



## CITY OF COCONUT CREEK PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MINUTES

Government Center  
4800 West Copans Road  
Coconut Creek, FL 33063

Date: July 9, 2025  
Time: 7:00 p.m.  
Meeting No. 2025-0709

---

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Jeffrey Light at 7:06 p.m.

### 2. PRESENT UPON ROLL CALL:

Jeffrey Light, Chair  
Solomon Briks  
Nancy Fry

#### ABSENT:

Colleen LaPlant, Vice Chair  
Alex Escoriza

Also present: Sustainable Development Assistant Director Lizet Aguiar, Sustainable Development Director Justin Proffitt, Assistant City Attorney Cassandra Harvey, and Deputy City Clerk Marianne E. Bowers.

Deputy City Clerk Bowers advised the Board that Vice Chair LaPlant and Mr. Escoriza had informed staff that they would be unable to attend the meeting.

Assistant City Attorney Harvey noted that the meeting was being conducted live with a quorum physically present and explained the procedures for the meeting.

### 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A MOTION APPROVING THE MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING(S). (2025-0611)

**MOTION:** Fry/Briks – To approve the Minutes of the June 11, 2025, Planning and Zoning Board Meeting.

**Upon roll call, the Motion passed by a 3-0 vote.**

### AGENDA ITEMS

Assistant City Attorney Harvey explained the City's quasi-judicial procedures that would be applied to Agenda Items 4 and 5, as follows (verbatim):

First, I want to remind everyone to silence your cell phones. Florida courts have determined that there are certain types of matters, including Agenda Items 4 and 5 on tonight's agenda, that are to be treated differently than other items considered by the Board. In these quasi-judicial

**Planning and Zoning Board Minutes**  
**July 9, 2025**  
**Page 2**

applications, the Board is applying existing rules and policies to a factual situation and is therefore acting like a Judge and Jury do in a trial held in the courtroom. In such cases, the courts have decided that due process and fundamental fairness require that more formal procedures be followed.

The Board's decision must be based on the evidence and information that is presented at the public hearing including the agenda materials, staff recommendation, testimony presented at the public hearing, and the deliberations of the Board. The quasi-judicial procedures require that the Board consider the evidence presented to it and base their decision on the applicable law and primarily on credible evidence presented whether by staff, the applicant, or members of the public.

In a quasi-judicial proceeding, the Board is not allowed to take into consideration public sentiment or the popularity of a particular development proposal or application. The Board may only consider competent substantial evidence. This means testimony or other evidence that a reasonable mind would accept as credible and adequate to support a conclusion. Florida courts have made it clear that mere generalized statements of opposition are to be disregarded, but fact-based testimony can be considered competent and substantial evidence. This can include eyewitness observation testimony about relevant facts and documentary evidence, including photographs, aerials, and maps. Citizens who want to participate in a quasi-judicial hearing can testify as to factual matters and any element of the case that would not require specialized training or specific academic degrees. Their testimony will be considered provided their testimony is backed up by established facts, studies, or evidence that is not conjecture or just based on a feeling. The quasi-judicial hearing process is not a popularity contest. The strict rules of evidence do not apply during the public hearing, but any comments must be relevant to the agenda item.

Everyone who seeks to speak on an item will be given an opportunity to speak. If you intend to provide testimony as to any of the applications to be considered tonight, you will be sworn in before your testimony is taken. Please know if you speak, you may be subject to cross examination; the Board may comment or ask questions of persons addressing the Board at any time. If you refuse to either be cross-examined or to be sworn, your testimony will be considered in that context and given its due weight. The general public will not be permitted to cross examine witnesses, but may request that the Board direct questions on their behalf to the applicant or staff. Will the Clerk please confirm compliance with the notice requirements?

Deputy City Clerk Bowers confirmed the public notice requirements for Agenda Items 4 and 5 had been met and swore in the witnesses.

Chair Light asked if there were any objections to hearing Agenda Items 4 and 5 together, as they were related, and there were no objections.

4. **LINCOLN OF COCONUT CREEK:** A SIGN DEVIATION APPLICATION TO ALLOW AN INCREASE IN HEIGHT TO THE PROPOSED LOGO SIGN ON THE FRONT BUILDING ELEVATION FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 5501 WEST SAMPLE ROAD. (QUASI-JUDICIAL)(PUBLIC HEARING)
5. **LINCOLN OF COCONUT CREEK:** A SIGN DEVIATION APPLICATION TO ALLOW AN INCREASE IN SIZE AND TO ADD ILLUMINATION TO THE PROPOSED SERVICE SIGN ON THE FRONT ELEVATION FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 5501 WEST SAMPLE ROAD. (QUASI-JUDICIAL)(PUBLIC HEARING)

Assistant City Attorney Harvey asked if there were any disclosures or ex-parte communications related to Agenda Items 4 and 5, and there were no disclosures.

Sustainable Development Assistant Director Lizet Aguiar presented the items. She stated Lincoln of Coconut Creek sought a sign deviation to allow an increase in height to the proposed logo sign and two (2) deviations to allow an increase in size and added illumination to the proposed service sign, both on the front elevation of the building currently under construction. She reviewed the maximum allowable sizes and stated the specifications of the signs had not yet been developed at the time the Site Plan was approved, as it was typically addressed during the permit process. She advised that staff had reviewed the request for illumination related to any adverse impacts and confirmed the illumination did not conflict with any Sign Code regulations or requirements. She stated staff found the deviation requests met the standards for a sign deviation.

Mark Brenchley, Planning Consultant on behalf of TT Sample, Inc., reviewed the scope and size of the deviations requested. He stated the dealership was 300 feet away from Sample Road and behind landscaping, and the signage would be consistent with the Lincoln brand and compatible with the architecture and building materials.

Board Member Nancy Fry asked for clarification on the logo sign. Mr. Brenchley explained the specifications of the logo sign briefly and noted that the Code did not allow service signs to be illuminated, but this sign was 17 feet behind the front of the building and under a porte cochere. He stated the applicant believed the minimally-lit sign would off-set the shadow effect for wayfinding purposes.

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

Ms. Fry asked for clarification on the deviation request related to the logo sign and its attachment to a panel. Ms. Aguiar clarified briefly, explaining that the panel the sign was attached to was part of the architecture, not the sign. Ms. Fry asked if the illumination would cause any environmental impacts. Ms. Aguiar stated there should not be any impacts because the sign was covered by a roof and there would not be spillage beyond the property lines.

Board Member Solomon Briks inquired as to whether the service sign would be turned off at some point or left on all the time. Mr. Brenchley stated the sign would be on during the day, and the applicant would be amicable to parameters set by the Board for off hours. Ms. Aguiar added that staff would suggest the sign was off after hours.

Chair Light asked for clarification on the difference between a deviation and a variance. Ms. Aguiar explained and noted that deviations were limited to signage.

**MOTION:** Fry/Briks – To recommend approval of Agenda Item 4, as presented.

**Upon roll call, the Motion passed by a 3-0 vote.**

**MOTION:** Fry/Briks – To recommend approval of Agenda Item 5, as presented.

**Upon roll call, the Motion passed by a 3-0 vote.**

**6. COMMUNICATIONS AND REPORTS**

Sustainable Development Director Justin Proffitt shared updates on items the Board had considered in the past, noting that the Vinkemulder Neighborhood Equestrian Overlay Area and Master Plan adoption were on the City Commission agenda for the July 10 meeting. He explained the changes that were made to the draft ordinance since the Board's review, noting they were largely due to changes in State law and associated preemptions. He noted that the Special Land Use Application for a drive-thru facility within Block 3 of the MainStreet project would also be on the July 10 Commission agenda, along with an amendment to the Broward County Transportation Surtax agreement.

Chair Light asked if substantial changes to an ordinance reviewed by the Board would result in the item coming back before the Board. Mr. Proffitt advised that it would not and noted the ordinance would be before the Commission for first reading.

Chair Light inquired about outstanding MainStreet approvals. Mr. Proffitt stated Block 10 was currently under staff review and Block 16 was pending further design changes. He stated review and negotiation of the Development Agreement was also ongoing. Discussion continued regarding the project and progress of the traffic light warrant analysis.

Ms. Fry inquired about the Lyons Road Pedestrian Safety Lighting Project presentation on the July 10 Commission Meeting agenda, and Mr. Proffitt advised that the presentation material was available online with the published agenda.

**7. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:37 p.m.

---

Marianne E. Bowers, CMC  
Deputy City Clerk

---

Date