



**MINUTES
CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD MEETING
CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBER
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 15, 2025 -- 6:00 PM**

ROLL CALL and RECORDING OF ABSENCES: Present were: Juan Contin, Chair; Mark Humm; Dave Mathews; Dan Walesky, Vice-Chair. Absent/Recused: Henry Pawski.

Also present were: Annie Greening, Principal Planner; Scott Rodriguez, Asst. Director for Planning & Preservation; Karina Maldonado, Senior Community Planner; William Water, Director for Community Sustainability; Glen Torcivia, City Attorney; Sherie Coale, Board Secretary.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ADDITIONS / DELETIONS / REORDERING AND APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA None

Motion: D. Walesky moves to approve the agenda; D. Mathews 2nd.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

CASES:

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

BOARD DISCLOSURE: None, no ex-parte communications by Board members.

NEW BUSINESS:

- A. Ordinance 2025-16 (PZB 25-01300002):** Privately-initiated Zoning Map amendment to rezone 826 Sunset Drive from the unincorporated Palm Beach County designated zoning district to a City of Lake Worth Beach zoning district: Single-Family and Two-Family Residential (SF-TF-14); PCN 38-43-44-29-01-004-0240.

Board: M. Humm moves to allow affected parties a maximum of 5 minutes and general public 2 minutes to speak; D. Mathews 2nd. **Vote:** 3/1 D. Walesky dissenting.

Quasi-judicial procedures: Twelve parties have registered as affected parties. Affected parties are those who are more adversely affected than those interested parties which includes all persons within the 400 foot notification radius. They may present evidence, produce witnesses, cross examine witnesses. Generally, appeals and suits may be filed. Opinion testimony is not given the same weight as professionals representing parties to the proceedings. It is based on Compliance with the City Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Regulations. The parcel does not have a zoning designation and one must be assigned, it does have a Land Use designation of Medium Density Residential (MDR). A reasonable zoning district must be assigned even if not the one requested. The result will be forwarded to the City Commission as a recommendation to adopt or not adopt. The Planning & Zoning Board is not the decisive party for the request. The Board may recommend or not recommend

the requested district. If not recommending the requested district, another reasonable zoning district shall be recommended with reasons given that the decision is not arbitrary, discriminatory or unreasonable and serves a legitimate public purpose.

The speaking order will be City(staff), Applicant, Affected Parties.

Staff: A. Greening provided a brief re-cap of the history of the property. Annexed into the City in November 2005. In 2006 the City approved a FLUM of MDR and later, 2009, reversed the approval. The City since 2012 has updated and revised the comprehensive plan, Future Land Use and Zoning maps. The request to provide SF-TF14 zoning to the parcel is consistent and supported by the Comprehensive Plan in effect and the Strategic Plan. It is also the least dense use within the Future Land Use (MDR) which is the assigned land use. It will allow redevelopment of vacant property providing additional housing in the City. It would be a complementary designation to the surrounding multi-family and single family units in the area. Some conditions from Electric Utilities and Public Works are attached.

Board: The Conditions are normally attached to a Site Plan approval, how can the be attached to a re-zoning?

William Waters: They are provided as preliminary guidance for any developer who may want to develop the parcel once re-zoned. The access is via county road to the north, with properties to the north in unincorporated Palm Beach County. There are some issues getting utilities to the site.

16 SFR

6:22 Chris Raley, Applicant and John Lang, property owner: Appreciates the residents and opportunity to address the concerns. This is a new effort to address the issues presented by ROLO and surrounding property owners. Those concerns are the natural features and perimeter buffers- they have been increased, the trees are evaluated and preserved/relocated according to best practices.

Secondly, the retaining wall- owned and maintained by Murray Hills. The original developer of Murray Hills maximized the building area by flattening out the grade. A visual inspection was conducted and is agreeing to submit an additional structural report by a structural engineer prior to submitting building permits.

Traffic concerns – Recent traffic studies show sufficient capacity for the proposal and this will be updated at time of plat.

Height of new structures- all will conform to the City Land Development Regulations for the zoning district. The increased of perimeter buffering will also reduce the impact.

Density – the setbacks and lot sizes in SF-TF 14 are identical to SFR lot size requirements and setbacks therefore the limits are set.

No variances to Code are being requested. Buffers generally range from 40 feet on the south, 50 feet on the east and west and 130 feet on the north.

John Lang- Property owner-bought the property 23 years ago with a partner. The transmittal to DCA did not happen after the approval for MF-20.

AFFECTED PARTIES

Attorney for Murray Hills, Scott Lee: The matter should be deferred until after the City undertakes studies on the environmental, drainage, runoff impacts, as well at the structural integrity of the retention wall. What wasn't mentioned was over a year ago Mr. Raley did not take any responsibility pertaining to the wall or willingness to bond the work naming Murray Hills as an insured. The visual inspection doesn't tell the story. 518 condo units with the community surrounding the proposed project.

Suzanne Cioci – 822 Sunset Dr: Its all about the zoning. The property was previously before the board with the rental units and pathway to ownership. Single Family residential (SFR-7) is the only zoning that should be allowed.

Nicoletta Loulis- 821 Sunset Dr. -There is a big difference between SF-TF 14 zoning and SFR-7 despite what Mr. Raley claims are similarities. The topographical map shows the area is associated with ROLO not necessarily Murray Hills. They are big developers, also in Atlantis and the question has always been why so long to hold the property without development. The traffic study done during the pandemic was not an accurate reflection of the conditions especially with the bridge under construction. Should the developer want to take advantage of the TDR incentive it must be zoned SF-TF14.

Aaron Thum -2201 Collier Ave – It would negatively affect his family. Murray Hills has seven entrances, the proposed development would only have one egress and ingress. Single family would be appreciated.

Daniela Santamarina – not present

Chris and Katherine Hunter-Frost 2212 Quail Trail-Primary concern is safety and access. With only one egress and ingress causing problems for Emergency services. Doesn't trust the developer will only build 16 units. Please deny the request for SF-TF14.

John and Ruth Lynch-2802 Lake Osborne Drive- Why is he asking for SF-TF 14? So he can flip it. Not against but wanting. Most of the adjacent SF homes are 1/3 to ¼ acre lots. Wants the development to match the character of the neighborhood. Is the developer upzoning. A commercial real estate site shows the lot for sale on Loop-Net. In July 2025 the advertisement was taken down from the site. It was listed for 4 million and subject to site plan approval.

Emily Golisch-2033 Collier Ave- The one way in and out directly affects those at the entrance; the property should be zoned Single Family.

William Yates 3120 Cynthia Lane- Opposed to the SF-TF14 zoning as it is inappropriate for the land. Believes staff review is flawed. The safety and prosperity of the community is at risk due to the retention wall and runoff. Lower property values due to runoff and property damage are possible.

Amy Mihelich-2032 Collier Ave- This change will impact the safety and integrity of the neighborhood. The Future Land Use was previously disputed by the neighborhood. The traffic would impact the neighborhood to the north, not Murray Hills. Streets are not designed for heavy traffic. Environmentally speaking the flora and fauna will be affected burrowing owls and gopher tortoises. This zoning request is not an oversight but the result of a longstanding dispute. Any change should be to the Future Land Use.

Rebecca Steers – not present

Kathleen McGivern – 2121 Collier Ave- There is one point of egress and ingress. Site Plans aren't worth the paper they're printed on. Once the zoning is applied and the property is flipped there's nothing to be done.

Ignacio Martinez – not present

Board: Any questions of the Board to the affected parties? **Response:** None at his time.

Public Comment:

George Adams – See written comment

Lawrence Silver -5356 Lake Osborne Dr- stands with Lake Osborne community.

Jane Schumacher – see written comment

Catherine Cargill – see written comment

Read into the Record: see written comments

Celeste Palmowski

Gene and Kaye Nyffeler

Eugene & Jan Sengstacken

Gretchen Feero

Janice Keogh

Yvonne Harmon

Carol & Phillip Michalski

Raymond & Susan Ludwig

Robert & Kyla Reising

Thomas & Audrey Voss

Rhonda Ragen

Benedict Ives

Kathleen Richard

Chad Ruhlander & Brittany Katz

Laurie Lamb

Carole Castonguay

Joan & Paul Kunes

Susan & John Herr

Marilyn More

Kathy Goldsworthy

Vicki & Henry Cooper

Sandra Brancaleone

Greg Hensley

Lorene Tapellini

Jorma Peltola

Jim Pellegrino – analysis of staff report included

Gunster- Brian Seymour

Greg Richter- 1202 S Palmway -has concerns with the changes in zoning and whether this will happen in other neighborhoods. Live Local would allow the height to be as high as the Towers. Don't make the decision, let the City Commission decide.

Adrienne Lo Piccolo- 2024 Collier Ave- concerned with quality of life, safety and property value. Builder doesn't care about the community.

Roland Rentfrow 3280 Lake Osborne Dr– Zoom – drainage is a concern. Zoning of SFR would be a better option. Height is a concern, they should be single storm.

June Bingham- 5438 Lake Osborne Civic Association – the heavy equipment will damage the roads and infrastructure during construction.

Florin Nisip-2161 Mark Drive- The "sidewalks" are the streets and can't imagine the density. Keep as SF-7.

Chris Raley- Previous comments from community have been heard, that's why the plans have changed from 42 townhomes to 16 lots. The ad in the paper was because he needed a partner at the time to build 42 townhomes. He is an engineer; a drainage study was completed. The lot drains from south to north with the retention wall on the south, which is why it remains. The soil is sandy; runoff problems will end with development of the lot. The water management district requires all runoff to be retained on site. See

the retention pond on the site. Previously completed environmental studies will be updated. Understands the traffic, minimum lot requirements are the exact same for SF-TF-14 as they are for SFR.

Affected party rebuttal:

Ruth Lynch: Displays the ad for the lot for sale posted in May 2025.

Nikki Loulis: Questions why can it not be SFR7? Can they apply for TDR?

William Waters: There are only 3 implementing zoning districts for MDR and SF7 is not one. The Board recommended against including SFR in the MDR Future Land Use Designation. TDR west of I-95 must be five (5) acres.

Scott Lee: Can a Board attach Conditions to a zoning Ordinance restricting number of units?

William Waters: The limiting of the units may only be through the Planned Development process. Unaware of any limitation of units under Florida Statutes. If a site plan were to come in, environmental and development regulations could limit the number of units.

Scott Lee: Is there any statute allowing the Board to prohibit or limit the number of units?

Glenn Torcivia: Are you aware of a statute that allows that? That would occur at the Site Plan level.

Scott Lee: Is that something that the Board could curate at time of adoption?

William Waters: There is much that would need to be addressed by many reviewing entities in addition to the road, which is not a City road, before ever pulling a building permit.

Scott Lee: Has the City ever entered into an agreement indemnifying the community?

Glenn Torcivia: Do you have authority to support your position? You are asking if the City has the authority to allow this. This is a novel approach and this is not a court of law; getting off topic.

Board Chair: Getting into sticky things like spot zoning. The Zoning is set-up by the City and to be respected and you should not be asking the Board to go down this path. It is not correct to tell the Board what to do.

William Waters: What is different in this case is there is no zoning on the property. Rezoning are frequently accompanied by a Site Plan which allows Conditioning.

Scott Lee: Does the Board have the authority to designate the zoning (particular to the topography) with regard to the surrounding communities?

Glenn Torcivia: No, what you are asking will happen at Site Plan. You are asking about a new zoning category that's not in the Comprehensive Plan or Zoning Code.

Amy Miehlich: Since it is not attached to a Site Plan, they can get the zoning and then develop to the maximum. Why is this not a Future Land Use change? That would be a good faith thing to do.

William Waters: The City, precluded by State law, cannot initiate a FLU change to a lower density; the property owner would have to do that.

Aaron Thum: Supports development on the property. A FLU mistake should not be fixed with another rezoning mistake. It might make sense if it was part of Murry Hills but it's part of the community to the north. Fix this in an expedient way so the property owner can get on with the development.

Chris Raley: The drainage and minimum lot requirements preclude more lots.

William Waters: Lot width, depth and area are the same for both SFR and SF-TF 14. Performance requirements, such as water retention, preclude increased intensity/density.

Kathleen McGiveron: There are two choices to be made tonight- either SF-TF14 or SFR7.

William Waters: If Board feels or believes it to be in compliance/alignment with the Comp Plan and LDR's and not legally challenged, they could recommend SFR to City Commission.

Board: Would this be asking for a change the Future Land Use as well? This was last reviewed by Board and the difficulty is that it impacts the entire City.

William Waters: In 2012 much of the City was downzoned to SFR but the Land Use remained the same.

Board Comments: D. Walesky wants to clarify that the Site Plan may not have to come before the Board.

William Waters: No longer processed through the Board but staff reviewed.

D. Walesky: They could build 16 duplexes (32 units).

D. Mathews: Was SF-TF 14 requested or proposed by staff? **Response:** Requested by applicant.

J. Contin: Although there is a theme of discontent with the proposal, there are things that limit the development of the lot. The lowest density to be recommended at the moment is SF-TF 14 (without changes to FLU) and have the same requirements

William Waters: The lot size, dimension and area are the same. FAR requirements and lot coverage are a bit higher.

D. Walesky: It was previously understood that 3+ units would be reviewed by Board.

William Waters: If platted, the State precludes the review but the site plan could come before the Board. If each individual lot is developed, it would not come before the Board.

The process of Platting, within the LDR's, will be re-visited soon as there have been changes as of July 1, 2025.

D. Walesky: To clarify, Live Local applies to a Mixed-Use zoning district. It will not work with purely residential zoning. The comment regarding the Land Use being a mistake; In 2005 there was a push for high-density with opposition and it ended up being medium density so the applicant may have a good argument if staff/Board requested applicant consider a land-use change. Board also recommended against allowing SFR in MDR Land Use just 2 weeks ago.

Closing Arguments

Chris Raley: The site plan will be reviewed, traffic will be increased.

Is the intent meant that there will be 16 units, Response: yes. Currently there is a housing crisis and tariffs. Medium income cannot afford an SFR home. The applicant wishes to move this along, that is the goal. It's been under contract for four (4) years.

Scott Lee: Does the Board have the right to adopt SF4? A rote reading of the Code and Statute is the wrong way to interpret; go outside the parameters based upon the topography.

Amy Miehlich: The first proposal fit the site and there is no guarantee that he won't switch back. Board should deny, he withdrawal application and return with a rezoning and site plan concurrent. It's the only way to guarantee what he states.

Jason LoPiccolo: This will be a rental community of 32 units. Doesn't want a rental community in the midst of the neighborhood.

Kathleen McGiveron: There are two choices; I don't think you'll see another site plan. They'll take the rezoning and run. This has been going on since 2005.

Aaron Thum: If there's a possibility that it could become duplexes, it would be unacceptable.

Public Hearing closed at 8:59 PM by the Board Chair.

William Waters: The Site plan would come back before the Board as the street dedication would require that.

D. Walesky – Leaning toward approval. The Site Plan is where it can be seen if over-built.

MDR and SFR was determined to not be compatible (2 weeks ago).

Motion: M. Humm moves to recommend approval of Ordinance 2025-16 (PZB 25-01300002) to the City Commission based upon data and analysis in the staff report and the testimony at the public hearing; D. Walesky 2nd.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

PLANNING ISSUES: None

PUBLIC COMMENTS (3 minute limit) None

DEPARTMENT REPORTS: A. Greening is leaving the City employ for a position in Des Moines. There will be more Comp Plan Amendments as well as a new Element for the Comprehensive Plan. Most projects in review are for Live Local.

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS: None

ADJOURNMENT: 9:05 PM

CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH PUBLIC COMMENT CARD
Planning & Zoning Board Meeting – October 15, 2025 6:00 PM

Topic of Agenda Item on which you want to speak: Ordinance 2025-16

Agenda Section: New Business

Name: Dr. John Lynch
(Please print)

Address: 2802 Lake Osborne Drive, Lake Worth Beach
(Please print)

For ☐ Against ☒

If you prefer to not speak but have the Chair read your comments into the minutes:

To address the **Board** on any agenda item, this card **MUST** be fully completed and presented to the staff member seated at the front of the Chambers **PRIOR** to the item being opened for public discussion.

Note: A separate card is necessary for each agenda item to be addressed.

CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH PUBLIC COMMENT CARD
Planning & Zoning Board Meeting – October 15, 2025 6:00 PM

Topic of Agenda Item on which you want to speak: Ordinance 2025-16

Agenda Section: A - New Business

Name: Ruth Lynch
(Please print)

Address: 2802 Lake Osborne Drive, Lake Worth Beach
(Please print)

For ☐ Against ☒

If you prefer to not speak but have the Chair read your comments into the minutes:

To address the **Board** on any agenda item, this card **MUST** be fully completed and presented to the staff member seated at the front of the Chambers **PRIOR** to the item being opened for public discussion.

Note: A separate card is necessary for each agenda item to be addressed.

CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH PUBLIC COMMENT CARD
Planning & Zoning Board Meeting – October 15, 2025 6:00 PM

Topic of Agenda Item on which you want to speak: _____

Agenda Section: _____

Name: _____

(Please print)

Address: _____

(Please print)

For ☐

Against ☒

If you prefer to not speak but have the Chair read your comments into the minutes:

To address the **Board** on any agenda item, this card **MUST** be fully completed and presented to the staff member seated at the front of the Chambers **PRIOR** to the item being opened for public discussion.

Note: A separate card is necessary for each agenda item to be addressed.

CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH PUBLIC COMMENT CARD
Planning & Zoning Board Meeting – October 15, 2025 6:00 PM

Topic of Agenda Item on which you want to speak: _____

Agenda Section: _____

Name: _____

(Please print)

Address: _____

(Please print)

For ☐

Against ☒

If you prefer to not speak but have the Chair read your comments into the minutes:

To address the **Board** on any agenda item, this card **MUST** be fully completed and presented to the staff member seated at the front of the Chambers **PRIOR** to the item being opened for public discussion.

Note: A separate card is necessary for each agenda item to be addressed.

CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH PUBLIC COMMENT CARD
Planning & Zoning Board Meeting – October 15, 2025 6:00 PM

Topic of Agenda Item on which you want to speak: 2025-16

Agenda Section: A - New Business

Name: Renee Hunter-Frost
(Please print)

Address: 2212 Quail Trail
(Please print)

For ☐ Against ☒

If you prefer to not speak but have the Chair read your comments into the minutes:

To address the **Board** on any agenda item, this card **MUST** be fully completed and presented to the staff member seated at the front of the Chambers **PRIOR** to the item being opened for public discussion.

Note: A separate card is necessary for each agenda item to be addressed.

CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH PUBLIC COMMENT CARD
Planning & Zoning Board Meeting – October 15, 2025 6:00 PM

Topic of Agenda Item on which you want to speak: 2025-16

Agenda Section: A - New Business

Name: Chris Frost
(Please print)

Address: 2212 Quail Trail
(Please print)

For ☐ Against ☒

If you prefer to not speak but have the Chair read your comments into the minutes:

To address the **Board** on any agenda item, this card **MUST** be fully completed and presented to the staff member seated at the front of the Chambers **PRIOR** to the item being opened for public discussion.

Note: A separate card is necessary for each agenda item to be addressed.

CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH PUBLIC COMMENT CARD
Planning & Zoning Board Meeting – October 15, 2025 6:00 PM

Topic of Agenda Item on which you want to speak: Sunset

Agenda Section: New Business

Name: Amy Mihelich
(Please print)

Address: 2032 Collier Ave, Lake Worth FL 33461
(Please print)

For ☐ Against ☒

If you prefer to not speak but have the Chair read your comments into the minutes:

To address the **Board** on any agenda item, this card **MUST** be fully completed and presented to the staff member seated at the front of the Chambers **PRIOR** to the item being opened for public discussion.

Note: A separate card is necessary for each agenda item to be addressed.

unincorp.

4:15

CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH PUBLIC COMMENT CARD
Planning & Zoning Board Meeting – October 15, 2025 6:00 PM

Topic of Agenda Item on which you want to speak: Ordinance 2025-16 (P2025-01300002

Agenda Section: New Business A

Name: Kathleen McGivern
(Please print)

Address: 2121 Collier Ave Lake Worth Beach FL 33461
(Please print)

For ☐ Against ☒

If you prefer to not speak but have the Chair read your comments into the minutes:

To address the **Board** on any agenda item, this card **MUST** be fully completed and presented to the staff member seated at the front of the Chambers **PRIOR** to the item being opened for public discussion.

Note: A separate card is necessary for each agenda item to be addressed.



Writer's Direct Dial Number: 561-650-0621
Writer's E-Mail Address: bseymour@gunster.com

October 15, 2025

VIA EMAIL & U.S. MAIL

bresch@lakeworthbeachfl.gov
smalega@lakeworthbeachfl.gov
cmcvoy@lakeworthbeachfl.gov
mmay@lakeworthbeachfl.gov
asegrich@lakeworthbeachfl.gov

City of Lake Worth Beach
c/o Mayor Bettsy Resch
and City Commissioners
7 North Dixie Highway
Lake Worth Beach, FL 33460

Re: Planning and Zoning regarding Sunset Drive Holdings

Dear Mayor Resch and Commissioners:

As you may be aware, our firm represents Sunset Drive Holdings, LLC ("Sunset"), the owner of 826 Sunset Drive in the City of Lake Worth Beach (the "Property"). The Property is subject of an application by SCG Florida, LLC (the "Applicant") to rezone the Property to place an appropriate City zoning on the Property, to which Sunset has consented. We urge the City to approve the proposed rezoning, which will allow for a low density, environmentally sensitive development of the Property by the Applicant.

Since the Property was annexed into the City, it has not had any City zoning category assigned to it. The City has assigned the Property the Medium-Density Residential (MDR) land use on your Future Land Use Map. Pursuant to Policy 1.1.1.1, Table 1 of the Future Land Use Element of the City's Comprehensive Plan, the MDR land use has three compatible zoning categories: SF/TF-14, MF-20, and NC. As all development orders, which includes zoning of property, must be consistent with the City comprehensive plan, one of the three identified zoning categories must be applied to the Property

The Applicant has applied for the least dense zoning category available for the Property. As identified in Table 1 of Policy 1.1.1.1, both the MF-20 and NC provide for a density of 20 units per acre. The proposed SF/TF-14 provides for only 14 units per acre. As such, unless the City proposes that the Property be developed with more units than the Applicant is proposing, the SF/TF-14 is the *only* zoning that is consistent with the Property's land use designation.

Mayor and Commissioners
October 15, 2025
Page 2

We understand that some of the neighbors in the surrounding developments (which contain the same land use designation as the Property) may not desire any development of the Property, or development less than the zoning categories permitted by the Property's land use designation. However, regardless of neighbor objection, Florida law is clear that all development must be consistent with the comprehensive plan. As the Applicant is requesting the least dense available zoning category, this is the best option available to follow the requirements of Florida law in a manner that gives those neighbors the least available development.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Brian M. Seymour", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Brian M. Seymour

cc (via email only): Elizabeth Lenihan, City Attorney (elenihan@torcivialaw.com)
Planning & Zoning Department (pzoning@lakeworthbeachfl.gov)
Client

ACTIVE:38608165.1

**PUBLIC COMMENT
CARD - ADVISORY
BOARD - {AGENDA
SECTION:10} -
JANICE - KEOUGH**

{Topic of Agenda Item on
which you want to
speak:12}



**WHICH BOARD MEETING IS THIS
COMMENT FOR?**

Planning and Zoning Board

MEETING DATE

10/15/2025

COMMENT TOPIC

Rezoning of Smith property/825 Sunset Dr

NAME

Janice Keough

EMAIL

LucysLakeside@gmail.com

ADDRESS

3200 Lake Osborne Dr Apt 106
Lake Worth Beach, FL 33461
United States

TESTIMONY CONSENT

✓ I swear and affirm the testimony I am about to give will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth
Do you swear and affirm the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?

**HOW WOULD YOU LIKE TO
PARTICIPATE?**

I would like the city to read my comments below

COMMENTS TO BE READ INTO RECORD

Would like to start by thanking the Board members for their service to the City of LWB.
This is being sent in opposition to the purposed zoning changes to the above property. The impact that the residents of this area will be subjected to are overwhelming ex: traffic, noise, water runoff, environmental issues, destruction of fauna, birds and critters and last but definitely as important, height of possible future structures if zoned as requested. With all due respect I ask the Board to please take all these concerns to heart in making your decision.
Thank you
Janice Keough

Subject: 826 Sunset Drive

Caution: This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments from unknown or unverified sources.

My name is Kathleen McGiveron. My address is 2121 Collier Avenue, Lake Worth Beach Fl. I am an affected party in this matter. My property is within 400 feet of 826 Sunset Drive. Please do not allow the proposed re-zoning on this property. The proposed zoning would allow up to 56 units or more to be built on this property. There is ONE way in and out of this property, straight into my neighborhood. The increase in traffic would create hazardous conditions for the entire Lake Osborne/6th avenue South area. Numerous traffic fatalities have ALREADY occurred on the neighborhood streets that feed into 6th Avenue South west of I-95 and East of Congress Avenue. The property in Question lies above my property. Noise and privacy concerns will become very real with the proposed zoning. My home's property value lies in it's lot size and in its being a true single family home. With the proposed development being able to build up to 56 units, my home's value is going to be drastically reduced after being averaged in with whatever small, packed in units end up on the property. Site plans are not worth the paper they are printed on. The property owner can offer the moon and stars, their signature in blood, their first born, whatever. And it doesn't mean a thing. IT'S ALL ABOUT THE ZONING. Period. As soon as the owner gets a zoning like the one being proposed , it's all over for the residents of the neighborhood. The property will immediately be flipped to the highest bidder.

Sherie Coale

From: Robert Feero <rfeero@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 2:09 PM
To: Sherie Coale; Planning and Zoning
Subject: Ordinance 2025-16 (PZB 25-01300002)

Caution: This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments from unknown or unverified sources.

PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING DURING THE COMMENT PERIOD AT TONIGHT'S PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING

Robert E. Feero
3280 Lake Osborne Drive
Lake Worth Beach, FL 33461

In the best interest of our neighborhood I ask that you kindly consider the impact to the surrounding existing residents - especially the residents of Murry Hills Condominiums. I'm a resident of Murry Hills and the current Board Vice President. I'm extremely concerned about the proposed change in zoning that you as the Planning and Zoning Board are about to address.

We understand growing communities need to allow for healthy development and it seems apparent that this parcel of land will eventually be built upon. We are very concerned that SF-TF-14 is extreme and excessive and implore the PZB to consider limiting the zoning to match the single family residential zoning found in the surrounding neighborhoods.

Please consider the following issues:

The small land-locked parcel - only 4.1 acres

Limited ingress and egress - 1 entrance - impact on safety and traffic flow

A 50 year old 20' tall retaining wall that was designed to maintain a single family farmette - may be compromised during construction

It is the highest spot of land in the area- with a 30 foot differential between Murry Hills Condos and the top of Sunset Property

Even at our pre development stage the water runoff has been a big issue for Murry Hills

The existing old growth trees are important to the environment and maintaining soil stability

Quality of life and the home values for existing neighbors will be negatively impacted

This is clearly an example of egregious Spot Zoning, especially if SF/ST 14 is approved - there is no benefit to the public good

I truly appreciate the work of the PBZ staff and the Planning and Zoning Board members' volunteer efforts and interest in our community. At this time I can only ask that you please listen to the people you represent and vote **NOT TO** recommend approval of Ordinance 2025-16 and consider approving a more reasonable zoning maximum that limits this project to no more than 16 homes total.

Thank you,

From: [Jorma Peltola](#)
To: pzoning@lakeworthbeach.fl.gov; [Sherie Coale](#)
Subject: Resident comments to October 15 meeting regarding Ordinance 2025-16 (PZB 25-01300002)
Date: Tuesday, October 14, 2025 5:52:58 PM

Caution: *This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments from unknown or unverified sources.*

Hello,

I received a letter from the Property owner: Sunset Drive Holdings, LLC regarding the referred Privately Initiated Zoning Map amendment. I live within the 400-yard radius from the said property and thus am considered as "interested party. I own this condominium; address and contact information is given below.

It is my understanding that the owner of the referred property is seeking a new zoning designation with the intent to develop this property that surrounded by Murry Hills Condominiums on east, south and west sides, and on the north side by single family residential as unincorporated Palm Beach County zoning district.

As a year-round owner and resident of Murry Hills, I have developed an appreciation for the Lake Worth community including parks, beaches and retention of old town residential neighborhoods where appropriate. Needless to say, Lake Osborne, parks and surrounding neighborhoods are unique in many respect.

As the owner within close proximity to the referred Sunset Holdings, LLC property and future development, I have several concerns that should be taken into account when zoning designations are decided as it will impact many property owners and community at large. More specifically, I would like express following concerns:

1. **Zoning designation options.** The Privately initiated zoning map proposition singularly focuses only on Single Family and Two Family Residential (SF-TF-14) zoning plans. Should the developer and the city consider **alternate zoning options** that would better synergize with the adjacent community - why just SF-TF-14). Granted, referred property on 3 edges is surrounded by Medium Density Residential (MF-30) and the north side the unincorporated PBC single family. I trust equally compelling other zoning options could be considered that would also support City Strategic Development Plans and interests.
2. **Topographical height differences between Sunset Property and South Side of**

Murry Hills. It has to be noted that part of the 826 Sunset drive is not at the same topographical level than especially Murry Hills South side buildings are. More specifically, certain Sunset Drive ground level are close to roof level of Murry Hills 2-story buildings - see 3 pictures attached. This fact should be taken into account with the zoning designation that would not allow 2-story building to be constructed on this target property. That said, why not synergize the said Sunset Property with the current unincorporated (4 dwellings/acre) or comparable zoning designation enabling the development of single story, single family residential homes like present at the north side of the Sunset property.

3. **Increased traffic flows** to adjacent roads to the Sunset Drive's one and only entry/exit road with higher density zoning designations
4. **Privacy concerns** between lower-level Murry Hill and higher level Sunset Drive dwellings especially if 2-story dwellings are allowed by new zoning designation

If still possible I am requesting that these concerns will be read during this Planning and Zoning Board Meeting on Wednesday 15 at 6 pm.

Respectfully,

Mr. Jorma Peltola
3362 Cynthia Lane, Unit 104, Lake Worth FL 33461
Lake Worth Beach, FL
Mobile: 708-603-1909
Email: Mr.Peltola@gmail.com

From: [Lorene Tapellini](#)
To: [Planning and Zoning](#); [Sherie Coale](#)
Subject: 826 Sunset Drive PLEASE DISTRIBUTE TO ALL ZONING BOARD MEMBERS and COMMISSIONERS
Date: Tuesday, October 14, 2025 5:25:44 PM

Caution: *This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments from unknown or unverified sources.*

Please distribute to all zoning board members and commissioners thank you.

I am a year round resident of Murry Hills and I am strongly opposed to anything other than the lowest possible zoning density for the Sunset Property. A higher density zoning designation for this small parcel of land which borders our retaining wall at Murry Hills on 3 sides will be detrimental to the safety of our community. This retaining wall was never intended to withstand the pressures of dense development with construction vehicles and uprooting large trees in close proximity to the wall. This wall was built in the 1970s when the property was a small farm. The Sunset property is significantly elevated above Murry Hills, therefore water runoff from a developed area will create a severe and imminent safety hazard for our residents.

Any development over the lowest possible rate to this already congested area will bring additional traffic to our residential streets, creating a dangerous environment for our 55+ community who walk and bike in the area. Even more concerning is the potential delay to emergency vehicles response time. The influx of traffic would significantly increase the risk of accidents, putting the lives of our residents in jeopardy. Before ANY development is proposed to the Sunset. Property, a new traffic study must be conducted. The traffic study the developer is using was done during Covid, when there was a much lower traffic rate. The new construction on the 6th Ave., Bridge is also bringing increased traffic that was not taken into consideration when the study was done.

Another traffic concern to all residents of the area is the one narrow ingress and egress to the sunset property. Has there been a safety study done on this? What about emergency vehicles getting in and out of that property with only one way in and one way out?

Why would anything other than single-family homes be approved for such an area? The infrastructure cannot support a denser zoning development.

There are also significant environmental impacts that any development on that property will bring. Where are the environmental studies for this property? As was brought up in many past meetings, developing this area will destroy old growth trees and wildlife including gopher tortoises and other endangered species. The green space of this area also affects the climate of our entire neighborhood—increased development equals increased temperatures. During the summer months when I walk through an already hot parking lot, the green space above Murry Hills provides some respite from this dangerous heat.

I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and vote against any development at 826 Sunset Drive until further traffic, environmental and safety studies are done. At the very least,

this property should not be zoned for anything greater than single family residences (SFR) allowing for no more than 7 SFR PER acre. As stated above anything above this designation will bring about dangerous conditions to our residents. Thank you for your consideration.

Lorene Tapellini

2840 Lake Osborne Drive 15-204

LWB, FL 33461

646-546-6816

From: [Greg Hensley](#)
To: [Planning and Zoning](#)
Cc: murryhills@gmail.com
Subject: ***Courtesy of Notice for Consideration of Re-zone of 826 Sunset
Date: Tuesday, October 14, 2025 11:21:31 AM

Caution: *This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments from unknown or unverified sources.*

To the Zoning Committee of Lake Worth Beach,

I appreciate the opportunity you have afforded us to ask questions and express our views to the Committee concerning the re-zoning at 826 Sunset. After review of property and the re-zoning notice, I have some concerns and questions. Please consider the following:

- 1.) Has the property received a comprehensive sub-soil investigation?
- 2.) I understand a height restriction is in effect for structures in the area. Is this height restriction from the average property ground elevation once excavated for foundations or is the height restriction from the average elevation of a radius of the area?
- 3.) Has a detailed study been conducted for traffic flow from the proposed property when considering the proposed plan of units by the contractor? This study, in my opinion, is very important since the property is being considered for a multi-unit property of traffic flows through an established single housing area. Safety would be a major concern.
- 4.) Has an environmental study of the property been completed and presented to the committee?
- 5.) Has a study been conducted of wildlife habitat on the four (4) plus acres? This should consider protected and invasive wildlife which may currently be on the property. Also, A "Certified Wildlife Area" designation is posted adjacent the roadway leading into the property. I assume from its placement the property to the right of the entrance has obtained this certification.
- 6.) How would drainage from the project be controlled through construction and after completion? Considering the elevation of the property, construction activity and its completion is a concern for all surrounding areas.

7.) Increased noise pollution is a concern for the surrounding area.

8.) A major part of the property is surrounded by a retaining wall for Murry Hills. How will this be wall be affected by construction activities? Will the contractor be required to post a bond covering the wall? Would the contractor be required to complete any and all reconstruction, repairs, modifications and modified drainage during and after construction?

Thank You.

Greg L Hensley
Property Owner of Deed
Murry Hills

From: [Sandra Brancaleone](#)
To: [Sherie Coale](#)
Subject: Zone board meeting
Date: Monday, October 13, 2025 3:55:44 PM

Caution: *This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments from unknown or unverified sources.*

To:

The Members of the Zoning Board Lake Worth Beach , Fl 33461

Re: Opposition to Proposed Zoning Change to SF-TF-14

Dear Members of the Zoning Board,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed zoning change to SF-TF-14 for the property located at [property address or parcel number]. This zoning designation is extreme and excessive for this particular site and surrounding area. The decision on how this property is zoned will directly determine the scale and intensity of development that follows, and therefore has far-reaching implications for the neighborhood's safety, livability, and environmental health.

Several issues warrant your careful consideration:

1. Parcel Size (4.1 Acres):

The proposed density is disproportionate to the limited acreage and incompatible with the surrounding residential character.

2. Ingress and Egress Limitations:

The property has only one entrance and exit, creating a potential safety hazard for residents, emergency vehicles, and increased traffic congestion.

3. Retaining Wall Concerns:

The existing retaining wall is aging and was not constructed to handle the level of activity this zoning density would permit. The wall should be evaluated, bonded, and certified to ensure structural safety before any increased use is allowed.

4. Water Drainage:

Increased impervious surfaces will worsen stormwater runoff and could contribute to flooding or erosion in adjacent areas. A comprehensive drainage study should be required.

5. Old-Growth Trees and Environmental Impact:

The property contains mature trees that provide essential shade, wildlife habitat, and stormwater absorption. Their removal would significantly alter the local ecosystem and increase heat and runoff.

6. Traffic and Safety:

Additional vehicles from higher-density housing will strain local roads not designed for such volume, increasing risks for pedestrians and cyclists.

7. Quality of Life and Privacy:

Residents of Murry Hills and nearby neighborhoods value their peace, privacy, and limited light pollution. A dense development would compromise these conditions.

8. Impact on Home Values:

Overdevelopment can negatively affect nearby property values, particularly when infrastructure and aesthetics are not aligned with existing community standards.

9. Spot Zoning Concerns:

Changing the zoning to SF-TF-14 would constitute spot zoning, inconsistent with the comprehensive plan and unfair to neighboring homeowners who purchased their properties under different expectations.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Zoning Board to deny the proposed zoning change and instead consider options that preserve the

neighborhood's character, environmental integrity, and safety.

Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration of these concerns.

Sincerely,

Sandra Brancalone

3322 Cynthia Ln apt 205

Lake Worth Beach, Fl 33461

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Henry and Vicki Cooper](#)
To: [Planning and Zoning](#); [Sherie Coale](#)
Subject: Zoning for Sunset Property Proposal
Date: Tuesday, October 14, 2025 11:00:06 AM

Caution: *This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments from unknown or unverified sources.*

Dear members of the zoning committee,

My name is Vicki Cooper, owner of 210 in building 21 and owner of 211 in building 22 in Murry Hills.

Please distribute my email to all of the zoning board members.

We were drawn to purchase a condo in Murry Hills because it is an *old Florida* , quiet and calm community. We were pleasantly surprised to see hillside property full of old trees and wildlife giving visual health and serenity to our new community. No High rises, no speeding traffic, a small town flavor so difficult to come by now.

My request is that you would consider the value of the lives of those of us who have been intentional about selecting and preferring an *old Florida *. Its a charming community with distinct characteristics.

Please consider the zoning for the Sunset property at the minimal amount of development. Without loop holes for future additional development. To ensure current lifestyle within our local community.

I express concerns about the retaining wall being able to support sustain new development. I express concern about the noise pollution during building and the dislocation of wildlife. We are a vulnerable , older community of folks and heavily development adjacent to us makes us more vulnerable. Please do your part in protecting us. I appreciate it.

Sincerely. Vicki Cooper for Henry too.

Sent from my U.S.Cellular© Smartphone

THIS PROPERTY SHOULD NOT BE ZONED SF-TF 14.

Zoning should be consistent with the surrounding neighborhood which is SF-1.... In an ideal world, the property should remain agricultural, however SF-1 is consistent with existing neighborhood. Any zoning for this property other than SF-1 is spot zoning and will deeply impact the Lake Osborne Estates community. The following bullet points highlight my concerns over SF-TF-14:

- Fire and Safety. Limited ingress/egress (1 entrance) will impact First Responders ability to reach property. Higher density zoning results in overflow parking and obstacles impacting First Responders ability to respond to emergency events.
- Environmental impacts to community. Higher density zoning will over tax storm water management, destroy old growth trees and natural habitat.
- Traffic. Higher density zoning adds more stress to the already overstressed traffic in the region. Conservative estimate of 2 cars per household, SF-TF 14 injects 115 additional cars (4.1 acres x 14 units/acre x 2 cars) into a single ingress/egress during rush hour.
- Impacts to Murry Hill retirement community. Structural integrity of retaining wall – not designed to support high density zoning and Quality of life – privacy/lighting/noise/traffic..etc

Thank you for your time and dedication to keeping/defending the fun, eclectic character of Lake Worth Beach.

George and Cynthia Adams

3320 Lake Osborne Dr, Unit 201

Lake Worth Beach, FL 33461

From: [kathy goldsworthy](#)
To: [Planning and Zoning](#)
Subject: 826 Sunset Development
Date: Monday, October 13, 2025 3:56:53 PM

Caution: This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments from unknown or unverified sources.

Dear Zoning Board Member:

I am a resident at Murry Hills. My name is Kathy Goldsworthy Building 3-211. I am writing to ask you to consider all of the information concerning our community pertaining to the proposed 826 Sunset Development.

Water runoff is a huge issue, with their property being so much higher than ours. We have a good friend in building 18 and I feel they, and all owners bordering the property, will be at risk.

Another issue of safety is the retaining wall. The new pressure from the proposed construction again puts our community at risk.

The other issues of annoyance like increased traffic and noise and the invasion of privacy remain, but I am most concerned that our properties will be severely affected in a very damaging way.

This small 4.1 acre property with limited access is not conducive to the number of proposed sites. Please vote against this and save Murry Hills from damage and property devaluation.

Sincerely,

Kathy Goldsworthy

From: [marilyn More](#)
To: [Planning and Zoning](#)
Subject: zoning
Date: Monday, October 13, 2025 2:53:45 PM

Caution: *This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments from unknown or unverified sources.*

My name is Marilyn More residing at 3280 Lake Osborn Dr in the Murry Hills complex attached to 826 Sunset property. We would appreciate your consideration for us living in the neighbor. We would like this to be zoned with the least amount of buildings. There is only one entrance and our retaining wall is 16ft with this property having an elevation of 49ft. Thank you for your consideration.

RECOMMENDATION

The proposed rezoning (Ordinance 2025-16) is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, Strategic Plan, and the guidelines and standards found in the City of Lake Worth Beach Land Development Regulations (LDRs). Therefore, staff recommends that the Planning and Zoning Board recommends approval to the City Commission for the proposed rezoning request.

Since this is a **privately initiated zoning** map amendment by a developer who has currently submitted a proposal of 16 single family homes, Ordinance 2025-16 which recommends SF-TF-14 is much denser zoning than what is apparently needed. While SF-TF-14 is a type of zoning that meets guidelines and standards found elsewhere in the City of Lake Worth Beach, it is not in line with other zoning standards in this area of the city west of I-95.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed privately-initiated rezoning request would amend the zoning district on the subject properties from an unincorporated Palm Beach County zoning district to Single-Family and Two-Family Residential (SF-TF-14). The proposed map amendment would be consistent with the current Future Land Use designation of Medium Density Residential (MDR) and would reflect the mix of uses of the residential properties in this area. The rezoning is supported by and is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and City Strategic Plan, as described in the respective Comprehensive Plan and Strategic Plan Analysis sections of this report.

The data and analysis section of this staff report for the Zoning Map amendment analyzes the proposed request for consistency with the City's Comprehensive Plan, Strategic Plan, and review criteria provided in LDR Section 23.2-36(3).

The proposed **privately initiated rezoning request** would indeed amend the zoning district on the subject property from an unincorporated Palm Beach County zoning district to Single Family and Two-Family Residential (SF-TF-14) **allowing a much denser zoning that what is needed for the request at hand**. The proposed map amendment might be consistent with the current Future Land Use designation of Medium Density Residential (MDR). However, MDR has various ranges in how many dwelling units are allowed per acre. As this is not specified, this board cannot assume that MDR automatically means the highest of that range.

While the data and analysis section of the staff report for the **privately initiated zoning map** amendment may show consistency with the City's Comprehensive Plan, Strategic

Plan and review criteria provided in LDR Section 23.2-36(3), this **privately initiated zoning map** amendment is not best recommendation for this area of the community.

COMMUNITY OUTREACH

Notification letters were sent out to all property owners within 400 feet of the proposed rezoning area on September 30, 2025. Signs were also posted at the subject property to be rezoned. As of the date of publication, staff has not received letters of support or opposition for this application.

Notification letters were indeed sent out on September 30, 2025, by USPS. Upon receipt, owners have indeed sent back letters of opposition and have received confirmation of receipt of their letters of opposition including confirmation that their letters would be read into the record at the Planning & Zoning Board meeting on October 15th. This includes at least one confirmation that was received back on October 7th, 2025, making the above statement incorrect.

BACKGROUND

Listed below is a summary of the subject property's background:

- The subject property was annexed into the City in November 2005, with the City Commission approving the annexation and rezoning requests from Sunset Drive Holdings, LLC.
- On June 6, 2006, the City Commission approved a future land use map designation of Medium Density Residential (MDR), however, this designation was challenged by residents of the City.
- In August 2009, the City reversed the prior land use and zoning approvals.
- Since 2012, the City updated and revised its comprehensive plan, future land use map, and zoning map.
- The subject property currently has a City adopted land use designation of Medium Density Residential (MDR) but no City adopted zoning designation.
- The subject property does not have any active code compliance cases.

The rezoning will correct the longstanding annexation error that did not provide a City zoning designation during the annexation process and will allow for the redevelopment of the vacant parcel. The property is proposed to be developed with sixteen (16) single-family houses; that proposed development is not part of the subject request and will be subject to administrative review through the building permit process. The proposed zoning designation is consistent with the underlying Future Land Use (FLU) designation and does not require a FLU amendment.

MDR has various ranges in how many dwelling units are allowed per acre. As this is not specified, this board cannot assume that MDR automatically means the highest of that range.

ANALYSIS

Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and Strategic Plan

The subject site has a Future Land Use (FLU) designation of Medium Density Residential (MDR). Per Policy 1.1.1.3, the MDR category is intended primarily to permit development of two-family and multi-family structures. Two-family structures are those that provide two principal dwelling units, each for occupancy by one family or household. Multi-family structures are those that contain three or more principal dwelling units, each for occupancy by one family or household. Implementing zoning districts are SF/TF-14, MF-20 and NC. Zoning regulations shall protect two-family and medium density multi-family residential areas from the encroachment of incompatible land uses. At the same time, provision may be made for a limited number of nonresidential uses that are compatible by reason of their nature and limited frequency of occurrence with an overall medium-density, multi-family residential character. Zoning regulations shall provide for compatible nonresidential uses either through special zoning districts that may be mapped in areas designated SF/TF-14, MF-20 or NC, or through conditional use permit provisions. Academic schools that are determined to be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood shall be a conditionally permitted use within this land use category.

MDR does not automatically equate to SF-TF-14. MDR can range from 5 to 20 units per acre. While Policy 1.1.1.3 does indicate that the MDR category is intended to primarily permit the development of two-family and multi-family structures and that implementing Sf-TF-14 can accomplish that, and this site and the current proposed development does not need that dense of zoning due to multiple reasonings. The elevation factor of this site alone brings into question several safety and environmental concerns that must be addressed especially where rezoning is involved.

Future development of multi-family structures in the medium- density residential category shall not exceed densities of 20 dwelling units per acre. Zoning regulations implementing this category shall set appropriate minimum lot area and lot width requirements and minimum site area per dwelling unit requirements.

Once again, the fact remains, MDR does not automatically equate to SF-TF-14. MDR can range from 5 to 20 units per acre.

Zoning regulations shall permit a variety of dwelling unit types in two-family and multi-family structures on lots that meet minimum lot size requirements for multi-family structures.

The City's Strategic Plan focuses on fostering safer neighborhoods, encouraging community pride, building a vibrant and diverse economy, planning for the future, and enhancing the natural, historic, and cultural environment of the City. Pillar II and Pilar IV of the Strategic Plan state that the City shall strengthen Lake Worth Beach as a community of neighborhoods and navigate towards a sustainable community. Pillars II.A, II.B, IV.A, and IV.E of the Strategic Plan state that the City shall diversify housing options, continue crime reduction and prevention in achieving a safe, livable and friendly community, achieve economic and financial sustainability through a versatile and stable tax base, and ensure facility placement, construction and development that anticipates and embraces the future. The proposed project will contribute towards the City's Pillars II.A, II.B, IV.A, and IV.E of the Strategic Plan.

The proposed zoning map amendment request is consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the City of Lake Worth Beach's Comprehensive Plan and Strategic Plan as it proposes a zoning district that aligns with the property's existing FLU designation and will enable redevelopment of a vacant property to provide additional housing in the City of Lake Worth Beach.

There is no argument with the above statement regarding the City's Strategi Plan. However, the **privately initiated zoning map** amendment request is not consistent with the current plan intended for the site. Perhaps for another location, but not for this purpose. There are unique land limitations specific to this site that are being side stepped in this analysis. The elevation and its environmental impact to the surrounding homes and communities must be taken into consideration. A simple example of this are the photos attached to this packet which only show pictures of the subject property from the center of the property, not from the edges where it would be obviously hovering over multiple other homes and units. Photos of the site from the neighboring properties looking at the property but from the far distance to minimize the height difference, etc.

Consistency with the City's Land Development Regulations

The zoning map amendment will assign a Single-Family and Two-Family Residential (SF-TF-14) zoning district designation. The property is adjacent to single-family uses to the north and multi-family uses to the east, west, and south. Full analysis of the rezoning review criteria is provided below. The analysis demonstrates that the proposed rezoning complies

with the review criteria and that the required findings can be made in support of the rezoning.

The **privately initiated zoning map** amendment request does NOT have to use the Single-Family and Two-Family Residential (SF-TF-14) zoning district designation. This is not the only option and quite frankly for this site it is excessive.

Section 23.2-36(3): Review Criteria for the Rezoning of Land

The Department of Community Sustainability is tasked in the Code to review rezoning applications for consistency with the findings for granting rezoning applications in LDR Section 23.2-36 and to provide a recommendation for whether the application should be approved, approved with conditions, or denied.

The land development regulations require all rezoning requests without a concurrent FLUM Amendment be analyzed for consistency with Section 23.2-36(3). Staff has reviewed the rezoning against this section and has determined that the rezoning complies with the following review criteria:

a. Consistency. Whether the proposed rezoning amendment would be consistent with the purpose and intent of the applicable comprehensive plan policies, redevelopment plans, and land development regulations. Approvals of a request to rezone to a planned zoning district may include limitations or requirements imposed on the master plan in order to maintain such consistency.

Analysis: The zoning map amendment request furthers the implementation of the City's Comprehensive Plan with the proposed adoption of a zoning district that is consistent with the Medium Density Residential (MDR) Future Land Use (FLU) designation on the subject site. Meets Criterion.

The **privately initiated zoning map** amendment request does NOT have to use the Single-Family and Two-Family Residential (SF-TF-14) zoning district designation. This is not the only option and quite frankly for this site it is excessive. Therefore, although the staff has determined that this request meets criterion, it is not the only option that would also meet criterion.

b. Land use pattern. Whether the proposed rezoning amendment would be contrary to the established land use pattern, or would create an isolated zoning district unrelated to adjacent and nearby classifications, or would constitute a grant of special privilege to an individual property owner as contrasted with the protection of the public welfare. This factor is not intended to exclude rezoning that would result in more desirable and sustainable growth for the community.

Analysis: The zoning map amendment request will not be contrary or incompatible to the established land pattern, nor will it create an isolated zoning district unrelated to the adjacent and nearby classifications or constitute a grant of special privilege to the petitioner as contrasted with the protection of the public welfare. Below is a table outlining the existing zoning and future land use designations of adjacent properties. Meets Criterion.

The **privately initiated zoning map** amendment request does NOT have to use the Single-Family and Two-Family Residential (SF-TF-14) zoning district designation. This is not the only option and quite frankly for this site it is excessive. Therefore, although the staff has determined that this request meets criterion, it is not the only option that would also meet criterion.

Direction	Future Land Use Designation	Zoning District	Existing Use
North	Unincorporated Palm Beach County	Unincorporated Palm Beach County	Single-family residential
South	Medium Density Residential	Medium Density Multi-Family Residential (MF-30)	Multi-family residential
East	Medium Density Residential and High Density Residential	Medium Density Multi-Family Residential (MF-30)	Multi-family residential
West	Medium Density Residential	Medium Density Multi-Family Residential (MF-30)	Multi-family residential

c. Sustainability: Whether the proposed rezoning would support the integration of a mix of land uses consistent with smart growth or sustainability initiatives, with an emphasis on 1) complementary land uses; 2) access to alternative modes of transportation; and 3) interconnectivity within the project and between adjacent properties.

Analysis: The zoning map amendment request supports the integration of residential use consistent with smart growth

and sustainability initiatives. In particular, approval of the request could lead to compatible land uses that could strengthen and direct development to the vacant property. This is a smart growth principle that will allow the City to benefit from a stronger tax base, will increase efficiency of already-developed land, and will add to the redevelopment potential in the area. The uses immediately surrounding the property are primarily single-family residential and multi-family residential. Approval of the zoning map amendment will allow for land uses that are complementary to the existing residential uses surrounding the property. Meets Criterion.

The **privately initiated zoning map** amendment request does NOT have to use the Single-Family and Two-Family Residential (SF-TF-14) zoning district designation. This is not the

only option and quite frankly for this site it is excessive. Therefore, although the staff has determined that this request meets criterion, it is not the only option that would also meet criterion.

d. Availability of public services/infrastructure: Requests for rezoning to planned zoning districts shall be subject to review pursuant to section 23.5-2.

Analysis: This criterion is only applicable to requests to rezone land to a planned zoning district. As this request seeks approval to rezone the subject properties to a conventional zoning district and not a planned development district, this criterion does not apply.

Criterion not applicable.

Criterion not applicable.

e. Compatibility: The application shall consider the following compatibility factors: 1. Whether the proposed rezoning would be compatible with the current and future use of adjacent and nearby properties, or would negatively affect the property values of adjacent and nearby properties. 2. Whether the proposed rezoning is of a scale which is reasonably related to the needs of the neighborhood and the city as a whole.

Analysis: The proposed rezoning will reflect existing single-family and multi-family residential uses in the area, and reflects the mix of single-family, medium density, and high-density residential Future Land Use designations in the surrounding area. The lack of an official zoning designation of the subject property is not consistent with the adopted future land use. Assigning a zoning district designation to the subject site will increase compatibility with the adoption of a zoning district that is intended to implement the vision of the Medium Density Residential (MDR) FLU designation.

As such, the rezoning is compatible with the current uses and is not anticipated to negatively affect property values.

Meets Criterion.

The **privately initiated zoning map** amendment request does NOT have to use the Single-Family and Two-Family Residential (SF-TF-14) zoning district designation. This is not the only option and quite frankly for this site it is excessive. Therefore, although the staff has determined that this request meets criterion, it is not the only option that would also meet criterion. Additionally, many factors that the neighboring residents have voiced concern over are indeed items of concern that can and will decrease property values.

f. Direct community sustainability and economic development benefits: For rezoning involving rezoning to a planned zoning district, the review shall consider the economic benefits of the proposed amendment, specifically, whether the proposal would:

1. Further implementation of the city's economic development (CED) program;
2. Contribute to the enhancement and diversification of the city's tax base;
3. Respond to the current market demand or community needs or provide services or retail choices not locally available;
4. Create new employment opportunities for the residents, with pay at or above the county average hourly wage;
5. Represent innovative methods/technologies, especially those promoting sustainability;
6. Support more efficient and sustainable use of land resources in furtherance of overall community health, safety and general welfare;
7. Be complementary to existing uses, thus fostering synergy effects; and
8. Alleviate blight/economic obsolescence of the subject area.

Analysis: The rezoning request does not include rezoning to a planned zoning district. As such, this criterion is not applicable. Criterion not applicable.

Criterion not applicable.

g. Economic development impact determination for conventional zoning districts. For rezoning to a conventional zoning district, the review shall consider whether the proposal would further the economic development program, and also determine whether the proposal would:

1. Represent a potential decrease in the possible intensity of development, given the uses permitted in the proposed land use category; and
2. Represent a potential decrease in the number of uses with high probable economic development benefits.

Analysis: The proposed zoning designation as SF-TF-14 will further the economic development program, and will not represent a decrease in the possible intensity of development or number of uses with high probable economic development benefits. The site currently cannot be developed, as it does not have a zoning designation; therefore, providing a City zoning designation to the parcel will allow for and increase the potential for development on the site.

Meets Criterion.

The **privately initiated zoning map** amendment request does NOT have to use the Single-Family and Two-Family Residential (SF-TF-14) zoning district designation. This is not the only option and quite frankly for this site it is excessive. Therefore, although the staff has determined that this request meets criterion, it is not the only option that would also meet criterion.

h. Master plan and site plan compliance with land development regulations. When master plan and site plan review are required pursuant to section 2.D.1.e. above, both shall comply with the requirements of the respective zoning district regulations of article III and the site development standards of section 23.2-32.

Analysis: A master plan and site plan are not part of this request. Criterion not applicable.

Criterion not applicable.

The analysis has shown that the required findings can be made in support of the rezoning. Therefore, the proposed rezoning is consistent with the review criteria for rezoning as outlined in LDR Section 23.2-36.

The staff's findings have been limited to only reviewing the option of SF-TF-14 without any other option. A vote on this without proper research into other options available for the safety and concern of the neighboring residents could be considered negligent. The board is reminded that in many sections of this report, the staff has referred to the "proposed rezoning" or the "zoning map amendment" but it is a **privately initiated zoning map** amendment request which may have alternative agendas considering that it far exceeds the current proposed development that has been submitted to the city.

CONCLUSION

The proposed rezoning is consistent with the purpose, intent, and requirements of the Comprehensive Plan and LDRs.

Therefore, staff recommends that the Board recommend approval to the City Commission for the Zoning Map amendment based on the data and analysis in this report and the findings summarized below:

- The Zoning Map amendment is consistent with the existing FLU;
- The amendment corrects a longstanding error and provide the site with a City of Lake Worth Beach zoning district; And
- The proposed amendment is supported by and consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and City Strategic Plan.

Conditions of Approval:

Electric Utilities

1. If the developer is going to request primary power lines in the alley between the houses and the west of property, a 10' easement will be required.

Public Works

1. Contact Public Works Solid Waste and Recycling Division and meet with a representative to agree on garbage bin storage location and screening, garbage bin pickup location, and number of bins required. Solid Waste and Recycling can be contacted by email at solidwasteinfo@lakeworthbeachfl.gov . The agreed upon refuse location and enclosure (if applicable) shall be depicted on the site plan.

2. Prior to issuance of a building permit, a location shall be designated on the site plan for the storage of refuse carts and/or dumpsters on non-collection days. Plans shall also indicate how the refuse carts/dumpsters will be screened from public view on non-collection days.

3. Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, the dumpster enclosure design shall meet the specifications of the Public Works Dept for size, type, and material.

These are all additional items of concern of the neighboring residents. Large trash vehicles maneuvering around an elevated piece of property, picking up debris, trash cans and waste materials. Even in flat areas, trash frequently does not all make in into the trash removal vehicle, imagine the amount of flying debris landing below.

BOARD POTENTIAL MOTION:

I MOVE TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL of Ordinance 2025-16 for the proposed Zoning Map amendment based on the data and analysis in the staff report and the testimony at the public hearing.

I MOVE TO NOT RECOMMEND APPROVAL of Ordinance 2025-16 for the proposed Zoning Map amendment. The proposal does not meet the applicable criteria for the following reasons [Board member please state reasons.]

Consequent Action: The Planning and Zoning Board will forward a recommendation to the City Commission.

From: [Susan Herr](#)
To: [Sherie Coale](#); [Planning and Zoning](#)
Subject: Sunset Property Zoning. Please share with all zoning board members before the October 15, 2025 meeting
Date: Tuesday, October 14, 2025 1:30:50 AM

Caution: *This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments from unknown or unverified sources.*

October 13, 2025

Dear Lake Worth Zoning Board Members,

As residents of Murry Hills, we strongly oppose development of the property at 826 Sunset (Smith Property) in what essentially is our backyard. We reside at: 3120 Cynthia Lane #101 Lake Worth, Florida 33461. The Smith property is directly behind our unit. Any development on that higher elevation property, especially if it is a high density development combined with 2 story units will affect our privacy, lifestyle and living environment as we know it now, in a negative manner.

If the development cannot be stopped, we request the development be limited to SFR zoning and only one story residences be built to lessen the impact on our property. We believe any development at 826 Sunset will strongly affect the value of our property in a negative way. The privacy & quietness we enjoy now in our unit and on our rear patio will be threatened with residential development on the Smith property. The resale value of our unit will be negatively compromised if the Smith Property Project moves forward. How will we be compensated for this loss? We ask you please do not approve higher density zoning SF/TF14 on this property which would only amplify all of the concerns/issues.

There are concerns regarding the structural integrity of the current boundary wall and associated soil content if stressed by the physical pressure of homes on the opposite side of the wall as well as issues with water runoff. Will the developer secure a bond for the upcoming wall issues if the proposed development moves forward?

How will the developer mitigate the noise and privacy issues to those of us living immediately on the other side of the wall? Also, the increased traffic issues associated with increased housing development will not be welcome.

Please do not approve higher density zoning SF/TF14 on this property which would only magnify all of the above stated concerns.

Thank you for your attention in reading this.

Susan Herr

John Herr

Susan & John Herr
3120 Cynthia Lane
Unit #101
Lake Worth, Florida 33461

From: [Joan Kunes](#)
To: [Planning and Zoning](#)
Subject: Sunset Property
Date: Sunday, October 12, 2025 7:14:58 PM

Caution: *This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments from unknown or unverified sources.*

I'm writing this to express concerns and opposition to the Sunset property in Lake Worth Beach.

I have lived in Murry Hills, which is adjacent to this property and believe the development of more than single-family homes would be detrimental to this area. I'm sure you've heard of all the concerns so I will not express them in detail, but they would include removal of trees and vegetation, soil, erosion, wall integrity to protect Murry Hills homeowners, traffic in that neighborhood and safety of access in and out.

Thank you for understanding the concerns of all of the neighbors we want the value of their homes to remain high as possible.

Paul and Joan Kunes
3280 Lake Osborne Dr.
#205
Lake Worth Beach FL

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

From: [Cocast](#)
To: [Planning and Zoning](#)
Subject: Sunset Development Project
Date: Saturday, October 11, 2025 9:21:18 AM

Caution: *This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments from unknown or unverified sources.*

Dear Lake Worth Commissioners, Mayor, and Vice Mayor,

First of all, thank you for your service.

I have lived in Murry Hills since 1999 when I married my husband Albert. I expect to be here until I pass away. I saw it as a well kept, happy community. I am now 83 and very happy to live here.

Every morning I participate in the water aerobics class for my old sciatic back. I look up at that beautiful Smith Property and its huge, elegant trees, and also see how close that little retaining wall between us is to our POOL and buildings 18 and 19--a stone's throw. We already have issues with water runoff from that property.

Changing the zoning on that property could mean the DESTRUCTION of the POOL and Buildings 18 and 19 and affect the 513 owners in Murry Hills. PLEASE PROTECT US FROM THIS ZONING CHANGE, which would invite even further destruction. Nothing would stop a developer from making something even BIGGER. This developer have proven he is unwilling to BOND that eventuality. In addition to those major issues, there are others as well:

This will add SO MANY CARS to our already crowded streets - no traffic study has been done since COVID and 6th Ave. construction completion.

We keep fighting this zoning battle every few months. I believe that you know if you give an inch to the builder, he will wiggle a mile.

Please protect us. We need your help.

Carole Castonguay
2840 Lake Osborne Dr.
Apartment 103
Lake Worth Beach, FL 33461
cocast@aol.com

From: [A Lamb](#)
To: [Sherie Coale](#)
Cc: [Planning and Zoning](#)
Subject: Sunset Property Rezoning request
Date: Sunday, October 12, 2025 5:35:03 PM

Caution: *This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments from unknown or unverified sources.*

To Whom It May Concern:

I am an owner at Murry Hills Condominium. As you know, our property has many concerns about the possibility of allowing the Sunset Property to be rezoned for more houses than is currently allowed.

Here are some of my concerns:

The 4-acre site's only single ingress/egress is inadequate for the volume of traffic generated by so many units. This small property has an unusually high elevation unlike any other within the City of Lake Worth Beach. This creates an unsafe infrastructure that will negatively impact Murry Hills regarding water runoff and a retaining wall not built for the size of development currently proposed.

I am concerned about an increase in lighting pollution as well as traffic and noise. The small cul de sac is not equipped for development of the kind proposed. It will disrupt the lives of the surrounding single story homes as well as our condominium property.

I am concerned about the loss of majestic shade trees, and the destruction of an old, quiet neighborhood.

Lake Worth Beach will find its charm eroded along with infrastructure and quality of life.

Please take heed and do not allow Lake Worth Beach to be overrun by the greed of a developer that does not live here. I choose this town as a place to homestead specifically because of its commitment to remaining a unique Florida town, unlike any other.

Regards,
Laurie Lamb
3320 Lake Osborne Dr, #211
LWB 33461



DEPARTMENT FOR COMMUNITY SUSTAINABILITY
Planning Zoning Historic Preservation Division
1900 2ND Avenue North
Lake Worth Beach, FL 33461
561-586-1687

AFFECTED PARTY STATUS FORM FOR QUASI-
JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS

(Please Print)

CASE NUMBER/TOPIC: Planning and rezoning

Location/Address of Property: 826 Sunset drive

Name of Affected Party: Chad Ruhlander and Brittney Katz

Address: 2022 Collier Ave

Best Contact Phone Number(s)/email addresses: Chad: 561-291-4191 Brittney: 561-351-6082

Check one of the following: For the Petition ☒ Against the Petition ☐ Chadruh1014@gmail.com; Lune101499@gmail.com.

*Qualification as Affected Party - Describe below how you qualify for standing as an affected party in addition to property ownership within 400 feet of the property at issue:

We live within 400 feet of 826 Sunset drive and are directly impacted by this proposed rezoning. Adding 56 units would bring a lot more traffic, parking issues, noise and affect our overall quality of life. We also worried it could change the overall feel of our quiet neighborhood and put extra strain on local roads and services.

List Attached Documents/Exhibits: (Attach copies of documents/exhibits you intend to present)

Disclosure of Witnesses:

List below the names and addresses of witnesses or anyone who will be present to provide sworn testimony. If you are represented by an attorney, please provide the name, address and phone number of the attorney. (Attach an additional sheet if necessary.)

Name: _____ Address: _____ Phone Number: _____

Please estimate the time needed for your presentation: _____

The City, by resolution, limited presentations to no more than 10 minutes.

Signed by:  Date: 10/10/25

NOTE: Please complete this form and return by email or mail to pzoning@lakeworthbeachfl.gov or to the City of Lake Worth Beach, Community Sustainability Department, 1900 2nd Avenue North, Lake Worth Beach, FL 33461, no later than five (5) calendar days before the proceeding.

* Affected parties must have an interest greater than an interested party. §23.1-2, Code of Ordinances. Also see §23.2-16, Code of Ordinances, for additional information concerning quasi-judicial procedures and affected parties.

Received by: _____ Date and Time: _____

Signed by:  Date: 10/10/25

NOTE: Please complete this form and return by email or mail to pzoning@lakeworthbeachfl.gov or to the City of Lake Worth Beach, Community Sustainability Department, 1900 2nd Avenue North, Lake Worth Beach, FL 33461, no later than five (5) calendar days before the proceeding.

* Affected parties must have an interest greater than an interested party. §23.1-2, Code of Ordinances. Also see §23.2-16, Code of Ordinances, for additional information concerning quasi-judicial procedures and affected parties.

Received by: _____ Date and Time: _____

From: [Planning and Zoning](#)
To: ["kkss21"](#)
Cc: [Planning and Zoning](#); [Sarah Malega](#); [Scott Rodriguez](#); [Elizabeth Lenihan](#)
Subject: RE: 826 Sunset Drive
Date: Friday, October 10, 2025 11:10:00 AM
Attachments: [Quasi Judicial Proceeding Affected Party Form.pdf](#)

Good morning,

Thank you for your comment. If you wish to apply as an affected party, which is different from an interested party, please complete the attached form and return by noon today.

The section to discuss how you will be more "affected" or impacted than your neighbors in the immediate area (which is all those within the 400 foot radius) should be completed.

An affected party is different from an interested party. All property owners within the 400 foot radius who received a courtesy notice are interested parties. Property owners within the radius must demonstrate/explain how they would be more impacted than others within the same radius.

Should you choose to be an interested party only:

1. you may be present at the meeting to read your comment into the record, or
2. The Board Secretary will read your comment into the record, or
3. you may participate through Zoom accessed through the City website.

Please advise of your decision and choice.

Sincerely,

Sherie C Coale
Executive Secretary - Department for Community Sustainability

City of Lake Worth Beach
1900 2nd Ave North
Lake Worth Beach, FL 33461

V: 561-586-1687
V: 561-586-1633
scoale@lakeworthbeachfl.gov
www.lakeworthbeachfl.gov

"We are LAKE WORTH BEACH. A hometown City that is committed to delivering the highest level of customer service through a commitment to integrity, hard work and a friendly attitude. We strive to exceed the expectations of our citizens, our businesses, our elected officials and our fellow employees."

CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH E-MAIL DISCLAIMER:

PLEASE NOTE: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from local officials regarding city business are public records available to the public and media upon request. Your e-mail communications may therefore be subject to public disclosure.

-----Original Message-----

From: kkss21 <kkss21@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 9:02 PM
To: Planning and Zoning <Pzoning@lakeworthbeachfl.gov>

Subject: 826 Sunset Drive

Caution: This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments from unknown or unverified sources.

My name is Kathleen McGiveron. My address is 2121 Collier Avenue, Lake Worth Beach Fl. I am an affected party in this matter. My property is within 400 feet of 826 Sunset Drive. Please do not allow the proposed re-zoning on this property. The proposed zoning would allow up to 56 units or more to be built on this property. There is ONE way in and out of this property, straight into my neighborhood. The increase in traffic would create hazardous conditions for the entire Lake Osborne/6th Avenue South area. Numerous traffic fatalities have ALREADY occurred on the neighborhood streets that feed into 6th Avenue South west of I-95 and East of Congress Avenue. The property in Question lies above my property. Noise and privacy concerns will become very real with the proposed zoning. My home's property value lies in its lot size and in its being a true single family home. With the proposed development being able to build up to 56 units, my home's value is going to be drastically reduced after being averaged in with whatever small, packed in units end up on the property. Site plans are not worth the paper they are printed on. The property owner can offer the moon and stars, their signature in blood, their first born, whatever. And it doesn't mean a thing. IT'S ALL ABOUT THE ZONING. Period. As soon as the owner gets a zoning like the one being proposed, it's all over for the residents of the neighborhood. The property will immediately be flipped to the highest bidder.

From: [Catherine Cargill](#)
To: [Planning and Zoning](#); [Sherie Coale](#); [Melissa Coyne](#); [Betty Resch](#); [Christopher W. McVoy](#); [Sarah Malega](#); [Mimi May](#); segrich@lakeworthbeachfl.gov
Cc: [Catherine Cargill](#)
Subject: Smith Property Hearing October 15th
Date: Friday, October 10, 2025 12:12:01 PM

Caution: *This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments from unknown or unverified sources.*

Ladies and Gentlemen,

First of all, thank you for your service. I know you are all volunteers.

I moved to Murry Hills in 2015 to care for my parents, they are since gone and I'm staying. I love living in Lake Worth Beach and here at Murry Hills.

Every morning in the water aerobics class I look up at that beautiful Smith Property and its huge, elegant trees, and also see how close that little retaining wall between us is to our POOL and buildings 18 and 19--a stone's throw. We already have issues with water runoff from that property--it was built to hold back one small "farm."

Changing the zoning on that property will mean the DESTRUCTION of the POOL and Buildings 18 and 19 and affect the 517 owners in Murry Hills. PLEASE PROTECT US FROM THIS ZONING CHANGE, which would invite even further destruction. Nothing would stop a developer from making something even BIGGER. This developer have proven he is unwilling to BOND that eventuality. In addition to those major issues, there are others as well:

This would have a MAJOR impact on the quality of life here. We are ALL AFFECTED PARTIES!

There's only ONE ingress/egress - what if there's a fire?

This will add SO MANY CARS to our already crowded streets - no traffic study has been done since COVID and 6th Ave. construction completion.

Please protect us. We need your help.

Catherine Cargill
3320 Lake Osborne Drive
Apartment 102
Lake Worth Beach, FL 33461
cathcarg@gmail.com

From: [Celeste Palmowski](#)
To: [Planning and Zoning](#)
Cc: [Melissa Coyne](#)
Subject: Ordinance 2025-16
Date: Friday, October 10, 2025 2:16:01 PM

Caution: *This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments from unknown or unverified sources.*

We are writing this email in regards to the privately initiated Zoning Map Ammendment Ordinance 2025-16 to rezone to Single-Family and Two Family Residential SF-TF-14 at 826 Sunset Drive. We ask you to oppose this ammendment for the following reasons: 1. There is an established neighborhood around this area of only single family homes. 2. Saftey-

There is only one ingress/egress to this property.

3.Possible damage to the established Murry Hills Community retaining wall and drainage concerns.

native trees, plants and animals.

zone this SFR. Thank you.

Celeste and Jeff Deguzis

3360 Lake Osborne Dr #211 Lake Worth Beach

Residents of Lake Worth Beach for 11 years

Please distribute to all zoning board members and commissioners

From: [Kathleen Richard](#)
To: [Planning and Zoning](#)
Subject: Zoning of Sunrise Property
Date: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 3:47:25 PM

Caution: *This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments from unknown or unverified sources.*

To all Zoning Board Members:

As a resident of Murry Hills Condominium Association, I'm writing to express my concern regarding development of the Sunrise property. The Sunrise property would negatively impact our Murry Hills property by putting pressure on our already taxed retaining wall, create more traffic congestion, obscure our current views and encroach on our privacy. We are a large community with over 500 units so the impact will be felt by many. Please consider these factors before making any decisions that affect our quality of lives. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Kathleen E Richard
3200 Lake Osborne Drive Unit 203
(508)864-1446

PS: please distribute this email to all zoning board members.

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

From: [Melissa Coyne](#)
To: [Sherie Coale](#)
Cc: [benedict ives](#)
Subject: RE: 826 Sunset Drive PLEASE DISTRIBUTE TO ALL ZONING BOARD MEMBERS and COMMISSIONERS
Date: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 12:53:07 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Please see below.

Melissa Ann Coyne, MMC
City Clerk | Office of the City Clerk
Vice President | PBCMCA



City of Lake Worth Beach
7 N. Dixie Hwy.
Lake Worth Beach, FL 33460
V: 561-586-1659
mcoyne@lakeworthbeachfl.gov
www.lakeworthbeachfl.gov
<https://lakeworthbeachfl.gov/social-media/>

City Operating Hours

Monday – Friday 8:00 am – 5:00 pm

“We are LAKE WORTH BEACH. A hometown City that is committed to delivering the highest level of customer service through a commitment to integrity, hard work and a friendly attitude. We strive to exceed the expectations of our citizens, our businesses, our elected officials and our fellow employees.”

CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH E-MAIL DISCLAIMER:

PLEASE NOTE: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from local officials regarding city business are public records available to the public and media upon request. Your e-mail communications may therefore be subject to public disclosure.

“Whether you think you can or think you can’t...you’re right.”

From: benedict ives <benedictives@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 11:58 AM
To: Planning and Zoning <Pzoning@lakeworthbeachfl.gov>
Subject: Re: 826 Sunset Drive PLEASE DISTRIBUTE TO ALL ZONING BOARD MEMBERS and COMMISSIONERS

Caution: *This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments from unknown or unverified sources.*

This is to advise you of our extreme concern regarding the above-referenced upcoming zoning issue at 826 Sunset Dr. . As a retired Murry Hills owner and year-round resident, I urgently request that you **seek** the **absolute *minimal* development** in this four-acre parcel. With only **one ingress/egress point** updated traffic studies for Lake Osborne Drive and surrounding area must be a consideration. Our **greatest liability and fear of catastrophe** lays in the potential **water drainage impact on the 50-year-old retaining wall** which was **NOT DESIGNED** to withstand the currently unknown run off from densely packed homes.

While the right and need to develop this parcel intelligently is certainly understandable, we residents of Murry Hills are horrified at how **detrimental to our community** this may be. All things can be achieved with proper **balance and consideration**. We ask your **wisdom** and **fairness** to prevail in this matter.

Thanks for listening,

Benedict Ives
2840 Lake Osborne Drive #211
LWB FL 33461
561.707.2255

Planning and Zoning Board
City of Lake Worth Beach

October 6, 2025

I am a resident of Murry Hills. I and my 500 plus neighbors are long-standing Lake Worth Beach taxpayers, utility users and patrons of our community's many stores, restaurants and amenities.

I am concerned about the future development proposal for the 826 Sunset Property.

They are proposing to build approximately 16 -24 single family homes. The SR zoning would be sufficient for this development yet they are seeking SF/TF14 zoning.

SF/TF14 Zoning would give the developers the capability of a much denser development than this 4 acre limited access property would be suited for.

Please keep the Sunset property to as limited a zoning so that minimal single family home development occurs.

In addition, if this property is developed, the planning/zoning needs to oversee the assurance that the current retaining wall is bonded for protection/integrity as part of the developers requirements. Any development has the potential to cause significant soil shifting and erosion and is surrounded on 3 sides by a community of condos that has peacefully lived here for 50+ years.

Murry Hills residents have been good neighbors and taxpayers of Lake Worth Beach for three generations. We love our city and appreciate the quality leadership of our city staff and elected officials who have preserved the unique atmosphere and character of Lake Worth Beach.

For the sake of community preservation, we strongly urge the city to confine the Sunset Property development to as minimal development as possible.

Respectfully,

Jane L. Schumacher
Murry Hills Condo
3402 Cynthia Lane, Unit 201
Lake Worth Beach, FL 33461

Lake Worth Beach Board of Commissioners,

Murry Hills was developed and built in the late 1960 and early 1970. The developer SCG is asking the zoning committee to zone the property SF-7F14 which would then allow him to build more homes than 16 in his current site plan. This new construction will adversely affect the residents of Murry Hills with noise, dust and low air quality being of concern.

This also brings other concerns to the table. The first being the wall that divides the property and Murry Hill. This wall is 8-20 feet high throughout Murry Hills and is made of concrete blocks with a stucco finish. The developer states that the wall is ours to maintain which puts all the expense on the residents of Murry Hills. This expense would include hiring an engineer to inspect the wall and any expense related to damage or repairs due from construction. Set back from the walls needs to be more feet than his site plan currently shows. Heavy vehicles driving around, that could put additional pressure on the wall. With the removal of trees and vegetation this could further weaken the walls.

Drainage is another concern. The developer has stated he will use catch basins for runoff drainage. If there is a large rainfall, the runoff could flood the condos near the wall as well as our maintenance shop. About 8 or 10 years ago, we got 20" of rain and there was water at least 6" deep running down the streets with no buildings. Can you imagine that in our condos and the expense it would cost to fix the damage from standing water?

Zoning the property SF-7 for single family homes would be a better option as it would be sufficient to suit his current suggested site plan, but SF-TF-14 would allow much more than he is requesting. The surrounding area is single family homes, why do we need homes 15-25' higher height than nearby homes. I hope the zoning commission has their thinking hats on and not looking for more tax dollars for the city. This should be zoned SF-7.

Roland D Rentfrow
Owner-President of Murry Hills

From: [Kendra's Tropical Gifts](#)
To: [Planning and Zoning](#); [Henry Pawski](#)
Subject: Re: Sunset Property
Date: Thursday, September 25, 2025 6:40:33 PM

Caution: *This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments from unknown or unverified sources.*

I am a condo owner at Murry Hills and don't want home building on the Sunset property due to the probability of flooding of Murry Hills and additional traffic on Lake Osborne Drive. If homes are built it should be at the lower density. If the homes are built closer to Sunset Drive the woodsy area bordering Murry Hills could be left intact and have eco friendly trails added for the home owners and not affect Murry Hills. Thank you for the opportunity to give my opinion about the Sunset property.

Rhonda Ragen
Building #6 #111
kendrastrropicalgifts@aol.com

Please Distribute to all Zoning Board members. Thank you

Affected Party Response to 826 Sunset Development Project Zoning

Department for Community Sustainability, Planning and Zoning Division
1900 2nd Avenue North
Lake Worth, Florida 33461

Submitted By

Raymond and Susan Ludwig
Murry Hills
3402 Cynthia Lane
Lake Worth Beach, FL 33461
Building 23, Unit 110

Good evening,

We have owned our condo in Building 23 (3402 Cynthia Lane) in Murry Hills since February of 2001. We recently made an additional investment in our condo and have no plans for selling. We have been coming to Lake Worth since 1970, when my grandfather retired and bought a home on E Street, in which Ray's brother now resides.

Although we have many concerns that we are certain other residents will address, the fact that we are directly adjacent to the property separated by a 50-year-old retaining wall and downhill from the Project, drainage, integrity of the retaining wall and noise pollution are major concerns.

Note my condo's proximity to Sunset on the attached picture. 3402 Cynthia Lane

The previous use of the Sunset property was a small farm. This site is only 4.1 acres with one access point. The retaining walls construction was not intended to support the construction and retention of higher density housing. The retaining wall was not intended for the increased traffic movement this project would create. We are somewhat confused as to what density the owner is requesting when I hear the request for 16 single family homes (SFR) coupled with SF/TF-14 zoning. The SF/TR-14 would support additional density and two-family residences on the site. The increased water movement coupled with the loss of green space, replaced with macadam, to support 16 single family homes, or more, will be devastating to the retaining wall and downhill residents.

We understand we have asked the developer for an engineering study on the wall. This was denied by the developer. This makes me question the integrity of other projects he has managed. This study must be done. SF/TF14 zoning should not be allowed on this parcel. Even a proposal of 16 homes under a SFR zoning seems too dense for that site.

Is the wall adequate?

An adequate construction bond to support a potential wall failure must be required by the appropriate authority if this project moves forward.

We are on the first floor of Building 23, and Sunset property is already more than one story over my condo given the downhill grade. I have had water issues in the past on my back porch with heavy rain. We are currently spending money to replace my porch enclosure. We get a nice late evening sun on my back porch which may be in jeopardy pending home placements along the property line.

Currently, we have a peaceful neighborhood, and the pool is situated in a quiet private location on the property. This tranquility ends with this project. Many years of blowing dirt, run-off and construction noise will occur if Sunset moves forward. Murry Hills residents should not suffer this inconvenience of noise and light pollution. We are an Over 55 Community and every year counts in our retirements.

As animal lovers, we also ask the animals living on the property are relocated safely and humanely. I saw four cats consistently who can be domesticated by a rescue.

Thank you for your time and we urge you to recommend, at a minimum, not allowing SF/TF14 zoning on this Sunset parcel.

Raymond and Susan Ludwig

Owners, Murry Hills 23-110

From: [Gene Nyffeler](#)
To: [Sherie Coale](#); [Planning and Zoning](#)
Subject: Proposed rezoning of Sunset Property
Date: Sunday, October 12, 2025 8:25:07 PM

Caution: *This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments from unknown or unverified sources.*

To all Lake Worth Beach zoning board members:

My name is Gene Nyffeler. I own condo #110 at 3080 Lake Osborne Drive, Lake Worth Beach, in Murry Hills. I am very concerned about the rezoning request made by the Sunset Property (826 Sunset, Smith property). There are numerous reasons that this rezoning is inappropriate, unsound and unsafe.

- The single ingress/egress to the property is inadequate for the volume of traffic that will be generated.
- The retaining wall bordering Murry Hills is old and not built to handle properties above it.
- The elevation of the property which is much higher than Murry Hills will generate water runoff that has not been accommodated for in the wall bordering Murry Hills making it a safety hazard for residents of Murry Hills
- The location of the property significantly above Murry Hills will have a big impact on the residents in Murry Hills who border that property as their privacy and security will be greatly impacted.
- The property which will have more dwellings, more people, and more cars will completely change the landscape of the entire area and create more noise, more congestion, and many more environmental issues

I ask that my email and all comments I have made regarding this issue be shared with all zoning members.

Thank you for your careful consideration of this issue and its impact on our community at Murry Hills.

Gene Nyffeler

From: [Eugene Sengstacken](#)
To: [Planning and Zoning](#)
Subject: Lake worth Beach Zoning changes
Date: Monday, October 13, 2025 3:48:28 PM

Caution: *This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments from unknown or unverified sources.*

Eugene Sengstacken
2960 Cynthia Lane #210
Lake Worth Beach, Florida 33461

Board Members,

After reviewing the proposals brought forth, the question still remains why disrupt single family housing zoning in well established areas already. If further plans for the community can be performed with current zoning why open unnecessary loopholes that will inevitably be used. These zoning changes are not the wishes of the current residents so why would you vote to negatively impact your neighbors and friends?

Please take time to review the potential pitfalls that this zoning change could create. I would like to think that Lake Worth Beach is a friendly community where we are all looking out for each other and the family atmosphere we have created. Thank You for your time in this matter.

Sincerely,
Gene Sengstacken

From: [Kaye Nyffeler](#)
To: [Sherie Coale](#); [Planning and Zoning](#)
Subject: Rezoning request for Sunset Property
Date: Sunday, October 12, 2025 8:33:04 PM

Caution: *This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments from unknown or unverified sources.*

To all Lake Worth Beach zoning board members:

My name is Kaye Nyffeler. I own condo #101 at 2880 Lake Osborne Drive, Lake Worth Beach, in Murry Hills. I am very concerned about the rezoning request made by the Sunset Property (826 Sunset, Smith property). There are numerous reasons that this rezoning is inappropriate, unsound and unsafe.

- The single ingress/egress to the property is inadequate for the volume of traffic that will be generated.
- The retaining wall bordering Murry Hills is old and not built to handle properties above it.
- The elevation of the property which is much higher than Murry Hills will generate water runoff that has not been accommodated for in the wall bordering Murry Hills making it a safety hazard for residents of Murry Hills
- The location of the property significantly above Murry Hills will have a big impact on the residents in Murry Hills who border that property as their privacy and security will be greatly impacted.
- The property which will have more dwellings, more people, and more cars will completely change the landscape of the entire area and create more noise, more congestion, and many more environmental issues.

I ask that my email and all comments I have made regarding this issue be shared with all zoning members.

Thank you for your careful consideration of this issue and its impact on our community at Murry Hills.

Kaye Nyffeler

From: [janmseng \(null\)](#)
To: [Planning and Zoning](#)
Subject: 826 Sunset Development Rezoning Proposal
Date: Monday, October 13, 2025 5:45:25 PM

Caution: This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments from unknown or unverified sources.

I ask that my email be shared with all planning/zoning board members.

I cannot understand why the Lake Worth Beach Planning and Zoning Board would want to destroy our neighborhood by rezoning the Sunset property. The surrounding residents have previously voiced their strong opposition to this and there is no reason to rezone this property to SF-TF-14.

A change in zoning would negatively impact the established neighborhood of mostly one story single family homes and the Murry Hills Over 55 Community.

My Murry Hills community would be subject to :

1. Increased traffic with only ONE entrance for egress/ingress.
2. Water drainage/runoff from the elevation of the property (already an issue that would be exacerbated) as some Murry Hills buildings are just a few feet from the retaining wall of the property.

Murry Hills and surrounding homes take pride in our community and treasure our quality of life - this proposed change would decrease the value of our homes with lack of privacy and allowing our beautiful neighborhood to become another over-developed crowded housing project.

We have previously protested against this proposed zoning change and made very clear that we are against it. Why is this proposal being re-evaluated yet again ? WHY?

Jan Sengstacken
3280 Cynthia Lane
#101
Lake Worth Beach Florida, FL 33461
Sent from my iPad

From: [Eugene Sengstacken](#)
To: [Planning and Zoning](#)
Subject: Lake worth Beach Zoning changes
Date: Monday, October 13, 2025 3:48:28 PM

Caution: *This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments from unknown or unverified sources.*

Eugene Sengstacken
2960 Cynthia Lane #210
Lake Worth Beach, Florida 33461

Board Members,

After reviewing the proposals brought forth, the question still remains why disrupt single family housing zoning in well established areas already. If further plans for the community can be performed with current zoning why open unnecessary loopholes that will inevitably be used. These zoning changes are not the wishes of the current residents so why would you vote to negatively impact your neighbors and friends?

Please take time to review the potential pitfalls that this zoning change could create. I would like to think that Lake Worth Beach is a friendly community where we are all looking out for each other and the family atmosphere we have created. Thank You for your time in this matter.

Sincerely,
Gene Sengstacken

October, 13, 2025

OPPOSITION TO THE PROPOSED ZONING CHANGE AT 826 SUNSET DRIVE

PLEASE SHARE THESE COMMENTS WITH ALL THE ZONING BOARD MEMBERS

My husband and I, Phill and Carol Michalski, own the property at 3360 Lake Osborne Drive, Apt 111. We spend many of the Fall and Winter months there.

We have attended almost all of the sessions regarding this property and quite frankly, can't believe it has come up again. There is a lot of concern for the limited infrastructure to handle a high density development. The integrity of the retaining wall and the costs associated with failure of this wall would be astronomical. The height differential of the property and the surrounding properties would make water run-off an issue. As we all know our storms are getting bigger the associated increase of run-off could be catastrophic. The one ingress/egress that is associated with this property would create traffic issues for the neighboring block with narrow streets.

If there is really sincere interest in developing a reasonable single family development, then there is no need for a zoning charge. This feels like a backdoor avenue for a developer to get the change and go to the high density proposal he started with.

Please vote to deny this zoning change

 
Carol Michalski Phillip Michalski

3360 Lake Osborne Drive, Apt 111

Lake Worth, Beach, Fl. 33461

From: [Robert Reising](#)
To: [Sherie Coale](#)
Subject: SUNSET PROPERTY REZONING
Date: Sunday, October 12, 2025 7:58:04 PM

Caution: This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments from unknown or unverified sources.

I would like the zoning commission to be aware of special circumstances surrounding this property and how it affects Murry Hills Condominiums. We are substantially lower than this property and runoff from too many residences would surely cause a problem for our decades old retaining wall. Furthermore, with one road in traffic will be an even bigger headache for residences that surround this area.

Single family zoning should be maintained for this property. It is far too small to stack multiple residences in there. There is old growth woods there that we enjoy viewing. Lake Worth Beach is a special place and you should consider the opinions of the existing populace and not just deep-pocketed developers.

Sincerely,
Robert and Kyla Reising
3240 LakeOsborne Dr #105
Lake Worth Beach, FL
(630)258-3796
Sent from my iPad

OPPOISITION TO 826 SUNSET REZONING BEFORE CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH

ZONING is a PRIVELEGE NOT A RIGHT. The Sunset Development keeps coming before your boards & commissions in different forms and packages. They all have one thing in common. The Developer is creating ways of saying he wants MORE DENSITY.

For 45 years I have spent my professional career as a Municipal Attorney. What must be balanced is the desire to allow greater density on a small 4 acre parcel VS the greater good of the Neighborhood and the City.

This one way in development is clearly NOT good for the already built neighborhood. This small parcel is seeking to maximize housing units for economic gain despite the hundreds of citizens that are opposed. The issues are many, ranging from single access, safety with single access, high point on the hill and the water/erosion problem, elevation disparities between neighboring properties, and the potential Spot Zoning issues as to future density.

Thank you for your consideration,

Thomas G. Voss Audrey A. Voss

3280 Cynthia Lane #103

Lake Worth Beach, FL 33461

From: [Gretchen Feero](#)
To: [Sherie Coale](#); [Planning and Zoning](#)
Subject: Ordinance 2025-16 (PZB 25-01300002)
Date: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 12:21:44 PM

Caution: *This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments from unknown or unverified sources.*

**PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING DURING THE COMMENT PERIOD AT TONIGHT'S
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING**

Gretchen Feero
3280 Lake Osborne Drive
Lake Worth Beach, FL 33461

I ask that you kindly consider the impact to the surrounding existing residents - especially the residents of Murry Hills Condominiums. I'm a resident of Murry Hills and I'm extremely concerned about the proposed change in zoning that you as the Planning and Zoning Board are about to address.

We understand growing cities need to allow for healthy development and it seems apparent that this parcel of land will eventually be built upon. We are concerned that SF-TF-14 is extreme and excessive and implore the PZB to consider limiting the zoning to match the residential zoning found in the surrounding neighborhoods.

Please consider the following issues:

The small land-locked parcel - only 4.1 acres

Limited ingress and egress - 1 entrance - impact on safety and traffic flow

A 50 year old 20' tall retaining wall that was designed to maintain a single family farmette - may be compromised during construction

It is the highest spot of land in the area- with a 30 foot difference between Murry Hills Condos and the top of Sunset Property

Even at our pre development stage the water runoff has been a big issue for Murry Hills

Old growth trees are important to the environment and maintaining soil stability

Quality of life and the home values for existing neighbors will be negatively impacted

This is clearly an example of Spot Zoning, especially if SF/ST 14 is approved

We appreciate your volunteer efforts and interest in our community. Please listen to the people you represent and direct the zoning to a more reasonable zoning maximum that limits this project to no more than 16 homes total.

Thank you,
Gretchen W Feero
3280 Lake Osborne Dr
Lake Worth Beach FL 33461

Gretchen Feero
gwf.silver@gmail.com

From: [Yvonne Harmon](#)
To: [Sherie Coale](#)
Subject: Sunset Drive Rezoning
Date: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 10:31:18 AM

Caution: *This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments from unknown or unverified sources.*

To Whom it concerns:

Over the past couple years, my husband and I have attended several Lake Worth board meetings to express our deep concern about the future of the Sunset property. I am disappointed that the board rulings haven't put the major issues to rest and we once again are showing up to express our concerns about the property, specifically the current request to rezone which could ultimately result in future requests for higher density development than the area can responsibly support.

My specific concerns center around the nuanced characteristics of this particular 4.1 acre property. It is not located in an open area where multiple ingress/egress approaches are possible to insure safety both in traffic flow on an everyday basis and particularly in emergency situations. Thus, a single ingress/egress not only affects the (future) residents of the property, but also existing residents of surrounding adjacent properties in a negative and dangerous manner.

The elevation of this property in relation to the surrounding area is also a deep concern. There is an aging retaining wall that holds the elevated soils from sliding onto the Murry Hills site, not to mention water retention and other soil/elevation issues. Should development on the site not be carefully and responsibly managed, this wall, with the drainage and significant disruption pressure will not continue to provide the retention it has for five decades.

Though the current request for rezoning this property hasn't yet stated actual plans to later request higher density development, approving SF-TF-14 at this time does allow for that possibility in the future. The current zoning class of this property is not excessive in density for future development, making the need to rezone unnecessary.

As a resident of the Lake Osborne Community, I welcome the idea of residential homes being built on the property, if the number and placement of these structures and associated infrastructures are responsibly managed. The unique attributes of this property including the elevation, the resource of its old growth trees, the impact on surrounding long time residents, safety of the neighborhood all need to be managed to continue to live together in accord in this cherished community. We hope decisions made will contribute to continued quality of life in the Lake Osborne/Sunset Hills neighborhoods of Lake Worth Beach.

Please do not approve the rezoning of this Sunset Hills 4.1 acre property to SF-TF-14.

.

Yvonne Harmon
2840 Lake Osborne Drive #203
Lake Worth Beach, FL 33461