the project.

Mr. Hall asked the applicant to give a worst case scenario, and Mr. Dickerson explained that the site could handle 24 stacked vehicles and a worst case scenario would be a situation that has over 3-4 more vehicles. Mr. Peterson explained that the Deerfield site was a great place to study and noted that the proposed site was designed more efficiently with improvements, including the dual stacking. He pointed out that during peak hours over three days, there were only two occasions where there was a maximum cue of 28 vehicles and that was for a short duration. He stated that the proposed site has the capability to stack 24 vehicles without any impact.

Discussion ensued regarding the right turn out of the site, depicted on Alternative 2, and prevention of left turns being made. Mr. Barker expressed his concerns with the opportunity to make a right hand U-turn onsite. Mr. Pfeffer explained how the U-turn would work. Mr. Barker noted his preference for Alternative 2. Discussion ensued.

Chair Poole opened the public hearing. There were no questions or comments from the public, and the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Dickerson made his closing remarks, stating that Chick-Fil-A felt that both alternatives were efficient and safe.

Mr. Barker asked staff for clarification on how the motion should be made by the board. Ms. Rose addressed the questions and explained the various options. Discussion ensued.

MOTION: Barker/Young - Move to approve the ordinance for the rezoning application and the ordinance for the special land use application for Alternatives 1 and 2.

Upon roll call, the Motion to Amend passed by a 4-1 vote, with Mr. Hall voting no.

MOTION: Barker/Young - Move to approve Alternative 1 for the Site Plan application.

Mr. Barker reiterated his earlier comment that his preference was Alternative 2.

Upon roll call, the Motion to Amend passed by a 4-1 vote, with Mr. Hall voting no.

MOTION: Barker/Young - Move to approve Alternative 2 for the Site Plan application.

Upon roll call, the Motion to Amend passed by a 4-1 vote, with Mr. Hall voting no.

MOTION: Hall/Young - Move to recommend Alternative 2 to the City Commission.

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