



MINUTES OF THE CITY OF MIRAMAR PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING

FEBRUARY 11 2025

6:30 P.M.

A meeting of the Planning & Zoning (P&Z) Board was called to order by Chairperson Thompson on Tuesday, February 11, 2025, at 6:40 p.m. in the Commission Chambers, Miramar City Hall, 2300 Civic Center Place, Miramar, Florida.

I. ROLL CALL

The following members of the Planning & Zoning Board were present:

Matthew Thompson, Chairperson
Marcus Dixon, Vice Chairperson
Anneline Carter
Hobel Florido
James Hepburn
Mary Lou Tighe
Annette Payne
Vivian Walters, Jr.

The following members of the Planning & Zoning Board were absent:

Wayne Lomax

A quorum was achieved.

The following City staff members attended:

Building, Planning & Zoning Dept. (BPZ) Director Nixon Lebrun
City Attorney Pam Booker
Senior Planner Deyman Rodriguez
Planner Robert Artuso
Planning Technician Sonia Gollab

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

City Attorney Booker stated that former City Attorney Paul Gougelman, a P&Z Board attorney, passed away the previous week; it was appropriate to remember him, and

extend sincerest condolences to his family in his memory.

Chairperson Thompson asked for a moment of silence to honor the memory of Mr. Gougelman.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- **Regular Meeting Minutes of October 8, 2024**

Chairperson Thompson asked for a motion to approve the October 8, 2024, minutes, as presented; Member Florido made a motion to approve, seconded by Member Walters; the following vote was recorded:

AYE: Chairperson Thompson, Vice Chairperson Dixon, Members Carter, Florido, Hepburn, Payne, Tighe and Walters

NO: None

ABSENT FOR VOTE: Member Lomax

MOTION PASSED: 8-0

IV. QUASI-JUDICIAL PUBLIC HEARING:

City Attorney Booker reviewed the City's quasi-judicial procedures, collectively swearing in all persons wishing to speak on agenda item IV. (1).

- (1) Application No. 2405675 for a Conditional Use approval for a proposed car wash facility on two adjacent vacant parcels abutting Miramar Parkway located within the Plat of Interchange Park, specifically Property Folio Numbers 514025020010 & 514025020021.

Presenter: Deyman Rodriguez, Senior Planner

Senior Planner Deyman Rodriguez gave a PowerPoint presentation on the subject application, as detailed in the backup, highlighting the following:

- The subject site was located on an outparcel of the Miramar Crossings shopping center on the southwest corner of Miramar Parkway and Red Road.
- Both parcels combined were 1.33 acres.
- The applicant proposed an automatic carwash facility; hours of operation were 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m.
- The use was consistent with the policy 1.13 of the City's Comprehensive Plan that allowed for mix of land uses in the Regional Activity Center (RAC); it would be the first carwash located in the RAC; that had no accessory association with any other use, such as a gas station.

- There would be cross access to the shopping center; the applicant planned to build a driveway connection between the carwash site and the Precious Years Christian Living Center.
- The traffic study showed there would be minimal impact to the adjacent roadways; stacking would be sufficient for the proposed use.
- They would recycle approximately 80 to 90 percent of water through a reclaimed system within the building.
- A community meeting was held October 14, 2024; no members of the public attended; notice advising of the community meeting, and the present P&Z Board meeting were mailed to property owners located within 1,000 feet of the site.
- The Development Review Committee (DRC) approved the application on January 22, 2025.
- City staff recommended approval with a finding of consistency with the Comprehensive Plan.

Member Hepburn wished to know the level of smart technology integrated into the carwash operations other than it being an automatic system.

Vice Chairperson Dixon asked for more information on the traffic study, as well as clarification on the dedicated turn from Miramar Parkway, as it appeared when cars turned in, they could only proceed right.

Mr. Rodriguez felt the applicant was better able to provide that information in their presentation, stating that, as it currently existed, the shopping center had a designated turn lane into the main shopping center, but given that the shopping center was very elongated, the plat allowed for a designated turn lane. Even if cars were backed up within all stacking lanes, they would line up along that turn lane, as shown by the black arrow on the rendering; no through traffic on Miramar Parkway would be impeded. He added that the cars could turn both right and left once they entered; they could make a right, and go through the queuing, or make a left to continue to the rest of the shopping center.

Member Florido sought clarification if vehicles would turn directly from Miramar Parkway into the carwash, or would there be a turn lane off Miramar Parkway taking cars onto the shopping center property.

Mr. Rodriguez affirmed there would be a designated turn lane before entering the parcel.

Member Walters questioned if in the application city staff contemplated anything environmentally related.

Mr. Rodriguez explained, at present, the City's Land Development Code (LDC) did not speak to environmental issues; he believed Broward County would look at environmental components when the development reached that permitting stage, and the applicant would comment as to those factors they proposed to integrate into their operations.

Janna Lhota, the applicant's representative, introduce the development team members

present with her; she gave a PowerPoint presentation, providing additional information on the subject development, as detailed in the backup, stating the following:

- Along with the subject application, the applicant had companion applications for the site plan, a variance application, and Community Appearance Board (CAB).
- El Car Wash was the largest company of its time operating with this particular platform; in Florida they had well over 50 sites operating; their first in Broward County located in Miramar at Dykes Road and Miramar Parkway.
- El Car Wash strived to be a good community partner, as well as a good neighbor to the surrounding community.
- Their operations was one of their pride points; they were not open 24 hours a day as many other carwashes.
- They typically used, on average, 45 gallons or less per carwash, unlike at-home carwashes that typically used up to 140 gallons of water; a large portion of the recycled water was, such as to wash the undercarriage of cars.
- They used biodegradable, and environmentally friendly products; they had an oil/sand separator, so their water was filtered before it was discharged into the sanitary sewer system, while at-home carwashes discharged water into storm water systems, lakes, canals, etc.
- There were no speakers, or amplification systems onsite; the kiosks at which carwashes were paid for had no speaker; an attendant was stationed to help new customers with selecting the type of wash they desired, sell memberships, etc.; they helped and facilitated patrons working their way into the carwash tunnel.
- A large portion of their patrons were monthly members.
- They utilized state-of-the-art technology, RFID, LPRs, etc. readers onsite, so vehicles were recognized when they approached the kiosk; drivers could simply proceed to the tunnel.
- The individual vacuum stations shown on the site plan did not have a producer, so there was no noise; there were two producers that provided the suction for all the vacuum stations throughout the site, and they were encased in concrete.
- The site plan complied with all the City's photometric standards.
- The trips associated with the subject use were much less than many other uses presently allowed within the B2 zoning.
- The underlying plat approved for the subject property had commercial square footage above and beyond what the use the applicant was proposing.
- The traffic impact statement included in the application showed that a large percentage of the trips associated with the site were pass-by trips, or trips already on the road; that is, they pulled into the property to go to another destination; the applicant's traffic impact statement was reviewed, and the results confirmed by the City's traffic engineer and development staff.
- There would be 24/7 cameras deployed throughout the site.
- It was a cashless operation; no cash was accepted or maintained onsite; purchases were made by debit/credit card at the kiosks.
- Examples of other sites shown illustrated the planned aesthetics for the proposed development; the site locations included Palm Beach, Melbourne, and Miramar.
- The applicant met all the City's Level Of Service (LOS) standards as required.

Vice Chairperson Dixon sought confirmation the only signage for the proposed development would be on the building itself.

Ms. Lhota affirmed they had minimal signage onsite; there was only one sign on the building facing Miramar Parkway; a monument sign was proposed for the property that was being finalized to be consistent with the rest of the shopping center.

Vice Chairperson Dixon asked for more information on the lighting, and possible impacts.

Ms. Lhota replied that the proposed lighting for the site was LED all facing downward; the photometric plan was provided as part of the site plan application, which the DRC reviewed, and found the applicant's photometric plan met all the City's lighting standards onsite, as well as eliminating any spillage onto adjacent property; the city code was met or exceeded.

Vice Chairperson Dixon questioned if the building included bathroom facilities.

Ms. Lhota said there was a bathroom for patrons to use at the front of the building; this was not a full-service carwash, where customers' could leave their cars for an attendant to wash and vacuum. This was a customer-driven experience, and staff did not wash patrons' car, they were only there to clarify how to use the system.

Vice Chairperson Dixon wished to know about trash collection, particularly for patrons wishing to clean out their car while they vacuumed them.

Ms. Lhota replied there would be a dumpster enclosure as shown in the renderings to be located to the east side of the site; on the poles of their canopy system, there were cannisters that collected anything caught by the hose; the canisters were emptied regularly. There would be trash receptacles throughout the site, and at each pole, so there were numerous opportunities to dispose of trash, and all trash receptacles were emptied into the onsite dumpster by staff. She said their trash disposal service provider was Waste Pro, and they already confirmed the dumpster was adequate for the site.

Vice Chairperson Dixon sought clarification that the applicant did not own the parcel between theirs and the preschool.

Ms. Lhota responded there was an area shown in green by the buffer and the vacuums that was not owned by the applicant, but the latter had an agreement with the owner, as they and the applicant wished to provide that connection, so the agreement was to pave the area to connect to the larger Crossings site.

Member Florido asked about the number of sites in Florida, and if they were under one owner, or operated as franchises.

Ms. Lhota replied there were 65 to date, and more were in development; one was presently being built at East Oakland Park Boulevard. They were not franchises, so they were all owned and operated by the same entity.

Member Florido questioned if the green area that was to be paved was an easement.

Ms. Lhota stated the easements were already in place; the recorded cross accesses crossed over the property whether it was improved or not.

Member Florido noted the rendering showed landscaping in front of the empty lot.

Ms. Lhota said the landscaping was on the applicant's property. She pointed out the present rendering did not show any of the trees they proposed on the west side for their buffer, nor the host of trees they were retaining along Miramar Parkway in front; they would update this information before the next public hearing.

Member Florido wondered if there was anything learned from the existing Miramar El Car Wash, so those lessons could be incorporated into the proposed development.

Ms. Lhota remarked that she asked the same question, as this was one of particular sensitivity; there were single-family homes directly across a lake to the north and west of the Dykes Road site. At the end of the tunnel where vehicles exited there were blowers on which there were silencers, and it would be the same with the subject site; the blowers were pressure sensitive, so when there was no car in the tunnel, they went off. She noted there were no complaints about noise or other issues with respect to the Dykes Road site that opened a few years ago, showing that the 1,664 reviews had an average of 4.8 out of five. The homes at this site were closer than the residential uses to the north, and the subject site was significantly larger, so there was more space for queuing, parking, etc.

Member Tighe sought confirmation there would be no onsite retail.

Ms. Lhota answered no, there would be no onsite retail.

Member Tighe saw mention of an arcade area.

Ms. Lhota clarified that "arcade" referred to the breezeway area; it was an architectural feature only.

Member Tighe commented as to the noise factor, as she assumed the live attendant would be monitoring patrons playing car radios, such as while vacuuming their cars.

Ms. Lhota affirmed they would; the applicant was very sensitive to noise control.

Member Tighe noticed in the site plan that when patrons exited there was a bump with landscaping shown; it appeared vehicles would turn directly into traffic, and the existing bike lane; she wondered why the turn lane did not exist all the way through.

Ms. Lhota believed the road in question was a Broward County road; as such, the standards with respect to the curb, and the bump was per the design to keep through traffic in their lane.

Chairperson Thompson believed the bump out was to prevent people from driving straight to the other entrance down the road. The Department of Transportation (DOT) standards required those bump outs be installed to prevent accidents.

Member Walters wished to know how long El Car Wash had been in business, as he noticed some carwashes popped up, then disappeared soon thereafter.

Ms. Lhota replied this particular ownership and platform had been in business since 2019.

Alejandro Quintana, El Car Wash's Development Director for Florida, stated they were backed by a venture capitalist firm, and they had a contract that went into 2027. At the end of 2025 they were projected to have 85 to 100 stores, and they would continue to do 20 to 30 greenfield developments per year, plus some acquisitions. They were not a fly-by-night operation; they started with six that their owner acquired in 2019, and they built that up to 65 to date, with ten in construction/development at present. He said they aimed to be a staple in the communities in which they were located, and their employees usually lived within three to five miles of each site.

Member Walters said he was a fan, as he used the El Car Wash in Miramar. He questioned if the applicant conducted a needs assessment to gauge the potential volume/usage of the services when selecting a site.

Mr. Quintana affirmed, as they continued to grow, they used various benchmarks, whether it was **Azure 53:46** data to pull demographics, traffic counts, and they had a confidential internal scorecard on which they based site-specific characteristics, including: visibility, site access, closeness to intersections, closeness to certain retailers, etc. The subject site came to his desk in February 2024, showing the length of time they dedicated to selecting and developing a site.

Member Walters wished to know what the applicant's community involvement looked like.

Mr. Quintana responded their activities included: contributions to the Broward County Sheriff's Office (BSO), the local Baptist Memorial Hospital; numerous fundraisers, donating part of the proceeds to such organizations as the Red Cross; they did these activities constantly to give back to communities.

Chairperson Thompson asked staff if the nearby daycare responded to the notice.

Mr. Rodriguez mentioned only one inquiry was received to the mailed notice; this was from a nearby property owner that was a part of the Park of Commerce asking for information about the site. No one else contacted staff specifically about the subject project.

Chairperson Thompson saw no bypass lane on the site plan; these usually gave patrons the option to circle back around if, for example, vacuums were unavailable.

Ms. Lhota replied the vehicle would go through the kiosk, and use the bypass lane that was actually the fire access lane at the rear of the building.

Chairperson Thompson observed in the bypass lane there were six-inch bollards at five-foot on center going all the way across, so no one could get out.

Ms. Lhota explained that a vehicle would just advance through the kiosk, go past the carwash tunnel, and use the eastbound drive lane on the southside of the carwash; that was the bypass lane.

Chairperson Thompson commented, going towards the handicap stalls, on the other side, not where the canopy was located, the site plan showed six-inch diameter bollards, five-foot on center going all the way down, asking how a driver going in one direction down the two-lane road could get out, particularly if the driver was not great at maneuvering.

Arturo Fanjul, the architect of record, explained the area shown as striped by the ADA space was a dedicated turnaround lane that was 12 feet wide at the end; cars would travel to the end, and make a three-point turn. The bollards were placed as shown to protect staff from anyone getting aggressive, or frustrated, refusing to make a three-point turn. He added that all their parking spaces were 12 feet wide, so car doors could stay open while being worked on, and they had 26 feet in backout space.

Chairperson Thompson noticed on the plan that for the bypass lane on the southside of the building had a note, "Pipe and chain per Miramar fire emergency."

Mr. Fanjul clarified this meant that during closing hours that area would be chained off to prevent anyone driving around the area at night. This was done at the request of the Miramar Fire Department.

Vice Chairperson Dixon asked if the bathrooms were ADA accessible.

Mr. Fanjul answered yes; the entire site was ADA accessible.

Vice Chairperson Dixon questioned if road markings would go all the way across the site.

Mr. Fanjul said they would, and though not shown on the rendering, they were shown on the site plan, and on their civil paving, and marking plan.

Chairperson Thompson opened the discussion to the public; he received no input.

Member Walters asked if the employee makeup was mainly from the area in which the carwash was situated.

Mr. Quintana answered yes; the day-to-day employees were mainly from surrounding communities; as they built up a store, they hosted hiring events, doing actual hiring about a month before a store opened, training new staff at another location. As they did a soft opening before the grand opening, they trained new staff at the new store; there were also area vice presidents (VP), and county VPs floating, building those layers of organizational structure.

Member Walters asked if there were any veteran considerations.

Mr. Quintana affirmed they worked with a program that incorporated hiring veterans into the carwash industry. In 2023, they launched their Neurodivergent Program, of which they had about three to five employees thus far; this program was championed by their Human Resources (HR) Specialist Jia Kruger.

Member Tighe wished to know what the total staff count would be for the subject location.

Mr. Quintana replied, including part-timers, probably 12 to 15 employees.

Vice Chairperson Dixon asked staff if there were current plans for the middle parcel.

Mr. Rodriguez responded there was no proposal or interest as yet for the middle parcel.

Chairperson Thompson asked for a motion to approve Application No. 2405675 as presented, with a recommendation of approval to the City Commission, and with the finding that the subject application was consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan. Member Walters made a motion to approve; seconded by Vice Chairperson Dixon; the following vote was recorded:

AYE: Chairperson Thompson, Vice Chairperson Dixon, Members Carter, Florido, Hepburn, Payne, Tighe and Walters

NO: None

ABSENT FOR VOTE: Member Lomax

MOTION PASSED: 8-0

V. OTHER BUSINESS

Chairperson Thompson referred to the meeting calendar contained in the backup.

Mr. Rodriguez said staff desired a motion to approve the meeting calendar as presented.

Chairperson Thompson clarified the two meeting dates with an asterisk indicated they were moved to another Tuesday: March 11 was moved to March 18 to accommodate City elections; and November 11 was moved to November 18 to accommodate Veterans Day.

Chairperson Thompson asked for a motion to approve the P&Z Board meeting calendar as presented. Member Florido made a motion to approve; seconded by Member Walters; the following vote was recorded:

AYE: Chairperson Thompson, Vice Chairperson Dixon, Members Carter, Florido, Hepburn, Payne, Tighe and Walters

NO: None

ABSENT FOR VOTE: Member Lomax

MOTION PASSED: 8-0

* * *

Chairperson Thompson asked for a motion to approve the excused absence of Member Lomax. Member Walters made a motion to approve; seconded by Member Tighe; the following vote was recorded:

AYE: Chairperson Thompson, Vice Chairperson Dixon, Members Carter, Florido, Hepburn, Payne, Tighe and Walters

NO: None

ABSENT FOR VOTE: Member Lomax

MOTION PASSED: 8-0

Member Florido asked why there were rules for excused/unexcused absences.

Chairperson Thompson believed the rules were instituted at a time when advisory boards had difficulty achieving a quorum due to members being absent without prior notice to city staff. The agreed upon ground rule was a board member with three unexcused absences within a calendar year facilitated a board's request to remove that member, and have a replacement appointed. He noted this was the reason the P&Z Board had alternates, such as Member Payne, as this helped the board achieve a quorum if needed.

Mr. Artuso added he was directed to keep track of all P&Z Board member's absences, excused and unexcused, and relay the information to the City Clerk's Office, though he was not told anything as to repercussions.

Member Florido mentioned all members served voluntarily, so he felt they should be given a reason for the directive, asking Mr. Artuso to find out, and let the board know; the present board had a pretty good attendance record.

Mr. Artuso explained that the City Clerk asked him to keep a record, but he was unsure if this was so they, too, could keep a record of board absences in general or specifically. He would ask City Clerk Gibbs, and let the board know.

Mr. Rodriguez mentioned staff would give the board a presentation at the next meeting regarding board meeting attendance regulations.

Chairperson Thompson thought the regulations to be presented should be forwarded to the board in advance of the next meeting.

City Attorney Booker concurred as to the need to track absences was related directly to ensuring boards achieved a quorum at each meeting, so they could vote. It was an enforcement mechanism she saw used by other municipalities, giving commissions the ability to remove members who were repeatedly absent and ineffective.

Mr. Rodriguez mentioned staff was working on several LDC and Comprehensive Plan amendments that would be brought forth to the board over the next few months.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting: March 18, 2025, at 6:30 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:58 p.m.



Matthew Thompson, Chairperson
MT/cp