



**MINUTES**  
**CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH**  
**PLANNING & ZONING BOARD MEETING**  
**CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBER**  
**WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 01, 2025 -- 6:00 PM**

**ROLL CALL and RECORDING OF ABSENCES:** Present were: Juan Contin, Chair; Mark Humm, Henry Pawski; Daniel Walesky, Vice-Chair. Absent: Dave Mathews. Also present were: Karina Maldonado, Senior Community Planner; Annie Greening, Principal Planner; Elizabeth Lenihan, Board Attorney; Sherie Coale, Board Secretary.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**ADDITIONS / DELETIONS / REORDERING AND APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

A. September 3, 2025 Regular Meeting Minutes

**Motion:** D. Walesky moved to approve the September minutes as presented; H. Pawski 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Vote:** Ayes all, unanimous.

**CASES:**

**SWEARING IN OF STAFF AND APPLICANTS** Board Secretary administered oath to those wishing to give testimony.

**PROOF OF PUBLICATION** – Included in the meeting packet.

- 1) 732 S Dixie Hwy  
1617 North Lakeside Dr  
Ordinance 2025-15

**WITHDRAWALS / POSTPONEMENTS** None

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**BOARD DISCLOSURE** None

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS:** None

**NEW BUSINESS:**

- A. PZB Project Number 25-01500004:** Consideration of a variance request for 1617 North Lakeside Drive to allow a boat and boat trailer to be parked in front of the front building line. The subject site is zoned Single Family Residential (SFR) and has a future land use designation of Single Family Residential (SFR).

**Staff:** K. Maldonado presents case findings and analysis. The parking of the recreational vessel forward of the front building line resulted in a Code violation. The violation was cured in May with the removal of the vessel, at the same time the property owner applied for a variance. The applicant is proposing to

park and store the vessel forward of the front building line with additional screening on the north side as well as adding an additional parking space.

Staff analysis shows the site is constrained due to the narrow side yard resulting in insufficient room to park a boat and trailer alongside the home; lack of access through the rear alley as well as a pool in the back yard; the front setback is inadequate to allow the vessel in the front yard behind the front building line. **Criteria #1 is met.**

**Criteria #2 is not met** as the home continues to remain fully functional as a single-family home, recreational boat storage is a convenience not a fundamental component of reasonable residential use.

**Criteria #3 is not met** as it is within the same vein as above; the granting of the variance is not required to utilize the home as a residence regardless of the size of the request.

**Criteria #4 is met** as the proposal as put forth by the applicant would not be unduly injurious to contiguous properties or be detrimental to the public welfare. The proposal includes measures to mitigate impacts with a defined parking area on site reducing burden on neighbors with less on-street parking; meeting all front yard landscape requirements, including installation of a landscape screen; and meeting impervious surface requirements.

Staff received one public comment (Michael Anderson and Cristina Steinhaus- 1531 N. Palmway) in opposition to the request as they did not believe a precedent should be set. Should the Board choose to approve the request, there are Conditions to be met.

**Board Attorney:** The Variance “may” be approved if they fully meet the criteria.

**Board:** D. Walesky is generally in favor of property rights. Typically variances are related to buildings/structures. M. Humm queries if the impermeable requirements will be met. It is a luxury item. The criteria cannot be met.

**Applicant:** Previous owner had a boat in the driveway, it seems similar uses are in the neighborhood and does not see how it affects the appearance of the neighborhood.

Board member recalls a previous request from a property owner fronting on Federal Hwy for a boat variance, it was also denied so the precedence has been set.

**Motion:** D. Walesky moves to disapprove PZB 25-01500004 as it does not meet the criteria based on the data and analysis in the staff report; M. Humm 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Vote:** Ayes all, unanimous.

**B. Ordinance 2025-15:** City-initiated request for Text Amendments to the City of Lake Worth Beach Comprehensive Plan to update the Future Land Use (FLU) table by incorporating the Neighborhood Commercial (NC) Zoning District into the Artisanal Mixed Use Land Use Designation (Table 1, Future Land Use Element), and by incorporating the Single-Family Residential (SFR) Zoning District into the Medium Density Residential (MDR) Land Use Designation.

#### **Board Attorney reads the Ordinance Title**

**Staff:** This is a text amendment to the Future Land Use table. SFR zoning is being put under MDR Future Land Use designation and Neighborhood Commercial under Artisanal Mixed Use (AMU) Land Use designation.

**Board:** H. Pawski expresses concern that the inclusion of Single Family Residential zoning district to be included in MDR Land Use would be changing the focus from quality of life and neighborhood feeling by allowing for a higher density. D. Walesky explains with the Medium Density Land Use the density doesn't go low enough to allow Single-Family zoning. Requests staff to elaborate on the impacted areas.

**Staff:** For instance, on the south side of the City, the Arms of Hope, a rather large business/structure that is not permitted in the zoning district. This is the area that prompted the review. The zoning is not changing, only the underlying land use designation. This is not reflected in the table but exists in reality. Medium density (MDR) would include development of Single Family Residential properties. An example

would be if SFR zoning district is included in MDR land use, it wouldn't allow for the construction of a duplex.

**Lance Lilly-Chen Moore and Associates-** The intent is to include a broader range of Single Family Residential (SFR) uses in the MDR. Regarding Neighborhood Commercial (NC) there are properties already zoned NC but the table is not consistent. Only a rezoning would allow a parcel to change from SFR to SF-TF 14 or MF-20.

**Board Attorney:** Medium Density Land Use – The City currently has a Medium Density Land Use with SF-TF14, MF 20, and NC zoning districts within that Land Use. City also has many SFR neighborhoods with MDR Land Use. It is ok to be less dense. SFR will remain less dense. The zoning district is not changing and within that zoning district, the regulations must be met. The Ordinance is bringing consistency to the Land Use and Zoning for the area in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan.

**Board:** Concerns are that this would be the first step towards a rezoning to increase density, there must be something prompting the fix besides a table cleanup. It seems like a down cycling to SFR. Single family does not include everything that MD allows. With this change the Medium Density Land Use would allow things that Single Family would not. Board generally concurs that SF-TF 14 is the only appropriate single-family zoning district for MDR land use. Despite all the existing uses in the area, it's not the way to change it.

The "fix" shouldn't be to allow inconsistencies. The fix should be to change the land use or change the zoning to match and how it was envisioned and adopted. Shouldn't just fix it because a mistake was made years ago.

### **Neighborhood Commercial**

**Board:** What additional uses would be allowed, Board sees it as a first step to rezoning and they are cautious.

**Staff:** The Artisanal Mixed Use (AMU) only incorporates the Artisanal Industrial (AI) zoning district; there are parcels that are zoned Neighborhood Commercial (NC) with the underlying land use as AMU. This ordinance would bring that zoning district (NC) into conformity with that Land Use by including it in AMU Land Use.

**Board Attorney:** Artisanal Industrial (AI) district includes low intensity commercial office, retail, industrial cultural and artisanal arts, personal services and allows Mixed- Use office, retail and residential. Neighborhood commercial is a much less intense use that could also be more appropriate in the AI Zoning district that allows for more intense uses. The question for both changes is does Board want to allow a less dense use than what is currently allowed? Neighborhood Commercial zoning is more similar to the AI zoning uses in the AMU Land Use areas.

**Board:** Non-conformities eventually get torn down. Recommendation for staff to initiate a rezoning in both areas to make them consistent with the Future Land Use.

**Board Attorney:** Advises the Board may recommend a portion of the Ordinance.

**Motion:** D. Walesky moved to recommend denial of Ordinance 2025-15 to the City Commission; H. Pawski 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Vote:** Ayes all, unanimous.

C. Ordinance 2025-17: Consideration of an ordinance amending Chapter 23, Article 6, Section 23.6-1(p) "Penalties for tree abuse and removal without a permit."

**Staff:** A. Greening – changing the re-ordering and text to read more clearly. Currently, as written, it is not clear to customers, the fees are not changing. It clarifies the process.

**Motion:** H. Pawski moves to recommend approval of Ordinance 2025-17 to the City Commission; M. Humm 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Board Attorney:** Does not change anything with regard to Florida Statutes.

**Vote:** Ayes all, unanimous.

**PLANNING ISSUES:** October 15 a special meeting is scheduled to hear a single item. A quorum was ascertained at this time.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS** (3 minute limit) Glen Bear 1711 N Lakeside Dr.- Mistakenly thought the variance tonight would be about the variance for the side setback that was previously heard and denied. Questioned if they re-applied?

**DEPARTMENT REPORTS:** None

**BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:** None

**ADJOURNMENT:** 7:17 pm