



**City of Coconut Creek
Planning and Zoning Board Meeting
July 10, 2024
Minutes – Excerpt**

4. MAINSTREET @ COCONUT CREEK BLOCK 3: A SITE PLAN APPLICATION TO CONSTRUCT EIGHT (8) INDIVIDUAL COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS WITHIN BLOCK 3 OF THE MAINSTREET PROJECT AREA. (QUASI-JUDICIAL)(PUBLIC HEARING)

Deputy City Attorney Mehaffey asked for any disclosures or ex-parte communications related to Agenda Item 4, there were none.

Sustainable Development Director Justin Proffitt presented the item, summarizing the Block 3 site plan application request and briefly reviewed the approvals for the MainStreet project to date. He advised that the staff found that the site plan complied with the site plan application review standards, the MainStreet Planned MainStreet Development District (PMDD) zoning standards, the MainStreet design standards, the City's Land Development Code, and the City's Comprehensive Plan, and recommended approval subject to the conditions as outlined in the staff report.

Ele Zachariades, Miskel Backman, LLP, representing Johns Family Partners, LLLP, shared a *PowerPoint* presentation, including an overview of the MainStreet area. She highlighted the allowable and proposed densities and the intent to focus on neighborhood design. She shared elevations and renderings and commented on features of the commercial buildings briefly.

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.

Ms. Fry asked if there were any restrictions on fast food as referenced in the Retail D building. Mr. Proffitt advised that fast food was an approved use, however, the Mainstreet PMDD was limited to one (1) drive-thru. Ms. Fry inquired as to whether design standards would be applied, using the example of a McDonalds. Ms. Zachariades stated there were no secured end users for any of the buildings at this time, and the color swatches as presented were what was being contemplated. Ms. Fry asked if there was a pedestrian walkway between the Retail F1 and Retail F2 buildings. Ms. Zachariades stated there was not. Ms. Fry noted a staff comment requesting that bollards be put in place and asked if the response from the applicant was adequate. Mr. Proffitt stated the comment was from the Police Department and the response was found to be satisfactory. Ms. Fry commented on a request for benches to not have center armrests and asked if this was a part of City Code. Mr. Proffitt advised that Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) standards were in the City Code, and the Police Department provides a set of guidelines. He stated it was a balance of design and function, and not all applicants were able to accommodate all issues raised. Ms. Fry asked for clarification on the location of the dumpsters, and Ms. Zachariades shared a slide showing the location.

Ms. Zachariades clarified her response to a previous question, noting that the Retail D building was a multi-tenant building, so irrespective of who the tenant was, the design would be as shown.

Mr. Light asked for clarification on the vehicular access points to the block. Ms. Zachariades reviewed the four (4) access points, including two (2) on NW 40 Avenue

and two (2) on Lyons Road. She reviewed the planned turns. Mr. Light commented that the presentation indicated there were four (4) electric vehicle (EV) spaces required, and four (4) provided. He asked for clarification on the requirements. Ms. Zachariades noted there was a recent Senate Bill that had changed the ability of municipalities to require EV parking, but the project was providing for it. Mr. Light asked about retention and treatment of stormwater prior to discharge. Mike Troxell, Thomas Engineering, explained that Broward County and the South Florida Water Management District required treatment of the first half inch of rainfall on site, and that was being accomplished through exfiltration trenches under the parking lot. Mr. Light asked if the units would be rented or sold. Ms. Zachariades stated the units would be rental. She explained they were looking at personal services, retail, and restaurant end users.

Mr. Escoriza confirmed the walking paths were denoted by pavers versus regular concrete for parking and other sidewalks. Ms. Zachariades stated that was correct. Mr. Escoriza asked if the walkway between the Retail A and Retail B buildings would extend to Block 4. Ms. Zachariades advised that it would. Mr. Escoriza inquired as to how many total tenants were expected. Brian Schmier, Schmier Property Group, advised that was to be determined, as each building was intended to be subdivided and size would depend on interest. He noted it was possible a tenant would take an entire building based on their business size. Mr. Escoriza asked if a larger tenant such as a grocery store was expected. Mr. Schmier stated not at this point in time, but that was fluid, and the project was designed to accommodate the right tenant.

Mr. Barker suggested there was an opportunity at the central entrance between buildings G and F1 for additional protection between vehicular traffic and the pedestrian walkway. Ms. Zachariades commented that the point was understood. Mr. Schmier explained there were architectural features planned. Mr. Barker asked for clarification on the drive-thru allowance. Mr. Proffitt stated the PMDD permitted one (1) drive-thru for one (1) establishment in the entire MainStreet development.

Chair LaPlant asked for clarification if there was a market planned for Block 3. Mr. Schmier stated they would like to have a market, if they are able to get the right market. He noted the success of the project depended on which tenants were placed in the development. Chair LaPlant stated she was concerned about tenant commitments, as there was a number of vacant spaces in the adjacent commercial project, the Promenade. Mr. Schmier advised there were a number of letters of intent but no tenants that were ready for public announcement. He discussed the effort to attract the right tenants briefly, including quality design, visibility, access, and parking distribution. Chair LaPlant asked about root barriers for the trees and the mix of trees. Mr. Proffitt commented on changes to the overall landscaping industry to provide larger areas for planting and root barriers. Chair LaPlant expressed concern with conflict between traffic and the turns available at the ingress and egress. Adam Kerr, Transportation Engineer, Kimley-Horn and Associates, provided additional clarification. He noted there were options available. Chair LaPlant asked about traffic signals. Ms. Zachariades explained they would need to prove signalization was warranted, but that was the intent. Mr. Proffitt advised there was a commitment made in the Development of Regional Impact (DRI) ordinance where the applicant would need to monitor the signaling requirements and warrant criteria, and if warranted, they would build it. Chair LaPlant asked if the restaurant and other buildings would be too close to the street. Mr. Proffitt stated the design standards called for these types of designs, but it was also set back by a large walkway, a swale, and strip of green. Chair LaPlant noted changes to the development calendar and asked for clarification on when the Development Agreement would be coming forward. Mr. Proffitt explained the desire was to get the Development Agreement done as soon as possible. Chair LaPlant pointed to the difference between the original commercial square footage approved and the current proposal. Mr. Proffitt discussed

changes made since the original discussion 20 years ago and stated the commercial square footage was significantly less.

Mr. Barker asked for clarification on the boundary between Block 3 and Block 4. Ms. Zachariades shared images to explain. Mr. Schmier added that there would be an enhanced greenway with a decorative fence.

Ms. Fry asked if there would be a dedicated left and dedicated right turn between the Retail D and Retail E buildings. Ms. Zachariades stated there was one (1) lane. Ms. Fry expressed concern that people making a left turn would be blocking traffic. Ms. Zachariades noted the queued traffic would be within the development. Mr. Schmier provided additional clarification, noting the light cycle and the internal stacking. Discussion ensued.

Neither staff nor the applicant had closing remarks.

MOTION: Barker/Escoriza – To recommend approval of Agenda Item 4, as presented.

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

DRAFT