

**MEETING MINUTES**  
**NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING FOR PROPOSED K STREET PARKING GARAGE**  
**COMPASS COMMUNITY CENTER – 201 N DIXIE HIGHWAY**  
**MONDAY, APRIL 13, 2026 – 6:00 PM**

**1. Call to Order**

- Meeting called to order at approximately 6:00 PM by Brent Whitfield.
- Attendees were asked to sign in upon arrival.

**2. Presentation**

Brent Whitfield introduced the City’s consultant team for the proposed City-owned parking garage located at S K Street. In attendance of the meeting was Brent Whitfield, Lance Lilly, and Austin Lawrence from ChenMoore as well as the project architect, Bruno Philips.

B. Whitfield began the presentation providing the outline of the meeting and presentation and mentioned that there would be time for public input and feedback.

Mr. Whitfield provided project background indicating the which stemmed from a 2018 Parking Study conducted by WGI. The 2018 study divided the Downtown different districts and the types of parking categories for each district (on-street, off-street, regulated, and unregulated). Based on an in person survey conducted in the Downtown Core, there was 462 on-street and 205 off-street parking spaces. The survey was conducted on specific times on a Saturday afternoon and night and Thursday morning and afternoon. In 2024, the study was updated to determine the parking availability downtown and used license plate recognition and other methods to measure parking.

The study indicated that the City’s downtown parking was sufficient during weekdays but was either at or over capacity on weekend afternoons and effectively full all evening on weekends (85% capacity or more). The conclusion of the study recommended that the City increase its parking supply downtown and consider a garage on K Street.

B. Whitfield demonstrated the subject of parking and surrounding areas, which included the following:

- 36 spaces required (penny sales tax obligation)
- 50 spaces anticipated for potential development on Lake Avenue
- 127 spaces impacted (spaces from South K Street, L Street and M Street and on-street parking)

B. Whitfield explained that the new garage would provide 133 new parking spaces that are not currently physically available. However, with the spaces obligated from the penny sales taxes as well as the anticipated parking from the new development on Lake Avenue, the garage would provide an estimated 47 additional parking spaces.

L. Lilly provided a brief overview of the proposed developments location, zoning district category, future land use designation, and total acreage. It was further explained the process for the development, which includes unity of title, a zoning map amendment, conditional use, certificates of appropriateness, a major site plan for an urban mixed use planned development, sustainable bonus incentive request, and right-of-way abandonment of a portion of an alley.

L. Lilly presented the existing conditions for the subject property then provided the project details such as the ingress and egress access, the number of parking, the square footage of the proposed parking garage of over 95,000 square feet with 260 parking spaces. In addition, it was explained that there are two historic buildings that would be relocated to the subject site and there is an alley to the west that would require a portion of it to be abandoned.

L. Lilly explained that the design team indicated two (2) architectural design options that would be presented to the Historic Resources Preservation Board (HRPB) for their review and approval. L. Lilly briefly explained that option 1 includes the relocated buildings with ADA accessibility as well as an add on to the existing historic buildings.

B. Philips explained the architectural elements of the proposed architectural design option 1 that includes green trellises, a mural, and enhanced architectural features. While Option 2 is the option that would eliminate some of the architectural design elements for budgetary purposes. These eliminations would include the removal of the trellises and mural while maintaining the overall structure and design compatibility.

Mr. Lilly provided the project timeline for the proposed development that includes:

- Application submitted: January 2026
- Public meeting: April 13, 2026
- HRPB hearing (tentative): April 29, 2026
- City Commission review: Late May–June 2026

Before beginning public comments and feedback, B. Whitfield provided a brief overview on the financial component of the garage. It was mentioned that the garage would be funded using city funds from the City and CRA (Community Redevelopment Agency), developer

contributions from payment in-lieu fees. The estimated cost of the garage would be approximately \$9.7–\$9.8 million dollars and would be paid without paid parking.

### **Public Comment (By Speaker)**

*Diane Brown, 905 N. Lakeside Drive*, questioned the net gain in parking spaces after accounting for removed and obligated spaces. D. Brown commented that based on the calculations there would only be a limited number of new spaces would remain available to the public.

*Richard Stowe, 414 N. Federal Hwy*, recommended that the City, its consultant's and residents read "High Cost of Free Parking" and other literature material. R. Stowe emphasized that the book provides parking management strategies that may be more effective than increasing supply.

B. Whitfield responded that in order to implement the recommendations from the referenced literature, then paid parking program would be required.

*Kim Stokes, City resident*, raised concerns regarding total project cost and financial sustainability. It was questioned whether the City has a clear plan for long-term maintenance and operations and asked if revenue projections exist without relying on citywide paid parking. K. Stokes also mentioned that the cost of the garage continues to differ and questioned the price of the garage.

B. Whitfield explained that the report prepared by WGI included paid parking as an idea; however, based on correspondence with the City that is not contemplated at this time and will be paid fully using taxpayer funds and CRA funds. It was explained that the cost has changed because of different design options proposed to the commission and the prices of the construction costs and construction costs total \$9.8 million for the 4.5 story garage. B. Whitfield also mentioned that the team cannot speak for the City but are taking notes to get an answer for the future.

*Jenny Powell, 224 N. Palmway*, questioned the cost efficiency of the project, particularly cost per net new parking space. It was suggested that alternative parking options should be explored, including shared use of private lots and mentioned potential availability of additional parking within nearby privately owned properties.

B. Whitfield mentioned that it was believed that the City attempted to come to terms with private entities regarding parking such as the First Baptist church and was unable to broker a deal. It was explained that the garage would allow for additional land in the downtown area that could provide more land for potential development.

*Susan Mason, 806 N N Street*, questioned why the meeting was not being recorded. It was also expressed concerns about the scale and character of the proposed garage and stated that peak parking demand (e.g., Saturday nights) should not dictate infrastructure size. Furthermore, commented not wanting Lake Worth Beach to become like other neighboring municipalities that have garages and encouraged alternative transportation options rather than constructing a large garage.

B. Whitfield mentioned that members of his team such as L. Lilly were taking notes to keep track of public comment.

Alan, resident on K Street, questioned whether the project has been reviewed by the Florida Department of State, Division of Historic Resources. It was mentioned that the City chose not to submit the proposed garage for the State's review. Alan questioned the validity of the WGI study and claimed the prices included in the study are not accurate compared to other parking prices in neighboring municipalities. Lastly, explained that there are other areas in the City that have underutilized parking that could be used in lieu of the garage.

B. Whitfield mentioned that the development is being reviewed by the City and was submitted to the required agencies for review.

*Aaron Slopey, 30 S J Street*, mentioned that the development would directly impact by the proposed development and that she monitored the WGI team when they conducted the study and that typically during the observations, parking was generally empty except on weekends, which is to be expected. A. Slopey commented regarding the 10-foot alley and would like to address the size of the egress/ingress.

*Nancy Goodell, 1131 North Palm Way*, mentioned that the garage is not being built out of actual need, but rather because it is required under the WMODA development agreement, that obligates the City to construct it. N. Goodell was unable to find any finalized parking agreement and asked where that information is available to the public, while also requesting clarification on the bidding process for the proposed K Street Garage, as it was believed the developers of the WMODA development had already been confirmed. N. Goodell concluded by emphasizing that if a parking agreement is in place, the numbers should be clearly reflected in the presentation, rather than appearing as if they are missing.

B. Whitfield mentioned that he is not familiar with the City or the developer agreement. B. Whitfield also stated that he is not familiar with the legal aspects, but to his knowledge, no agreements are in place for leasing the units.

*Todd Townsend*, stated that museum attendance has declined by about 30% since COVID-19 and questioned the need for the proposed garage. T. Townsend mentioned concerns that many of the spaces are designated for compact cars, which may not reflect actual vehicle use and could reduce practical capacity. Lastly, T. Townsend believes the project is outdated and requested that the public be allowed to vote on the entire proposal.

*Matthew Vanvoorthuijsen*, 302 N B Street, stated that he was not in favor of the garage and the WMODA development. As M. Vanvoorthuijsen mentioned, that any necessary garages should be similar to Disney Springs in terms of safety and the amount of foot traffic. M. Vanvoorthuijsen reiterated a point previously mentioned, noting that only five people parked in the Bohemian garage, which suggests the City may have the demand backward and should reconsider its approach, as the cost of the garage is not justified.

*Jana Piero*, 410 S M Street, mentioned owning two businesses downtown and understanding the potential traffic and parking issues. However, *J. Piero* mentioned full support of the parking garage.

*Catherine Colmeyer*, 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue South, emphasized the importance of the meeting and questioned why the meeting is not being recorded for those that were not attending the meeting. She also mentioned that according to the October meeting agendas for the WMODA museum, there is an development agreement indicating that the development is contingent upon the approval of a City-owned garage.

Mr. Whitfield mentioned that the WMODA development could be conducted without the approval of a City-owned garage. In addition, he mentioned that the City attorney should be the representative answering legal questions. He explained that the AV in the room could not accommodate a proper recording of the meeting, but members of the team are documenting the meeting.

*Lisa Summer*, S K Street, mentioned that she is opposed to the development and questioned the construction process such as the number of trucks, timeline, and impacts on infrastructure.

B. Whitfield mentioned that the development should take approximately 12 months from start to finish and that the owner's representative team is in coordination with the SLWD staff regarding best practices to minimize noise and vibration disturbances.

## **11. Adjournment**

- Meeting concluded at 7:50 p.m. following public comments and discussion.