## AGENDA <br> CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH <br> REGULAR CITY COMMISSION MEETING (REVISION \#2) <br> CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBER TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2023-6:00 PM

## ROLL CALL:

INVOCATION OR MOMENT OF SILENCE: led by Commissioner Reinaldo Diaz
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: led by Mayor Betty Resch

## AGENDA - Additions / Deletions / Reordering:

PRESENTATIONS: (there is no public comment on Presentation items)
A. Presentation by Rhonda Giger, General Counsel for the PBC Commission on Ethics
B. Proclamation declaring February 2023 as Black History Month
C. Proclamation declaring February 2023 as Anti-racism Month
D. Proclamation declaring February 10-17, 2023 as 2-1-1 Help Line Awareness Week

COMMISSION LIAISON REPORTS AND COMMENTS:
CITY MANAGER'S REPORT:

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION OF NON-AGENDAED ITEMS AND CONSENT AGENDA:

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A. Pre-agenda Work Session - January 11, 2023
B. Regular Meeting - January 17, 2023
C. Special Meeting - January 24, 2023
D. Pre-agenda Work Session - January 25, 2023

CONSENT AGENDA: (public comment allowed during Public Participation of Non-Agendaed items)
A. Resolution No. 02-2023 - Documenting the levy of municipal special assessment liens for unpaid lot clearing charges
B. Resolution No. 03-2023 - Documenting the levy of municipal special assessment liens for unpaid boarding and securing charges
C. Proposed settlement of Civil Rights lawsuit with Craig Kersh, Roy Kersh, Michael Fields, and J.R. Soares
D. Proposed Settlement of Pending Personal Injury Litigation with Roberta Jackson
E. Resolution No. 04-2023 - Urging members of the Florida Legislature to support the 2023 Florida League of Cities Legislative Platform brought forward by Commissioner Malega

## PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. Ordinance No. 2022-17 - First Reading - Approval of a Residential Urban Planned Development, Major Site Plan, Conditional Use Permit (CUP), and Sustainable Bonus Incentive Program (SBIP) requests for the project commonly referred to as "Residences at Lake Worth," to construct three (3) mid-rise residential structures that are 5-stories in height with a total of 195 dwelling units

## UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

A. Selection of final redistricting map
B. Mobile Home Park Solid Waste \& Recycling Rate Modification

## CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT:

## UPCOMING MEETINGS AND WORK SESSIONS:

February 8 - Pre-agenda Work Session @ 9 AM
February 9-Special @ 5 PM
February 21 - Regular @ 6 PM

## ADJOURNMENT:

The City Commission has adopted Rules of Decorum for Citizen Participation (See Resolution No. 812022). The Rules of Decorum are posted within the City Hall Chambers, City Hall Conference Room, posted online at: https://lakeworthbeachfl.gov/government/virtual-meetings/, and available through the City Clerk's office. Compliance with the Rules of Decorum is expected and appreciated.

If a person decides to appeal any decision made by the board, agency or commission with respect to any matter considered at such meeting or hearing, he or she will need a record of the proceedings, and that, for such purpose, he or she may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based. (F.S. 286.0105)

MINUTES
CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH CITY COMMISSION PRE-AGENDA WORK SESSION CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBER WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 11, 2023-9:00 AM

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Resch on the above date at 9:05 AM in the City Commission Chamber located at City Hall, 7 North Dixie Highway, Lake Worth Beach, Florida.

ROLL CALL: (0:37) Present were Mayor Betty Resch; Vice Mayor Christopher McVoy, Commissioners Kimberly Stokes and Reinaldo Diaz (arrived at 9:05 AM). Also present were City Manager Carmen Davis, City Attorney Glen Torcivia, and City Clerk Melissa Ann Coyne. Commissioner Sarah Malega was absent.

## UPDATES / FUTURE ACTION / DIRECTION:

Action: Consensus to have a work session on affordable/fair housing. (13:49)
Action: Consensus for code compliance to hold off on citing artificial turf violations until a work session would be held on the landscaping issue. (43:45)

ADJOURNMENT: (1:01:29)
The meeting adjourned at 10:06 AM.

Betty Resch, Mayor
ATTEST:


Melissa Ann Coyne, City Clerk
Minutes Approved: February 7, 2023

Item time stamps correspond to the recording of the meeting on YouTube.

# MINUTES <br> CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH REGULAR CITY COMMISSION MEETING CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBER TUESDAY, JANUARY 17, 2023 - 6:00 PM 

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Resch on the above date at 6:03 PM in the City Commission Chamber located at City Hall, 7 North Dixie Highway, Lake Worth Beach, Florida.

ROLL CALL: (0:35) Present were Mayor Betty Resch, Vice Mayor Christopher McVoy, Commissioners Sarah Malega, Kimberly Stokes and Reinaldo Diaz, Also present were City Manager Carmen Davis, City Attorney Glen Torcivia and City Clerk Melissa Ann Coyne.

INVOCATION OR MOMENT OF SILENCE: (0:55) was led by Vice Mayor Christopher McVoy.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: (2:05) was led by Commissioner Reinaldo Diaz.

## ADDITIONS/DELETIONS/REORDERING: (2:25)

Presentation B, presentation regarding the history of The Osborne Community was added and previous Presentations B and C were reordered to C and D. Consent Agenda C, Proclamation declaring January 16, 2023 as Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Day, Unfinished Business A, Update of 6th Avenue South Substation Property Exchange, and New Business E, Resolution No. 012023 - establishing an official signatory for all bank related functions, were added to the agenda.

Action: Motion made by Commissioner Malega and seconded by Vice Mayor McVoy to approve the agenda as amended.

Vote: Voice vote showed: AYES: Mayor Resch, Vice Mayor McVoy, and Commissioners Malega, Stokes and Diaz. NAYS: None.

PRESENTATIONS: (4:23) (there is no public comment on Presentation items)
A. Presentation by the Tree Board by Ginny Powell, Vice Chair (4:25)
B. (added) Presentation regarding the history of The Osborne Community by Ted Brownstein and Steve Lockwood of the Historical Society of Lake Worth (17:27)
C. (reordered) PBSO Community Policing Update by Capt. Todd Baer (37:58)
D. (reordered) Quarterly CRA Update by Joan Oliva, CRA Director (52:34)

COMMISSION LIAISON REPORTS AND COMMENTS: (1:06:01)

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT: (1:15:04)
City Manager Davis provided the following report:

- attended last week's Tree Board meeting

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION OF NON-AGENDAED ITEMS AND CONSENT AGENDA: (1:15:41)

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES: (1:34:56)

Action: Motion made by Vice Mayor McVoy and seconded by Commissioner Malega to approve the following minutes:
A. Regular Meeting - January 3, 2023

Vote: Voice vote showed: AYES: Mayor Resch, Vice Mayor McVoy, and Commissioners Malega, Stokes and Diaz. NAYS: None.

CONSENT AGENDA: (1:35:04)
Action: Motion made by Commissioner Stokes and seconded by Commissioner Diaz to approve the Consent Agenda.
A. Community Development Block Grant Project Agreement Amendment 001 for Memorial Park Improvements Phase I
B. Community Development Block Grant Project Agreement Amendment 001 for Memorial Park Improvements Phase II
C. (added) Proclamation declaring January 16, 2023 as Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Day

Vote: Voice vote showed: AYES: Mayor Resch, Vice Mayor McVoy, and Commissioners Malega, Stokes and Diaz. NAYS: None.

The meeting recessed at 7:38 PM and reconvened at 7:48 PM.
PUBLIC HEARINGS: (1:45:33)
A. Ordinance 2022-15 - First Reading (continued) Consideration of an Urban Planned Development, Major Site Plan, Conditional Use Permit (CUP), and Sustainable Bonus Incentive Program (SBIP) requests for the project commonly referred to as "Lake Worth Station" located at 930 N G Street to construct a 4 to 5 -story, 91 dwelling unit multi-family development with 39 multi-family units proposed to qualify as workforce housing (1:45:35)

City Attorney Torcivia read the ordinance by title only.
ORDINANCE NO. 2022-15 AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH, FLORIDA, AMENDING THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP BY APPROVING THE CREATION OF AN URBAN PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT, LOCATED AT 930 NORTH G STREE TO CONSTRUCT

AN APPROXIMATELY 5-STORY, 91-UNIT MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN EXHIBIT A, LOCATED WITHIN THE TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT - EAST (TOD-E) ZONING DISTRICT WITH A FUTURE LAND USE DESIGNATION OF TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT (TOD) SUBJECT TO SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS SET FORTH IN EXHIBIT B AND CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL SET FORTH IN EXHIBIT C; APPROVING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT; APPROVING HEIGHT AND DENSITY BONUS INCENTIVES THROUGH THE CITY'S SUSTAINABLE BONUS INCENTIVE PROGRAM; APPROVING A MAJOR SITE PLAN FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A MIXED USE URBAN PLANNED DEVELOPMENT; PROVIDED FOR SEVERABILITY, CONFLICTS AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE

Action: Motion made by Commissioner Malega and seconded by Commissioner Stokes to approve Ordinance 2022-15 with conditions on first reading, setting the second reading and public hearing for February 21, 2023.

Vote: Voice vote showed: AYES: Mayor Resch, Vice Mayor McVoy, and Commissioners Malega, Stokes and Diaz. NAYS: None.
B. Ordinance No. 2023-01 - Second Reading - Adopting amendments to Chapter 7 "Beaches, Parks and Recreation" to provide for Regulation of Launching and Landing of Aircraft (2:43:009)

City Attorney Torcivia read the ordinance by title only.
ORDINANCE NO. 2023-01 -- AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH, FLORIDA, AMENDING CHAPTER 7 BEACHES, PARKS AND RECREATION, ARTICLE I PARKS, RECREATIONAL FACILITIES AND PUBLIC PROPERTY, ADOPTING A NEW SECTION 7-13 AIRCRAFT; PROVIDING FOR REGULATION OF LAUNCHING AND LANDING OF AIRCRAFT; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY, THE REPEAL OF ALL CONFLICTING ORDINANCES, CODIFICATION AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE

Action: Motion made by Commissioner Diaz and seconded by Vice Mayor McVoy to approve Ordinance 2023-01 adopting amendments to Chapter 7 "Beaches, Parks and Recreation" to provide for Regulation of Launching and Landing of Aircraft.

Vote: Voice vote showed: AYES: Mayor Resch, Vice Mayor McVoy, and Commissioners Malega, Stokes and Diaz. NAYS: None.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: (2:52:331)
A. (added) Update of 6th Avenue South Substation Property Exchange

Action: Consensus to proceed with advertising the item and bringing it forward to a future meeting.
NEW BUSINESS: (3:00:05)
A. Northwest Ballfield Athletic Facility Field Light Replacements (3:00:08)

Action: Motion made by Commissioner Stokes and seconded by Commissioner Diaz to approve the Northwest Ballfield Athletic Facility Field Light Replacements

Vote: Voice vote showed: AYES: Mayor Resch, Vice Mayor McVoy, and Commissioners Malega, Stokes and Diaz. NAYS: None.
B. Work Order \#10 with The Paving Lady for paving and concrete work on Wellesley and Princeton Drives (3:02:02)

Action: Motion made by Commissioner Stokes and seconded by Commissioner Malega to approve Work Order \#10 with The Paving Lady for paving and concrete work on Wellesley and Princeton Drives.

Vote: Voice vote showed: AYES: Mayor Resch, Vice Mayor McVoy, and Commissioners Malega, Stokes and Diaz. NAYS: None.
C. Discussion of Mobile Food Vending/Food Trucks Policy for the City of Lake Worth Beach (3:03:38)

Action: Consensus to move the item forward.
Action: Motion made by Vice Mayor McVoy and seconded by Commissioner Malega to extend the meeting until 11:00 PM.

Vote: Voice vote showed: AYES: Mayor Resch, Vice Mayor McVoy, and Commissioners Malega, Stokes and Diaz. NAYS: None.
D. WGI Task Order No. 34 - Preparation of a Mobility Plan for the City of Lake Worth Beach (3:46:32)

Action: Motion made by Commissioner Stokes and seconded by Vice Mayor McVoy to approve WGI Task Order No. 34, preparation of a Mobility Plan for the City of Lake Worth Beach.

Vote: Voice vote showed: AYES: Mayor Resch, Vice Mayor McVoy, and Commissioners Malega, Stokes and Diaz. NAYS: None.
E. (added) Resolution No. 01-2023 - establishing an official signatory for all bank related functions (4:12:15)

The City Attorney did not read the resolution.
RESOLUTION NO. 01-2023 OF THE CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH, FLORIDA, APPROVING AUTHORIZED SIGNATORIES FOR ALL DISBURSEMENTS, TRANSFERS, AND WITHDRAWAL OF FUNDS FROM CITY ACCOUNTS; AND PROVIDING FOR CONFLICTS AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE

Action: Motion made by Vice Mayor McVoy and seconded by Commissioner Malega to approve Resolution No. 01-2023 - establishing an official signatory for all bank related functions.

Vote: Voice vote showed: AYES: Mayor Resch, Vice Mayor McVoy, and Commissioners Malega, Stokes and Diaz. NAYS: None.

## CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT:

City Attorney Torcivia did not provide a report.

## UPCOMING MEETINGS AND WORK SESSIONS:

January 24 - Special Meeting @ 5 PM
January 25- pre-agenda work session @ 9 AM
January 26 - Mayor's State of the City @ 6:30 PM (Casino Ballroom) January 31 - Utility @ 6 PM

ADJOURNMENT: (4:15:12)
Action: Motion made by Vice Mayor McVoy and seconded by Commissioner Stokes to adjourn the meeting at 10:18 PM.

Vote: Voice vote showed: AYES: Mayor Resch, Vice Mayor McVoy, and Commissioners Malega, Stokes and Diaz. NAYS: None.

## ATTEST:



Melissa Ann Coyne, City Clerk
Minutes approved February 7, 2023.
Item time stamps correspond to the video recordings of the meetings on YouTube.

## MINUTES

CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH SPECIAL CITY COMMISSION MEETING - L \& M PROPERTIES CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBER TUESDAY, JANUARY 24, 2023-5:00 PM

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Resch on the above date at 5:02 PM in the City Commission Chamber located at City Hall, 7 North Dixie Highway, Lake Worth Beach, Florida.

ROLL CALL: ( $0: 19$ ) Present were Mayor Betty Resch; Vice Mayor Christopher McVoy and Commissioners Sarah Malega, Kimberly Stokes and Reinaldo Diaz (via Zoom). Also present were City Manager Carmen Davis, City Attorney Christy L. Goddeau and Deputy City Clerk Shayla Ellis.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: (0:34) led by Commissioner Sarah Malega.
Action: Consensus to have Mayor Resch draft a letter to the Palm Beach County School Board in opposition to the proposed redistricting of the boundaries for Lake Worth Community High School students. (01:04)

NEW BUSINESS: (04:14)
A. Presentation of the of Final Draft of the Downtown Master Plan by the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC)

Action: Motion made by Vice Mayor McVoy and seconded Commissioner Malega to approve city staff in partnership with CRA staff in developing the parameters of a solicitation based upon the recommendations in the proposal from the Final Master Plan from the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council and to present those findings to the Commission by the end of March for review and to proceed with the previously recommend demolition of the following properties: 30 S L Street, 32 S L Street, 25 S K Street, $7041^{\text {st }}$ Avenue, $7101^{\text {st }}$ Avenue S.

Vote: Voice vote showed: AYES: Mayor Resch, Vice Mayor McVoy, and Commissioners Malega, Stokes and Diaz. NAYS: None.

## ADJOURNMENT: $(2: 27: 36)$

Action: Motion made by Commissioner Malega and seconded by Commissioner Stokes to adjourn the meeting at 7:30 PM.

Vote: Voice vote showed: AYES: Mayor Resch, Vice Mayor McVoy, and Commissioners Stokes and Diaz. NAYS: None.

Betty Resch, Mayor

ATTEST:

Melissa Ann Coyne, City Clerk
Minutes approved February 7, 2023.
Item time stamps refer to the recording of the meeting which is available on YouTube.


## MINUTES

CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH
CITY COMMISSION PRE-AGENDA WORK SESSION
CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBER
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 25, 2023-9:00 AM
The meeting was called to order by Mayor Resch on the above date at 9:02 AM in the City Commission Chamber located at City Hall, 7 North Dixie Highway, Lake Worth Beach, Florida.

ROLL CALL: (0:13) Present were Mayor Betty Resch; Vice Mayor Christopher McVoy, Commissioners Sarah Malega and Kimberly Stokes. Also present were City Manager Carmen Davis and Deputy City Clerk Shayla Ellis. Commissioner Reinaldo Diaz was absent.

## UPDATES / FUTURE ACTION / DIRECTION:

Commissioner Malega left the meeting at 9:21 AM.
Mayor Resch left the meeting at 9:27 AM.
ADJOURNMENT: (25:00)


The meeting ended at 09:27 AM due to the lack of quorum.


# STAFF REPORT REGULAR MEETING 

AGENDA DATE: February 7, 2023
DEPARTMENT: Community Sustainability

## TITLE:

Resolution No. 02-2023 - Documenting the levy of municipal special assessment liens for unpaid lot clearing charges

## SUMMARY:

This Resolution documents the assessment of the costs incurred by the City for lot clearing services and the levy of such costs as special assessment liens against the properties identified in the Resolution.

## BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION:

Pursuant to the provisions of sections 12-38 through 12-42 of the Code of Ordinances (the "Lot Clearing Ordinance"), the owners of certain parcels of real property were notified of the existence of debris, vegetation, tree or other matter thereon which were determined to create a hazard declared to be a public nuisance and a violation of the City's Lot Clearing Ordinance. Certain owners failed to abate such nuisances and the City or its contractor, in accordance with the procedures set forth in the Lot Clearing Ordinance, have abated said nuisances by clearing the offending lots. In accordance with section 1242, the costs incurred by the City to abate said nuisances were assessed against each property as a special assessment lien at the time services were provided. The list of properties assessed for unpaid lot clearing charges, along with the associated administrative costs, total $\$ 10,910.95$ and are attached to Resolution No. 02-2023 as Exhibit "A". If not paid, these liens may be foreclosed by the City or they may be certified to the tax collector for collection pursuant to the uniform method provided in section 197.3632, Florida Statues.

Attached is the proposed resolution documenting the levy of the special assessments for unpaid lot clearing charges including a spreadsheet of addresses, services provided and costs.

## MOTION:

Move to approve/disapprove Resolution No. 02-2023, documenting the levy of municipal special assessment liens for unpaid lot clearing charges.

## ATTACHMENT(S):

Resolution. 02-2023

> RESOLUTION NO. 02-2023 OF THE CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH, FLORIDA, DOCUMENTING THE ASSESSMENT OF THE COSTS INCURRED BY THE CITY PURSUANT TO SECTION $12-42$ OF THE CITY CODE OF ORDINANCES FOR THE ABATEMENT OF CERTAIN NUISANCES (LOT CLEARING) WITHIN THE CITY; LEVYING LIENS ON SAID PROPERTIES IDENTIFIED HEREIN; PROVIDING FOR THE RECORDING OF THIS RESOLUTION IN THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA; PROVIDING A SEVERABILITY CLAUSE, AN EFFECTIVE DATE AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

WHEREAS, the City of Lake Worth Beach, Florida has, pursuant to sections 1238 through 12-42 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Lake worth beach, Florida, as amended, found and determined that the condition of certain properties or parcels of land as hereinafter described violated section 12-38 of said Code by reason of the existence of debris, vegetation, tree, or other matter thereon and thereby created a hazard declared to be a public nuisance; and

WHEREAS, the respective owners of the parcels of property hereinafter described were duly notified of the existence of the aforesaid nuisances on their properties and were required to abate the nuisances; and

WHEREAS, said owners have, after being duly notified by a Notice of Violation, failed to bring their property into code compliance; and

WHEREAS, the lots have been cleared of debris, vegetation, tree or other public nuisance thereon by the City or its contractor at a cost to the City as set forth below; and

WHEREAS, it is recommended that in accordance with section 12-42 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Lake Worth Beach, the costs incurred to abate said nuisances, which are assessed against the respective properties as special assessment liens, be hereby documented and recorded against the properties in the Public Records of the Palm Beach County, Florida.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH, FLORIDA, that:

Section 1. The foregoing recitals are hereby ratified and confirmed as being true and correct and are hereby made a specific part of this resolution.

Section 2. Legislative Determinations. It is hereby ascertained and declared that the lot clearing on the properties listed in Exhibit "A" (attached hereto and incorporated herein) provided a special benefit to each parcel assessed, based upon the following
legislative determinations:
(A) It is hereby ascertained, determined, and declared that each assessed parcel has benefitted by the City's provision of lot clearing services in an amount not less than the amount of the lot clearing services costs imposed against each parcel.
(B) It is fair and reasonable to assess the lot clearing services costs in the amounts actually expended by the City to benefit each assessed parcel.

Section 3. In accordance with sec. 12-42 of the Code of Ordinances, at the time services were provided, all costs incurred by the City in the abatement of nuisances on the following parcels of land, along with an administrative fee, were levied and assessed against said properties as municipal special assessment liens on the properties identified and in the amounts indicated on the attached "Exhibit A". To each of the aforesaid lien amounts shall be added the cost to reimburse the City to record each lien in the Public Records of Palm Beach County, Florida. The City Commission is hereby documenting such special assessment liens through this resolution.

Section 4. Said liens shall be prior in dignity to all other liens, encumbrances, titles and claims against the property and equal in rank and dignity with ad valorem taxes and shall remain on such property until paid. A failure to pay any such lien, even a lien upon homesteaded property, may result in a loss of title to property.

Section 5. Said special assessment liens shall bear interest from the date of adoption of this resolution at the legal rate until fully paid.

Section 6. The City Clerk is hereby directed to record a certified copy of this resolution in the Public Records of Palm Beach County, Florida. The failure to record a certified copy of this resolution shall not affect the validity of any special assessment.

Section 7. The Finance Department is hereby directed to mail a copy of this resolution to the owners of the parcels of land levied hereby at the last known address of such owner.

Section 8. Such assessment liens, together with interest, administrative fees costs, and reasonable attorneys' fees shall be enforced and collected, and may be foreclosed, pursuant to the Code of Ordinances of the City of Lake Worth Beach and applicable provisions of law. Such assessment liens, if they remain unpaid, may also be collected pursuant to the uniform method set forth in sec. 197.3632, Fla. Stat. or through any other remedy available at law or in equity.

Section 9. All resolutions or parts of resolutions in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Section 10. If any provision of this resolution or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications
of this resolution which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application and to this end the provisions of this resolution are declared severable.

Section 11. This resolution shall take effect upon adoption.
The passage of this resolution was moved by Commissioner $\qquad$ , seconded by Commissioner $\qquad$ , and upon being put to a vote, the vote was as follows:

Mayor Betty Resch
Vice Mayor Christopher McVoy
Commissioner Sarah Malega
Commissioner Kim Stokes
Commissioner Reinaldo Diaz
The Mayor thereupon declared this resolution duly passed and adopted on this day of February, 2023.

# LAKE WORTH BEACH CITY COMMISSION 

By:
Betty Resch, Mayor

## ATTEST:

Melissa Ann Coyne, City Clerk

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CASE \# | OWNER | MAILING ADDRESS | MAILING CITY/STATE | PCN | LEGAL DESCRIPTION | PROPERTY ADDRESS | Invoice Amount |
| 21-2689 | DEALE WILLIAM R \& WILLIAMS ICON HOMES PROPERTIES | 1616 CAMERON LANDING DR | STOCKBRIDGE GA 30281 6863 | 38-43-44-21-15-082-0312 | TOWN OF LAKE WORTH W 45 FT OF LTS 31 \& 32 BLK 82 | 1006 3RD AVE N | \$245.00 |
| 22-0248 | JOHNSON BRUCE | 412 S B ST | LAKE WORTH BEACH FL | 38-43-44-21-15-137-0061 | TOWN OF LAKE WORTH N 25 FT OF LT 6 BLK 137 | 412 S B ST | \$501.17 |
| 22-339 | MAESEL SHAWN R | 105 E PALMETTO PARK RD | BOCA RATON FL 33432 | 38-43-44-21-15-118-0091 | TOWN OF LAKE WORTH N 1/2 OF LT 9 \& LT 10 BLK 118 | 420 N H ST | \$477.75 |
| 22-556 | MEZUZA LLC | PO BOX 6532 | $\underset{6532}{\text { DELRAY BEACH FL } 33482}$ | 38-43-44-27-01-045-0160 | ADD 1 TO TOWN OF LAKE WORTH LT 16 BLK 45 | 1131 S L ST | \$844.86 |
| 22-581 | BUYERS INVESTMENT GROUP LTD INC | 6717 STONECREEK ST | GREENACRES FL 334133408 | 38-43-44-15-07-000-8740 | COLLEGE PARK ADD 1 LTS 8748875 E OF FED HWY | 1902 N FEDERAL HWY | \$604.35 |
| 22-0534 | BARRIOS CARLOS | 2520 IDA WAY | WEST PALM BEACH FL 33415 | 38-43-44-27-01-026-0040 | ADD 1 TOWN OF LAKE WORTH LT 4 BLK 26 | 920 S J ST | \$600.72 |
| 22-0535 | BARRIOS CARLOS | 2520 IDA WAY | $\underset{33415}{\text { WEST PALM BEACH FL }}$ | 38-43-44-27-01-026-0051 | LAKE WORTH TOWN OF ADD 1, (LESS E 42.7 FT ) BLK 26 | 912 S J ST | \$563.72 |
| 22-0536 | BARRIOS CARLOS | 2520 IDA WAY | $\underset{33415}{\text { WEST PALM BEACH FL }}$ | 38-43-44-27-01-026-0052 | LAKE WORTH TOWN OF ADD 1,E 42.7 FT OF LTS 5 \& 6 BLK 26 | 914 S J ST | \$329.72 |
| 22-0677 | APPRECIATE CHARITY INC | 700 S DIXIE HWY | LAKE WORTH BEACH FL 33460 | 38-43-44-21-15-223-0090 | TOWN OF LAKE WORTH LT 9 (LESS E 2025 FT \& NELY TRGLR PAR US NO 1R/W) BLK 223 | 700 S DIXE HWY | \$462.00 |
| 22-1055 | buyers investment GROUP LTD INC | 6717 STONECREEK ST | GREENACRES FL 334133408 | 38-43-44-15-07-000-8740 | COLLEGE PARK ADD 1 LTS 874 \&875 E OF FED HWY | 1902 N FEDERAL HWY | \$318.50 |
| 22-0972 | MEZUZA LLC | PO BOX 6532 | DELRAY BEACH FL 33482 | 38-43-44-27-01-045-0160 | ADD 1 TO TOWN OF LAKE WORTH LT 16 BLK 45 | 1131 S L ST | \$464.00 |
| 22-1903 | MEZUZA LLC | PO BOX 6532 | $\underset{6532}{\text { DELRAY BEACH FL } 33482}$ | 38-43-44-27-01-045-0160 | ADD 1 TO TOWN OF LAKE WORTH LT 16 BLK 45 | 1131 S L ST | \$4,570.00 |
| 22-1925 | PIMIENTA JUAN C | 939 KEYSTONE WAY | LAKE WORTH FL 334634278 | 38-43-44-21-15-281-0120 | TOWN OF LAKE WORTH LT 12 BLK 281 | 1015 S G ST | \$929.16 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | total | \$10,910.95 |

# STAFF REPORT REGULAR MEETING 

AGENDA DATE: February 7, 2023
DEPARTMENT: Community Sustainability

## TITLE:

Resolution No. 03-2023 - Documenting the levy of municipal special assessment liens for unpaid boarding and securing charges

## SUMMARY:

This resolution documents the assessment of the costs incurred by the City for boarding and securing services and the levy of such costs as special assessment liens against the properties identified in the resolution.

## BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION:

Pursuant to the provisions of sections 2-75.2 through 2-75.2.7 of the Code of Ordinances (the "Board and Secure Ordinance"), the owners of certain parcels of real property were notified of the existence of a structure that allows access to its interior which is not boarded or secured and that does not have a certificate of boarding which were determined to create a hazard declared to be a public nuisance and a violation of the City's Board and Secure Ordinance. Certain owners failed to abate such nuisances and the City or its contractor, in accordance with the procedures set forth in the Board and Secure Ordinance, have abated said nuisances by boarding and securing the structure. In accordance with section 2-75.2.7, the costs incurred by the City to abate said nuisances were assessed against each property as a special assessment lien at the time services were provided. The list of properties assessed for unpaid boarding and securing charges, along with the associated administrative costs, total $\$ \mathbf{\$ 4 , 6 9 0 . 0 0}$ and are attached to Resolution No. 03-2023 as Exhibit "A". If not paid, these liens may be foreclosed by the City or they may be certified to the tax collector for collection pursuant to the uniform method provided in section 197.3632, Florida Statues.

Attached is the proposed resolution documenting the levy of the special assessments for unpaid boarding and securing charges including a spreadsheet of addresses, services and charges

## MOTION:

Move to approve/disapprove Resolution No. 03-2023, documenting the levy of municipal special assessment liens for unpaid boarding and securing charges.

## ATTACHMENT(S):

Resolution No. 03-2023
Exhibit "A"

RESOLUTION NO. 03-2023 OF THE CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH, FLORIDA, DOCUMENTING THE ASSESSMENT OF THE COSTS INCURRED BY THE CITY PURSUANT TO SECTION 2-75.2.7 OF THE CITY CODE OF ORDINANCES FOR THE ABATEMENT OF CERTAIN NUISANCES (BOARDING AND SECURING) WITHIN THE CITY; LEVYING LIENS ON SAID PROPERTIES IDENTIFIED HEREIN; PROVIDING FOR THE RECORDING OF THIS RESOLUTION IN THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA; PROVIDING A SEVERABILITY CLAUSE, AN EFFECTIVE DATE AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

WHEREAS, the City of Lake Worth Beach, Florida has, pursuant to sections 275.2 through 2-75.2.7 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Lake Worth Beach, Florida, as amended, found and determined that the condition of certain properties or parcels of land as hereinafter described violated section 2-75.2.2(a) of said Code by reason of the existence of a structure that allows access to its interior and which is not boarded and secured or a structure that is boarded and secured but does not have a certificate of boarding which thereby has created a hazard declared to be a public nuisance; and

WHEREAS, the respective owners of the parcels of property hereinafter described were duly notified of the existence of the aforesaid nuisances on their properties and were required to abate the nuisances; and

WHEREAS, said owners have, after being duly notified by a Notice of Violation, failed to bring their property into code compliance; and

WHEREAS, the structures have been boarded and secured by the City or its contractor at a cost to the City as set forth below; and

WHEREAS, it is recommended that in accordance with section 2-75.2.7 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Lake Worth Beach, the costs incurred to abate said nuisances, which are assessed against the respective properties as special assessment liens, be hereby documented and recorded against the properties in the Public Records of the Palm Beach County, Florida.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH, FLORIDA, that:

Section 1. The foregoing recitals are hereby ratified and confirmed as being true and correct and are hereby made a specific part of this resolution.

Section 2. Legislative Determinations. It is hereby ascertained and declared that the boarding and securing of the structures on the properties listed in Exhibit "A" (attached hereto and incorporated herein) provided a special benefit to each parcel assessed, based upon the following legislative determinations:
(A) It is hereby ascertained, determined, and declared that each assessed parcel has benefitted by the City's provision of boarding and securing services in an amount not less than the amount of the boarding and securing services costs imposed against each parcel.
(B) It is fair and reasonable to assess the boarding and securing services costs in the amounts actually expended by the City to benefit each assessed parcel.

Section 3. In accordance with sec. 2-75.2.7 of the Code of Ordinances, at the time services were provided, all costs incurred by the City in the abatement of nuisances on the following parcels of land, along with an administrative fee, were levied and assessed against said properties as municipal special assessment liens on the properties identified and in the amounts indicated on the attached "Exhibit A". To each of the aforesaid lien amounts shall be added the cost to reimburse the City to record each lien in the Public Records of Palm Beach County, Florida. The City Commission is hereby documenting such special assessment liens through this resolution.

Section 4. Said liens shall be prior in dignity to all other liens, encumbrances, titles and claims against the property and equal in rank and dignity with ad valorem taxes and shall remain on such property until paid. A failure to pay any such lien, even a lien upon homesteaded property, may result in a loss of title to property.

Section 5. Said liens shall bear interest from the date of adoption of this resolution at the legal rate until fully paid.

Section 6. The City Clerk is hereby directed to record a certified copy of this resolution in the Public Records of Palm Beach County, Florida. The failure to record a certified copy of this resolution shall not affect the validity of any special assessment.

Section 7. The Finance Department is hereby directed to mail a copy of this resolution to the owners of the parcels of land levied hereby at the last known address of such owner.

Section 8. Such assessment liens, together with interest, administrative fees costs, and reasonable attorneys' fees shall be enforced and collected, and may be foreclosed, pursuant to the Code of Ordinances of the City of Lake Worth Beach and applicable provisions of law. Such assessment liens, if they remain unpaid, may also be collected pursuant to the uniform method set forth in sec. 197.3632, Fla. Stat. or through any other remedy available at law or in equity.

Section 9. All resolutions or parts of resolutions in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Section 10. If any provision of this resolution or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications
of this resolution which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application and to this end the provisions of this resolution are declared severable.

Section 11. This resolution shall take effect upon adoption.
The passage of this resolution was moved by Commissioner $\qquad$ , seconded by Commissioner $\qquad$ , and upon being put to a vote, the vote was as follows:

Mayor Betty Resch
Vice Mayor Christopher McVoy
Commissioner Sarah Malega
Commissioner Kim Stokes
Commissioner Reinaldo Diaz
The Mayor thereupon declared this resolution duly passed and adopted on this
$\qquad$ day of February, 2023.

LAKE WORTH BEACH CITY COMMISSION

By:
Betty Resch, Mayor
ATTEST:

Melissa Ann Coyne, City Clerk

## BOARD AND SECURE EXHIBIT A

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CASE \# | OWNER | MAILING ADDRESS | MAILING CITY/STATE | PCN | LEGAL DESCRIPTION | PROPERTY ADDRESS |
| 21-2714 | INVOICE <br> AMOUNT |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22-1057 | STEPP ROGER L SR <br> EST | 412 S B ST | LAKE WORTH BEACH FL <br> 33460 | $38-43-44-21-15-137-0061$ | TOWN OF LAKE WORTH N 25 FT <br> OF LT 6 BLK 137 | 412 S B ST |
|  |  |  |  |  | \$425.00 |  |

# STAFF REPORT REGULAR MEETING 

AGENDA DATE: February 7, 2023
DEPARTMENT: City Attorney

## TITLE:

Proposed settlement of Civil Rights lawsuit with Craig Kersh, Roy Kersh, Michael Fields, and J.R. Soares

## SUMMARY:

This is a request to settle a Civil Rights lawsuit filed by Craig Kersh, Roy Kersh, Michael Fields, and J.R. Soares in the USDC Southern District of Florida, Case No. 9:22-cv-80951, on June 29, 2022, for alleged violation of their First Amendment Rights. If approved, a general release will be executed in favor of the city.

## BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION:

On June 29, 2022, the City was sued by Craig Kersh, Roy Kersh, Michael Fields, and J.R. Soares, in USDC Southern District of Florida, Case No. 9:22-cv-80951. The lawsuit alleged that their First Amendment Rights were violated by being arrested multiple times for panhandling.
Both Federal and Florida Courts have consistently been striking down these types of ordinances as unconstitutional. The resolution of this case is for less than it would cost the City to continue litigating. Outside counsel (Ben Bedard) and the City Attorney (Glen Torcivia) attended mediation and recommend approving this $\$ 75,000$ settlement.
The settlement payment(s) fall within your deductible/ self-insured retention and will be issued by our office. As the settlement and costs currently are not in excess of your $\$ 100 \mathrm{k}$ retention, the insurance portion of your policy will not be applied.

## MOTION:

Move to approve/disapprove settlement with Craig Kersh, Roy Kersh, Michael Fields, and J.R. Soares for $\$ 75,000$ (inclusive of attorney's fees and costs).

## ATTACHMENT(S):

Fiscal Impact Analysis

## FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

Five Year Summary of Fiscal Impact:

| Fiscal Years | $\mathbf{2 0 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 7}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Inflows |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Program Income | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\quad$ Grants | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| In Kind | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Outflows |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operating <br> Capital | $\$ 75,000$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Fiscal Impact | $(\$ 75,000)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of Addn'l Full-Time <br> Employee Positions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| New Appropriation Fiscal Impact: |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Revenue Source | Expenditure |
| Department |  |  |
| Division |  |  |
| GL Description |  |  |
| GL Account Number |  |  |
| Project Number |  |  |
| Requested Funds |  |  |


| Budget Transfer Impact |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Revenue Source | Expenditure |
| Department |  |  |
| Division |  |  |
| GL Description |  |  |
| GL Account Number |  |  |
| Project Number |  |  |
| Requested Funds |  |  |


| Contract Award - Existing Appropriation |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Expenditure |
| Department |  |
| Division |  |
| GL Description | Self-Insurance Fund |
| GL Account Number | $520-1331-513.45-60$ |
| Project Number |  |
| Requested Funds |  |

# STAFF REPORT REGULAR MEETING 

AGENDA DATE: February 7, 2023
DEPARTMENT: City Attorney

## TITLE:

Proposed Settlement of Pending Personal Injury Litigation with Roberta Jackson

## SUMMARY:

The proposed settlement will conclude the pending litigation with Roberta Jackson regarding a personal injury claim for \$30,000 in exchange for a general release of the City

## BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION:

The proposed settlement is to conclude the pending personal injury litigation filed against the City by the Plaintiff, Roberta Jackson. The case arose out of a trip and fall that occurred on November 27, 2017 outside the City Hall annex when the Plaintiff and her daughter went to pay a utility bill. The Plaintiff claimed that the walkway was uneven and she tripped and fell. The City confirmed that the walkway was uneven at that time. As a result, the Plaintiff claimed she injured or exacerbated prior injuries to her left knee, left ankle, and back. The Plaintiff was transported from the scene by fire rescue to JFK Medical Center. Following that visit, the Plaintiff underwent chiropractic care, pain management care, and received recommendations for further medical treatments. The bills for treatment totaled approximately $\$ 47,000$ as of December 2022.

While the Plaintiff has a documented history of falls and related medical issues and injuries, the City's attempts to settle the litigation for less than $\$ 30,000$ did not resolve the case. In reviewing the costs and attorney's fees that the City would incur to take the case to trial and the uncertainty of trial, the City was able to final reach a tentative settlement with the Plaintiff for $\$ 30,000$ (inclusive of the Plaintiff's attorneys fees) to resolve the case. The settlement is contingent upon City Commission approval. If approved, the City will obtain a general release from the Plaintiff.

## MOTION:

Motion to approve / disapprove Settlement of Pending Personal Injury Litigation with Roberta Jackson for $\$ 30,000$ in exchange for a general release of the City.

## ATTACHMENT(S):

Fiscal Impact Analysis

FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS
Five Year Summary of Fiscal Impact:

| Fiscal Years | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Inflows |  |  |  |  |  |
| Current Appropriation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Program Income | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grants | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| In Kind | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Outflows |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operating | \$30,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Capital | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Fiscal Impact | $(\$ 30,000)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of Addn'l Full-Time |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employee Positions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| Contract Award - Existing Appropriation |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Expenditure |
| Department |  |
| Division |  |
| GL Description | Self-Insurance Fund |
| GL Account Number | $520-1331-513.45-60$ |
| Project Number |  |
| Requested Funds |  |

# STAFF REPORT <br> REGULAR MEETING 

AGENDA DATE: February 7, 2023
DEPARTMENT: City Commission

## TITLE:

Resolution No. 04-2023 - Urging members of the Florida Legislature to support the 2023 Florida League of Cities Legislative Platform brought forward by Commissioner Malega

## SUMMARY:

The Florida League of Cities adopts a legislative platform each year and is requesting that Florida municipalities send a resolution of support to the Florida Legislature.

## BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION:

The 2023 Florida League of Cities (FLC) Legislative Platform, which includes its priorities and policy positions, was adopted by its membership during the FLC Legislative Conference on December 2, 2022. The Florida Legislature will convene the 2023 Legislative Session on March 7, 2023 and the FLC requested that the Florida municipalities adopt the legislative platform and policies by resolution, sending the resolution to its local delegates and the FLC.
The FLC's platform includes supporting:

- the preservation of municipal authority to manage municipal revenue sources
- legislation that defines and clarifies mobility plans
- legislation that restores authority to local governments for the regulation of short-term rental properties and the creation of fair lodging standards
- legislation that requires all money from the Sadowski State and Local Housing Trust Fund be used only for Florida's affordable housing programs
- legislation establishing a statewide coordinated planning and prioritization approach for water resource investments that funds Florida's current and projected water needs
The complete legislative platform and policy positions can be found on the Resolution.


## MOTION:

Move to approve/disapprove Resolution No. 04-2023 - Urging members of the Florida Legislature to support the 2023 Florida League of Cities Legislative Platform.

## ATTACHMENT(S):

Fiscal Impact Analysis - N/A
Resolution 04-2023
FLC 2023 Legislative Platform

RESOLUTION NO. 04-2023 OF THE CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH, FLORIDA, URGING MEMBERS OF THE FLORIDA LEGISLATURE TO SUPPORT THE 2023 FLORIDA LEAGUE OF CITIES LEGISLATIVE PLATFORM. PROVIDING A SEVERABILITY CLAUSE, AN EFFECTIVE DATE AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

WHEREAS, the Florida Legislature will convene the 2023 Legislative Session on March 7, 2023; and

WHEREAS, the membership of the Florida League of Cities adopted the 2023 FLC Legislative Platform during the FLC Legislative Conference on December 2, 2022; and

WHEREAS, the City of Lake Worth Beach supports the 2023 FLC Legislative Platform, which includes:

1. Supporting the preservation of municipal authority to manage municipal revenue sources and realize a reasonable rate of return on their proprietary assets, investments, and services.
2. Supporting legislation that defines and clarifies mobility plans in order to provide a clear and concise regulatory framework for Florida cities to acquire, construct and implement both traditional and alternative modes of transportation.
3. Supporting legislation that restores authority to local governments for the regulation of short-term rental properties as necessary for quality of life, public safety and the creation of fair lodging standards. Supporting legislation clarifying that existing, grandfathered municipal short-term rental ordinances can be amended without penalty. Opposing legislation that preempts municipal authority as it relates to the regulation of short-term rental properties.
4. Supporting legislation that requires all money from the Sadowski State and Local Housing Trust Fund be used only for Florida's affordable housing programs that are targeted to meet the needs of workforce housing, including home ownership and rental availability.
5. Supporting legislation establishing a statewide coordinated planning and prioritization approach for water resource investments that funds Florida's current and projected water needs in an equitable manner and authorizing Comprehensive Watershed Management projects to qualify for funding under the state Water Protection and Sustainability Trust Fund.

WHEREAS, the City of Lake Worth Beach also supports the FLC policy positions relating to:

- Property Tax Protection
- Residential Zoning
- Transportation Funding
- Water and Wastewater Plant Operator Licensure

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH, FLORIDA, that:

Section 1. The City of Lake Worth Beach will work with our local legislative delegation in support of these and other issues affecting Florida's cities, towns and villages during the upcoming 2023 Legislative Session.

Section 2. A copy of this resolution shall be provided to members of our local legislative delegation and the Florida League of Cities, Inc.

Section 3. This resolution shall take effect upon adoption.
The passage of this resolution was moved by Commissioner $\qquad$ , seconded by Commissioner $\qquad$ , and upon being put to a vote, the vote was as follows:

Mayor Betty Resch
Vice Mayor Christopher McVoy
Commissioner Sarah Malega
Commissioner Kimberly Stokes
Commissioner Reinaldo Diaz

The Mayor thereupon declared this resolution duly passed and adopted on this
$\qquad$ day of February, 2023.

LAKE WORTH BEACH CITY COMMISSION

By:
Betty Resch, Mayor
ATTEST:

Melissa Ann Coyne, City Clerk

# © 2023 

FLORIDA LEAGUE OF CITIES LEGISLATIVE PLATFORM

## Priorities:

## Enterprise Fund Transfers

The Florida League of Cities SUPPORTS the preservation of municipal authority to manage municipal revenue sources and realize a reasonable rate of return on their proprietary assets, investments and services.

## Mobility Plans

The Florida League of Cities SUPPORTS legislation that defines and clarifies mobility plans in order to provide a clear and concise regulatory framework for Florida cities to acquire, construct and implement both traditional and alternative modes of transportation.

## Short-Term Rentals

The Florida League of Cities SUPPORTS legislation that restores authority to local governments for the regulation of short-term rental properties as necessary for quality of life, public safety and the creation of fair lodging standards. The Florida League of Cities SUPPORTS legislation clarifying that existing, grandfathered municipal short-term rental ordinances can be amended without penalty. The Florida League of Cities OPPOSES legislation that preempts municipal authority as it relates to the regulation of short-term rental properties.

## Accessible Housing

The Florida League of Cities SUPPORTS legislation that requires all money from the Sadowski State and Local Housing Trust Fund be used for Florida's affordable housing programs that are targeted to meet the needs of workforce housing, including home ownership and rental availability.

## Water Resources Planning and Comprehensive Watershed Management

The Florida League of Cities SUPPORTS legislation establishing a statewide coordinated planning and prioritization approach for water resource investments that funds Florida's current and projected water needs in an equitable manner and authorizing Comprehensive Watershed Management projects to qualify for funding under the state Water Protection and Sustainability Trust Fund.

## Policy Positions:

## Property Tax Protection

The Florida League of Cities SUPPORTS legislation that maintains an equitable property tax system while preserving a municipality's ability to fund public infrastructure, police, fire, emergency services and other essential services. Any further erosions and/or exemptions on the current property tax structure will unfairly shift the tax burden to the business community, renters and others.

## Residential Zoning

The Florida League of Cities SUPPORTS legislation that maintains, advances and encourages the fundamental ability for cities to tailor unique land development solutions through local decision-making, preserving the ability for cities to decide how they look and grow. Cities are strong supporters of affordable housing efforts and are best positioned to identify appropriate areas that can support high-density infill redevelopment.

## Transportation Funding

The Florida League of Cities SUPPORTS legislation directing the Florida Department of Transportation to provide financial assistance and incentives to develop and implement multimodal transportation plans that optimize different modes of combined transport and are tailored to municipal transportation demands. The Florida League of Cities SUPPORTS identifying additional transportation revenue to fund innovative infrastructure (e.g., electric vehicles) and transit projects to meet the surging transportation demands driven by growth in population throughout Florida.

## Water and Wastewater Plant Operator Licensure

The Florida League of Cities SUPPORTS legislation to address workforce shortages in municipal water and wastewater facilities by: one, defining facility operators as critical and essential workers; two, providing reciprocity with other states for licensure of facility operators; and three, allowing credit toward licensure for military experience and time served performing similar functions and providing flexibility for facilities to use retired or out-of-state operators in emergencies.

# STAFF REPORT REGULAR MEETING 

## AGENDA DATE: February 7, 2023

DEPARTMENT: Community Sustainability

## TITLE:

Ordinance No. 2022-17 - First Reading - Approval of a Residential Urban Planned Development, Major Site Plan, Conditional Use Permit (CUP), and Sustainable Bonus Incentive Program (SBIP) requests for the project commonly referred to as "Residences at Lake Worth," to construct three (3) mid-rise residential structures that are 5-stories in height with a total of 195 dwelling units

## SUMMARY:

The applicant, Brian Terry of Insite Studio, Inc, is requesting approval of the following for the project commonly referred to as "Residences of Lake Worth":

- A planned development, development of significant impact and major site plan request to construct a 195 -unit multi-family development with three (3) mid-rise residential multi-family buildings and one (1) amenity building/clubhouse. Each of the multi-family buildings will have 65 residential units. The proposed units will be divided between 105 one-bedroom units and 90 two-bedroom units.
- A conditional use permit request to develop a multi-family residential development with a total of 195 multi-family units, of which 14 one-bedroom room units and 16 two-bedroom units will be income restricted as workforce housing through the PBC Workforce Housing Program.
- A Sustainable Bonus request for an additional 3-stories of bonus height.

The Applicant is proposing a multi-family development on a 7.40 -acre vacant lot with the purpose to provide attainable apartments, including income restricted units, and amenities, including a pedestrian path around the lake. Per the applicant's justification statement, "residents will have access to multiple amenities on the property including a $+/-4,980$ square foot clubhouse with a management office, club room, fitness facility, yoga room and mail center. These amenities are located in the center of the property and will be the focal point entering into the community. Exterior to the clubhouse is a covered terrace and expansive pool deck with a central bar and grill area covered by an architectural pergola structure. Other site amenities include a fully connected sidewalk system that extends completely around the retention pond on the north and provides for access to a fenced dog park on the west side of the property."

## BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION:

On November 1, 2022, the applicant held a meeting with neighborhood residents at Mathews Brewing Company. Notices were mailed to all property owners within 400 ft of the project on October 15, 2022, and signs were placed on the property on October 17, 2022. There were two attendees that signed in at the meeting and no concerns were identified per the meeting minutes. The applicant also has a project webpage:

## https://www.insitestudio.com/residencesatlakeworth

The Planning and Zoning Board (PZB) at their November 16, 2022 meeting, recommended approval of the project with conditions. The motion included one modification to staff's recommended conditions of approval regarding the wording of the workforce/affordable housing condition as proposed by the City Attorney. Board discussion included questions to the applicant and staff related to the location and breakdown of the workforce housing units, clarification on which program the applicant would utilize restrict the income requirements for the units, lack of motorcycle parking, the architectural style, the
stormwater retention requirements due to the project's location in a C-51 sub-basin, and a flood zone discussion.

As outlined in the staff report, the proposed planned development meets all standards and requirements as outlined in the City's Land Development Regulations (LDRs) and Comprehensive Plan.
The Applicant is asking for bonus height that is less than the maximum allowance permitted via the SBIP in a planned development in the MU-W zoning district. The square footage of bonus area above the second floor (3rd, 4th, and 5th floors) is $+/-12,691$ square feet per floor for all three buildings. The SBIP incentive value for the 3rd \& 4th floors for all three building (Tier One - LDR) is \$571,095 (12,691 sf X 2 Floors X 3 Buildings X $\$ 7.50$ per sf). The SBIP incentive value for the 5th Floor (Tier Two per Policy 1.2.3.4) is $\$ 571,095$ ( 12,691 X 3 Buildings $X \$ 15$ per sf). The total combined SBIP incentive value is $\$ 1,142,190$. Fifty percent ( $50 \%$ ) of the incentive award value is $\$ 571,095$, which the applicant is required to pay to the City. For the remaining $50 \%$ of the incentive award value ( $\$ 571,095$ ), the applicant is proposing the following qualified improvements per Resolution 23-2021 \& LDR Section 23.2-33, which include Florida Green Building certification (\$287,547.50), and six (6) Electric vehicle charging spaces $(\$ 50,000)$. The applicant is requesting that the City Commission consider additional on-site improvements, including coastal hazard improvements to the LWDD Canal Banks, and 20 on-street parking spaces.

Additional background, history and justification can be found in the attached documentation, including the advisory board staff report.

## MOTION:

Move to approve/disapprove Ordinance No. 2022-17 on first reading and to schedule the second reading and public hearing for March 7, 2023.

## ATTACHMENT(S):

Ordinance 2022-17
PZB Staff Report
Supporting Plans and Documents


#### Abstract

ORDINANCE NO. 2022-17 - AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH, FLORIDA, AMENDING THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP BY APPROVING THE CREATION OF A RESIDENTIAL PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT, LOCATED AT THE NE CORNER OF $2^{\text {ND }}$ AVE NORTH AND THE LWDD E-4 CANAL TO CONSTRUCT AN APPROXIMATELY 5-STORY, 195UNIT RESIDENTIAL PLANNED DEVELOPMENT AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN EXHIBIT A, LOCATED WITHIN THE MIXED USE - WEST (MU-W) ZONING DISTRICT WITH A FUTURE LAND USE DESIGNATION OF MIXED USE - WEST (MU-W) SUBJECT TO SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS SET FORTH IN EXHIBIT B AND CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL SET FORTH IN EXHIBIT C; APPROVING A DEVELOPMENT OF SIGNIFCANT IMPACT; APPROVING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT; APPROVING A HEIGHT BONUS INCENTIVE THROUGH THE CITY'S SUSTAINABLE BONUS INCENTIVE PROGRAM; APPROVING A MAJOR SITE PLAN FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A RESIDENTIAL PLANNED DEVELOPMENT; PROVIDED FOR SEVERABILITY, CONFLICTS AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE


WHEREAS, the City Commission of the City of Lake Worth Beach, Florida, pursuant to the authority granted in Chapters 163 and 166, Florida Statutes, and the Land Development Regulations, as adopted by the City of Lake Worth Beach, is authorized and empowered to consider petitions relating to zoning and land development orders; and

WHEREAS, Chapter 23, Article 3, Division 6. - Planned Development of City of Lake Worth Beach's Land Development Regulations allows for the creation of planned development districts to incentivize innovative development through the utilization of incentive programs and flexible dimensional and use requirements that are defined within and occur in conformity with an approved master development plan; and

WHEREAS, Brian Terry, Insite Studio, Inc, (the applicant) has petitioned the City of Lake Worth Beach (the City) on behalf of the property owner Richman Lake Worth Apartments, LLC for creation of a Residential Planned Development District to allow for the construction of an approximately 5-story, 195-unit multi-family development (on a site located at the NE corner of the E-4 Canal and $2^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue N (PCNs 38-43-44-20-01-0970020, 38-43-44-20-01-097-0010, and 38-43-44-20-01-096-0020) as further described in Exhibit A (the Property) within the MU-W Zoning District and the MU-W Future Land Use designation, which, if approved, shall constitute an amendment to the City's official zoning map; and

WHEREAS, the applicant requests use of the City's Sustainable Bonus Incentive Program to allow for additional height to be considered in conjunction with the applicant's request for approval for a major site plan for the construction of a residential development
currently known as "Residences of Lake Worth" and containing 195 residential units to be constructed on this site;

WHEREAS, on November 16, 2022, the Lake Worth Beach Planning and Zoning Board (PZB) considered the subject application for a Residential Planned Development District, Development of Significant Impact, Major Site Plan, Conditional Use Permit, and Sustainable Bonus Incentive Program and recommended that the City Commission approve the creation of this residential planned development subject to specific district development standards and certain enumerated conditions; and

WHEREAS, on February 7, 2023, the City Commission voted to approve on first reading the subject application for a Residential Planned Development District, Development of Significant Impact, Major Site Plan, Conditional Use Permit, and Sustainable Bonus Incentive Program subject to specific district development standards and enumerated conditions herein; and

WHEREAS, the City Commission has considered all of the testimony and evidence and has determined that the Residential Planned Development District, Development of Significant Impact, Major Site Plan, Conditional Use Permit, and Sustainable Bonus Incentive Program including the development regulations and conditions, meets the requirements of the Land Development Regulations, Section 23.3-25.

## NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH, FLORIDA, that:

Section 1. Recitals. The foregoing recitals are true and correct and are hereby affirmed and ratified.

Section 2. The Mixed Use Urban Planned Development District located within the MUW Zoning District with a future land use designation of MU-W, as described more particularly in Exhibit A, is hereby approved. This approval includes the approval of the following elements to be known as the Master Development Plan: (a) Residential Planned Development; (b) Major Site Plan; (c) Sustainable Bonus Incentive Program; (d) Conditional Use Permit; (e) district development standards (Exhibit B); (f) conditions of approval (Exhibit C); (g) required plans including the site plan, landscape plan, and civil \& drainage plans; (h) supplemental supporting documents, as well as all agreements, provisions and/or covenants which shall govern the use, maintenance, and continued protection of the residential planned development and any of its common areas or facilities. The applicant is bound to all elements and requirements of the Master Development Plan.

Section 3. The City's zoning maps shall be updated to reflect the changes to the property described in Exhibit A.

Section 4. Repeal of Laws in Conflict. All ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict herewith are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.

Section 5. Severability. If any provision of this ordinance or the application thereof is held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the invalidity shall not affect other provisions of the ordinance which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this ordinance are declared severable.

Section 6. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective ten (10) days after its final passage.

The passage of this ordinance on first reading was moved by , seconded by ___ and upon being put to a vote, the vote was as follows:

Mayor Betty Resch
Vice Mayor Christopher McVoy
Commissioner Sarah Malega
Commissioner Kimberly Stokes
Commissioner Reinaldo Diaz

The Mayor thereupon declared this ordinance duly passed on first reading on the
$\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ , 2023.

The passage of this ordinance on second reading was moved by
$\qquad$ , seconded by $\qquad$ , and upon being put to a vote, the vote was as follows:

Mayor Betty Resch
Vice Mayor Christopher McVoy
Commissioner Sarah Malega
Commissioner Kimberly Stokes
Commissioner Reinaldo Diaz

The Mayor thereupon declared this ordinance duly passed on the $\qquad$ day of , 2023.

LAKE WORTH BEACH CITY COMMISSION

By:
Betty Resch, Mayor
ATTEST:

Melissa Ann Coyne, City Clerk

## Exhibit A

DEPARTMENT FOR COMMUNITY SUSTAINABILITY PLANNING, ZONING AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION \& LOCATION MAP

Address: 2559, 2441, $24312^{\text {nd }}$ Ave N

PCNs: 38-43-44-20-01-097-0020
38-43-44-20-01-097-0010
38-43-44-20-01-096-0020

Size: 7.40 acres

General Location: North of $2^{\text {nd }}$ Ave N , and just east of the LWDD E-4 Canal.

Legal Description: See boundary survey in the Master Development Plan supporting documentation


## Exhibit B

## DEPARTMENT FOR COMMUNITY SUSTAINABILITY PLANNING, ZONING AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION

DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

| Development Standard | Base Zoning District <br> Mixed Used - West <br> (MU-W) | Residential Planned <br> Development in MU-W <br> with SBIP | Provided |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Living Area (minimum) | Studio | 400 sf | 400 sf | N/A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 600 sf | 600 sf | +/-716 sf- 729 sf |
|  | Twobedroom units | 750 sf | 750 s | +/-1013 sf |
|  | Three- <br> bedroom units | 900 sf | 900 sf | N/A |
| Parking <br> See page 5 for detailed analysis. |  | Parking Calculated per unit, room, and non-residential square footage. | 237 spaces* <br> w/ 30 workforce housing units <br> Max alternate spaces $=59$ spaces | 279 spaces <br> w/ 12 alternate (compact) spaces <br> Additional parking that exceeds parking requirements: <br> 42 compact parking spaces \& 39 <br> bicycle spaces $=9$ parking spaces |
| Workforce/Affordable Housing |  | 15\% of Total Project | 30 Income Restricted Units | 30 Income Restricted Units <br> (14 one-bedroom units and 16 two-bedroom units) |

*Applicant is choosing to opt-in to the recently adopted workforce housing program ordinance (Ordinance 2022-12), which allows for a 25\% parking requirement reduction for income restricted units.

## -Exhibit C

# DEPARTMENT FOR COMMUNITY SUSTAINABILITY PLANNING, ZONING AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION 

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

## Planning \& Zoning

1. Fifty percent of the sustainable bonus fee $(\$ 428,321.25)$ shall be paid to the City within two years of approval, or prior to the issuance of the building permit, whichever comes first.
2. The applicant shall provide qualifying sustainable bonus features equal to $\$ 428,321.25$, or shall be required to pay the remaining portion of the $50 \%$ of the incentive value $(\$ 428,321.25)$ prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy.
3. Thirty (30) units shall be restricted for workforce housing in accordance with the City's Affordable/Workforce Housing Program prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the buildings
4. A unity of title shall be required to applied for and shall be recorded prior to the issuance of a building permit.
5. An address application shall be required to be submitted prior to application for building permit.
6. A video security system shall be required for the property.
7. Exterior lighting shall be required to comply dark sky lighting guidelines, including using fully shielded fixtures and led lighting that has a color temperature of no more than 3000 Kelvins. www.darksky.org_Specifically, the lighting fixtures shall be reviewed at building permit for consistency with the dark sky guidelines and the architecture of the buildings.
8. A designated delivery and/or ride share space shall be provided.
9. Dumpster enclosure material shall be reviewed for architectural consistency and for compliance with all applicable City requirements at building permit.
10. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a minor site plan amendment or modification shall be approved to update the site plan data table to remove errors.

## Utilities (Water, Sewer \& Stormwater)

1. There are several locations where proposed storm chamber overlaps with the water/storm utility easements. The easement shall be free of obstructions.
2. Provide inlet protection on the storm collection structures in $2 n d$ Avenue North and show the erosion control and sedimentation plan.
3. Capacity fees are due prior to building permit issuance.
4. The title block of all plans shall be updated to say Lake Worth Beach instead of Lake Worth.

## Public Works

1. The issuance of any permits shall comply with all provisions of the Lake Worth Municipal Code and all other applicable standards including but not limited to the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), and City of Lake Worth Public Services Construction Standards and Policy and Procedure Manual. No Certificate of Occupancy shall be granted until all conditions of approval have been satisfied under jurisdiction of the Department of Public Services.
2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall contact the Lake Worth Drainage (LWDD) District's Engineering Department and obtain any required permit(s), if necessary, and furnish to the City. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall contact the South Florida Water Management District's (SFWMD) Engineering Department and obtain any required permit(s), if necessary.
3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Applicant shall contact and meet with a representative from the Public Works Solid Waste and Recycling Division to confirm dumpster enclosure location, accessibility and demand on property and that it is compatible with the requirements of the Department of Public Works. Solid Waste Division contact number is 561-533-7344.
4. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the Applicant shall ensure the entire surrounding offsite infrastructure inclusive of the roadway, sidewalk, curbing, stormwater system piping and structures, valve boxes, manholes, landscaping, striping, signage, and other improvements are in the same condition as prior to construction.
5. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit an Erosion Control plan and indicate the BMP's and NPDES compliance practices.
6. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the applicant shall fine grade and sod all disturbed areas with bahia sod.
7. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the applicant shall broom sweep all areas of the affected right of way and remove of all silt and debris collected as a result of construction activity.
8. Prior to performing work in the right of way, the applicant shall apply for and receive issuance of a "Right of Way/Utility Permit" application.

## Electric Utility

1. Before or at the time of application for a Building Permit, Developer must provide the Load Calculation, Voltage requirements and Riser diagram. We will need to know the location of the Pad-Mount Transformers for the building. The Transformer locations must be accessible to our vehicles, and must have 8 - ft minimum clearance in front of them and $3-\mathrm{ft}$ clearance to the side or rear, including landscaping (None trees, plants, shrubs or vegetations are allowed within the clearance). The Transformers also must not be under or inside any structure.
2. Before the issuance of a Building permit, we will need a $10-\mathrm{ft}$ wide utility easement for the underground electric, transformers and other equipment that will need to be installed to provide power to this project.
3. The customer will be responsible for installing All Schedule 40 PVC Conduit that will be needed by Lake Worth Beach for this project for the primary cable. This conduit must be installed at a $24^{\prime \prime}$ minimum depth. Pad specs will be given to the customer to show the proper orientation of conduit at the pad mount transformers.
4. Before the issuance of a Building permit, we will need to know if any other services will be needed for the project such as irrigation, lift station, lighting, gates, etc., and where these services will be.
5. Developer to show the location of the meter center on the site plan.
6. Developer will be responsible for installing their own lightning for the parking areas.
7. Developer will be responsible for the cost of Lake Worth Beach's materials and labor for this project.
8. Before the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the utility easement must be recorded.
9. Before the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy (CO) a final electrical inspection must be done.

## Building Division

1. Pedestrian connections to the club house will require enhanced striping.

## PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD REPORT

PZB Project Number 22-01400004 (Ordinance 2022-17): A request for a Residential Planned Development, Development of Significant Impact, Major Site Plan, Conditional Use, and Sustainable Bonus for the project commonly referred to as "Residences at Lake Worth," to construct three (3) mid-rise residential structures that are 5 -stories in height with a total of 195 dwelling units. The sustainable bonus request is for an additional 3-stories in height.

PZB Meeting Date: November 16, 2022
Property Owner: Richman Lake Worth Apartments LLC

Applicant: Brian Terry - Insite Studio, Inc
Address: 2559, 2441, and $24312^{\text {nd }}$ Ave N
PCNs: 38-43-44-20-01-097-0020
38-43-44-20-01-097-0010
38-43-44-20-01-096-0020

Size: 7.40 acres
General Location: North of $2^{\text {nd }}$ Ave N , and east of the LWDD E-4 Canal.

Existing Land Use: Vacant
Current Future Land Use Designation: Mixed Use-
West (MU-W)
Zoning District: Mixed Use-West (MU-W)

Location Map


Note: Report updated on 1/23/2023 to reflect additional information and clarifications regarding workforce housing.

[^0]Project Contact: Erin Sita, AICP, Assistant Director | esita@lakeworthbeachfl.gov

## RECOMMENDATION

The documentation and materials provided with the application request were reviewed for compliance with the applicable guidelines and standards found in the City of Lake Worth Beach Land Development Regulations (LDRs), and for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and Strategic Plan. The proposed Residential Planned Development, Development of Significant Impact, Major Site Plan, Conditional Use, and Sustainable Bonus request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, Strategic Plan, and LDRs, as conditioned, and, therefore, a recommendation of approval with conditions is provided to the Planning and Zoning Board. The conditions are located on pages 8 to 10 of this report.

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant, Brian Terry of Insite Studio, Inc, is requesting approval of the following for the project commonly referred to as "Residences at Lake Worth:"

- A planned development, development of significant impact and major site plan request to construct a 195-unit multi-family development with three (3) mid-rise residential multi-family buildings and one (1) amenity building/clubhouse. Each of the multi-family buildings will have 65 residential units.
- A conditional use permit request to develop a multi-family residential development with a total of 195 multifamily units, of which 14 one-bedroom units and 16 two-bedroom units will be restricted as workforce housing. The proposed multi-family buildings will be divided between a total of 105 one-bedroom units and 90 twobedroom units.
- A Sustainable Bonus request for an additional 3-stories of bonus height.

The Applicant is proposing a multi-family development on a 7.40 -acre vacant lot with the purpose to provide attainable apartments, including income restricted units, and amenities, including a pedestrian path around the lake. Per the applicant's justification statement, "residents will have access to multiple amenities on the property including a +/-4,980 square foot clubhouse with a management office, club room, fitness facility, yoga room and mail center. These amenities are located in the center of the property and will be the focal point entering into the community. Exterior to the clubhouse is a covered terrace and expansive pool deck with a central bar and grill area covered by an architectural pergola structure. Other site amenities include a fully connected sidewalk system that extends completely around the retention pond on the north and provides for access to a fenced dog park on the west side of the property."

## COMMUNITY OUTREACH

Staff has not received any letters of support or opposition for this application. Per LDR Section 23.2-20, Public Neighborhood Meeting, a public neighborhood meeting shall be required for all Planned Developments, Developments of Significant Impact, and Lake Worth Beach Community Redevelopment Agency sponsored new construction projects along the City's major thoroughfares as well as those utilizing the City's Sustainable Bonus Incentive Program, Transfer of Development Rights Program and/or Economic Investment Incentives.

On November 1, 2022, the applicant held a meeting with neighborhood residents at Mathews Brewing Company. Notices were mailed to all property owners within 400 ft of the project on October 15, 2022, and signs were placed on the property on October 17, 2022. There were two attendees at the meeting and no concerns were identified per the meeting minutes. The applicant also has a project webpage: https://www.insitestudio.com/residencesatlakeworth

## BACKGROUND

Below is a summary of the property based on Palm Beach Property Appraiser's records and City records:

Use/Construction: Currently, the property is vacant with no existing structures on the site. A mixed-use development was previously approved on the property in 2014 with 3 , four-story buildings and 104 dwelling units. There is also an existing cell tower in the NE corner of the property.

Code Compliance: There are no active code cases on the subject site.

## ANALYSIS

Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and Strategic Plan
The subject site has a Future Land Use (FLU) designation of Mixed Use - West (MU-W). Per Policy 1.1.1.6, the MU-W FLU is intended to provide for a mixture of residential, office, service, and commercial retail uses within specific areas west of I-95. The distinguishing characteristic of the Mixed-Use West land use area is that it allows higher-intensity uses as well as higher height limits along the City's western thoroughfares. The preferred mix of uses area-wide is $75 \%$ residential and $25 \%$ non-residential. While mixed-use projects are allowed on a single site, it is not a requirement that each site within the category incorporate multiple uses. Zoning regulations implementing the Mixed-Use West category shall permit the establishment and expansion of residential (including single family, two-family and multi-family), office, service and commercial retail uses either as uses permitted by right or through conditional use permit provisions. All buildings are required to provide transitional buffering and design features to mitigate the impact of the MU-W sites adjacent to residential zoning districts.

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 multifamily building and associated site improvements will contribute towards the City's Pillars II.A, II.B, IV.A, and IV.E of the Strategic Plan.

The proposed development request is consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the City of Lake Worth Beach's Comprehensive Plan and Strategic Plan as it provides both market rate and income restricted workforce units in a multifamily project with substantial amenities, including an outdoor recreation path and dog park.

## Consistency with the Land Development Regulations

The proposed application was reviewed for consistency with all applicable requirements in the City's Land Development Regulations (LDR), including the district and planned development requirements. Per Section 23.3-25, planned developments are intended to encourage innovative land planning and development techniques through incentives to create more desirable and attractive development within the City. The Department of Community Sustainability is tasked to review planned development applications in accordance with the City's LDRs, to assess compliance with the findings for granting planned developments (analyzed in the following sections) and to provide a recommendation for whether the application should be approved, approved with conditions, or denied. The subject planned development is not requesting to waive or relax base zoning district requirements. However, the applicant is opting into the workforce housing program to utilize the parking reduction incentive allowed for income restricted workforce housing units.

Mixed Use - West (MU-W): Per LDR Section 23.3-18(a), the MU-W zoning district is intended to provide for the establishment and expansion of a broad range of office and commercial uses, including moderate intensity and higher intensity commercial, hotel/motel and medium-density multiple-family residential development along the city's western thoroughfares. The establishment of certain uses is subject to conditional use review to ensure they will not create excessive problems for through traffic, or have a negative impact on nearby residential areas or the commercial viability of their neighbors. The district implements in part the mixed-use land use category of the Lake Worth Comprehensive Plan.

The table and topic area analysis below evaluate the proposed site features and the project's compliance with the Code, and factoring in the Sustainable Bonus incentives, Planned Development incentives, and the Comprehensive Plan maximums:

| Development Standard |  | Base Zoning District Mixed Used - West (MU-W) | Residential Planned Development in MU-W with SBIP | Provided |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lot Size (min) In square feet (sf) |  | 13,000 sf | 0.5 acres | $\begin{gathered} 7.3985 \text { acres } \\ (322,278.64 \mathrm{sf}) \end{gathered}$ |
| Lot Width (min) |  | 100' | 100 | 401.62' |
| Setbacks | Front (min build-to line) | 20' | $20^{\prime}$ | $20^{\prime}$ |
|  | Rear (min) | 10' | 10' | 178' |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Street Side } \\ & (\mathrm{min}) \end{aligned}$ | $20^{\prime}$ | $20^{\prime}$ | N/A |
|  | Side (min) | $20^{\prime}$ | $20^{\prime}$ | $20^{\prime}$ - west side <br> 41' - east side |
| Impermeable Surface Coverage (maximum) |  | 65\% | 65\% | 49\% (157,900 SF) |
| Structure Coverage (max) |  | 50\% | 50\% | $\begin{gathered} \text { 13.4\% (43,293 SF) - } \\ \text { Buildings } \\ 1.15 \%(3,722 \text { SF) - } \end{gathered}$ Communication Tower |
| Density (max) |  | $30 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{acre}$ (221 units) | 37.5 du/acre (277 units) | 26.36 du/acre (195 units) |
| Building Height (max) |  | $30^{\prime}$ (max. 2 stories) | $\begin{gathered} \hline 65^{\prime} \\ \text { (Max. } 6 \text { stories) } \end{gathered}$ | 59'-4" - top of parapet (5 stories) |
| Maximum Wall Height at Side Setback |  | $30^{\prime}$ | $65^{\prime}$ | +/-59' |
| Floor Area Ratio (FAR)(max) |  | 1.3 | 3.75 | . 6 |
| Living Area (minimum) | Studio | 400 sf | 400 sf | N/A |
|  |  | 600 sf | 600 sf | +/-716 sf- 729 sf |
|  | Twobedroom units | 750 sf | 750 s | +/-1013 sf |
|  | Threebedroom units | 900 sf | 900 sf | N/A |
| Parking <br> See page 5 for detailed analysis. |  | Parking Calculated per unit, room, and nonresidential square footage. | 237 spaces* w/ 30 workforce housing units <br> Max alternate spaces $=59$ spaces | 279 spaces <br> w/ 12 alternate (compact) spaces <br> Additional parking that exceeds parking requirements: 42 compact parking spaces \& 39 bicycle spaces $=9$ parking spaces |


| Workforce/Affordable <br> Housing | $15 \%$ of Total Project | 30 Income Restricted <br> Units | 30 Income Restricted <br> Units <br> (14 one-bedroom units and 16 <br> two-bedroom units) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

*Applicant is choosing to opt-in to the recently adopted workforce housing program ordinance (Ordinance 2022-12), which allows for a $\mathbf{2 5 \%}$ parking requirement reduction for income restricted units.

Affordable/Workforce Housing Program Ordinance 2022-12: The proposed project was submitted to the City prior to Ordinance 2022-12 becoming effective. The applicant has elected to opt into the program to utilize the parking reduction incentive. Tier Two requires that $15 \%$ of the total number of units for projects utilizing any City incentives or bonus programs be income restricted in accordance with the provisions in this ordinance.

Analysis: The applicant is proposing 195 dwelling units of which 30 units (15\%) are required to be income restricted as consistent with the requirements in Ordinance 2022-12. The applicant is proposing to income restrict 30 units as required to utilize the parking reduction incentive. This is being implemented through the PBC Workforce Housing Program.

Section 23.4-10. - Off-street parking: This section provides general provisions for off-street parking. The standards "apply to all parking spaces required for new buildings, new uses, additions, enlargements, or changes."

Analysis: The parking for the dwelling units was calculated as follows: 1.5 spaces per 1-bedroom unit (1.5 $\times 105$ units $=$ 158 spaces) and 1.75 spaces for each 2-bedroom unit ( $1.75 \times 90$ units $=158$ spaces). The applicant is choosing to opt into the City's recently adopted Workforce Housing program (Ordinance 2022-12). This program provides a $25 \%$ reduction in required parking. Therefore, a total of two-hundred thirty-seven (237) spaces are required (316 spaces minus $25 \%$ reduction). Two-hundred and seventy-nine (279) parking spaces are proposed, which exceed the required parking by forty-two (42) spaces.

The applicant is proposing to utilize alternate spaces to fulfill their minimum parking requirement as permitted by LDR Section 23.4-10.I), which states that "alternate parking spaces including compact spaces shall count towards no more than twenty-five (25) percent of the overall site parking requirement." The maximum alternate spaces that can be applied to meet required parking for this development is 59 alternate spaces. The applicant is proposing 225 standard spaces, and 12 compact spaces as alternate spaces to meet the required parking of 237 total spaces. In addition to the required parking, the applicant is also proposing 42 more compacts spaces (total 54 compact spaces), and 39 bicycle spaces (four bicycle spaces count as one parking space).

Section 23.6-1. - Landscape regulations: The objective of this section is to provide minimum standards for the installation and maintenance of landscaping within the city. Per Section 23.6-1(c)(2), "on the site of a building or open-lot use providing an off-street parking, storage or other vehicular use area, where such an area will not be screened visually by an intervening building or structure from an abutting right-of-way or dedicated alley, shall require landscaping".

Analysis: The development proposal provides perimeter landscaping and shade trees. The proposed landscaping is consistent with the City's landscape regulations. Tree species include a mix of Gumbo Limbo, Pigeon Plum, Silver and Green Buttonwood, and Live Oak for the perimeter and interior plantings along with multiple native and non-native shrubs, grasses, and groundcovers. The proposed landscape complies with the City's requirement that $75 \%$ of all required plants be Florida native.

As required by the tree removal provisions in the landscape regulations, the applicant submitted a tree survey and disposition plan that was reviewed by staff. The diameter at breast height (DBH) for the existing trees with a condition rating of fifty (50) percent or greater on the property is used to calculate the replacement tree requirement. The development proposes to retain all existing trees on site, therefore replacement trees and/or mitigation is not required.

Section 23.5-1- Signage: Signage is required to comply with the size and design requirements of LDR Section 23.5-1, Signs. Ground or monument signage are required to be depicted on both the site and landscape plans, and are reviewed for consistency with the sign code requirements and planned development at building permit.

Analysis: The proposed entrance sign has a maximum sign area of 200 sf and a maximum height of 12 '. A planned development can exceed the sign code maximums in size and total area, provided the signage is requested as part of the planned development. The proposed sign is consistent with the City's sign code except for the maximum height. The increased height is an appropriate request as signage massing is tied in the code to linear frontage. The additional 4' feet in height allows for landscaping to maintained with a taller height and the massing of the sign is appropriate along the large road frontage ( $+/-635$ linear feet).

Section 12-7, Dumpster Requirements: The location of all dumpsters shall be approved by the public services director or his designee and/or the building official or his designee. All dumpsters shall meet the requirements set forth in this section and all other ordinances, rules, regulations and policies adopted by the city.

Analysis: The proposed dumpster location in the NE corner of the project was reviewed by Public Works, who determined that the dumpster was consistent with the size and screening requirements. The dumpster is located in the NE corner of the property adjacent to the communication/cell tower and is fully screened with fencing and landscaping. The dumpster enclosure material shall be reviewed in a subsequent minor site plan amendment for architecturally consistency with the project.

Section 23.4-3, Exterior Lighting: All outdoor lighting shall be installed in conformance with the provisions of this chapter, applicable electrical and energy codes, and applicable sections of the building code.

Analysis: A photometric plan was provided depicting compliance with the exterior lighting requirements in Section 23.43 and does not allow light trespass upon neighboring residential properties or districts in excess of 12.57 lumens. However, lighting fixtures were not included as part of the applicant's submittal. A recommended condition of approval has been provided requiring that the lighting fixture be reviewed at building permit to comply with Dark Skies lighting recommendations and for consistency with the architecture of the buildings. Further, proposed fixtures shall be required to have a warm tone setting of 3000 K or less.

## Section 23.2-31 - Site Design Qualitative Standards (Attachment A)

Site Design Qualitative Standards are intended to "promote safety and minimize negative impacts of development on its neighbors by establishing qualitative requirements for the arrangements of buildings, structures, parking areas, landscaping and other site improvements. The qualitative standards are designed to ensure that site improvements are arranged in ways which cannot be otherwise accomplished with quantitative standards." These qualitative standards are applicable to site plan applications as well as all conditional uses. Compliance determination with the applicable standards in Section 23.2-31 are provided in Attachment A. The following analysis of the site, building, vehicular use area and appearance support the compliance findings for the applicable standards listed in Attachment A.

## Site Design Qualitative Standards Analysis (including vehicular use areas):

The proposed improvements to the site circulations, landscaping and architecture are consistent with the Site Design Qualitative Standards. The architecture for the project is generally appropriate and compatible to the surrounding area. The pedestrian and vehicular site circulation safely connects to the existing public right-of-way. Further, the site pedestrian circulation system is appropriately insulated from vehicular circulation. A new dumpster enclosure is proposed in the rear of the property; this improvement is properly screened as required, and the location is deemed appropriate for pick-up services by Pubic Works. Improvements to the existing landscaping are also proposed and discussed in the landscape section of this report.

The proposed configuration and landscape buffering of the parking lot and vehicular use areas will be effectively screened from the public view with shade trees, palm trees and shrubs within the landscape areas. The proposed curb cuts and parking lot layout does not create an unsafe situation and are typical for the form of the development. The proposed architectural modifications are harmonious as a whole, will improve the aesthetics of the site, and will be an asset to the neighborhood.

The existing uses in the surrounding area are as follows:

| Direction | Future Land Use | Zoning District | Existing Use |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| North | Mixed Use - West <br> (MU-W) | Mixed Use - West (MU- <br> W) | Multi-family Residential <br> (Oakwood Townhomes) |
| South | Mixed Use - West <br> (MU-W) | Mixed Use - West (MU- <br> W) | Multi-family Residential <br>  <br> Riverview House) |
| East | Mixed Use - West <br> (MU-W) | Mixed Use - West (MU- <br> W) | Multi-family Residential <br> (Oakwood Townhomes) |
| West | N/A | N/A | LWDD E-4 Canal ROW |

The proposed uses and site improvements will not negatively affect the existing surrounding properties and uses. They are harmonious and compatible with the existing mixed-use and residential area.

## Community Appearance Criteria:

The proposed building and associated site improvements represent a substantial improvement in the general appearance of the property by providing new landscape around the perimeter of the property, and new architecturally compatible buildings. The proposed architecture of the building is appropriate and in harmony with the surrounding residential and nonresidential area. Overall, the development proposal represents a substantial improvement in the visual appearance of the vacant property.

## Development of Significant Impact (DSI)

A development of significant impact (DSI) is a commercial, office, or industrial development of 100,000 or more gross square feet of enclosed building area, including renovations of existing structures when a change to a more intensive use is anticipated, or a residential development of 100 or more dwelling units, including renovations of existing structures when a change to a more intensive use is anticipated. The project proposed qualifies as a DSI because it exceeds 100 dwelling units.

Per LDR Section 23.2-35, a proposed DSI and any amendments to an approved DSI shall be reviewed and approved in accordance with the procedures and requirements for a Conditional Use Permit except that the City Commission shall be the decision maker and not the Planning and Zoning Board or the Historic Resources Preservation Board. The Conditional Use Permit criteria is outlined in the conditional use analysis in the subsequent section.

## Conditional Use Findings (Attachment B)

Conditional uses are those uses that are generally compatible with the other uses permitted in a district, but that require individual review of their location, design, structure, configuration, density and intensity of use, and may require the imposition of conditions pertinent thereto in order to ensure the appropriateness and compatibility of the use at a particular location and to prevent or minimize potential adverse impacts to the surrounding area. The project proposal includes a conditional use request to establish a residential development greater than 7,500 square feet.

The proposed conditional use is not anticipated to impact the surrounding area greater than uses permitted by right or greater than the previously approved mixed use on the property. The site is currently vacant. The applicant is proposing
multifamily buildings that do not utilize the maximum development potential. The buildings will be served by existing municipal services, including water, sewer, refuse, fire and police. The proposed associated site improvements would provide new landscaping and an improved condition over the current vacant parcel while providing new attainable housing options.

## Section 23.2-33(c) - Sustainable Bonus Incentive Program (SBIP)

The City of Lake Worth Beach Sustainable Bonus Incentive Program (SBIP) is intended to implement Objective 1.2.3 of the City's Comprehensive Plan which states the City shall establish incentives to help support the creation of a compact, sustainable, community-oriented development by implementing a Sustainable Bonus Incentive Program. The Program offers the opportunity to attain an option for increased height and/or FAR in exchange for the incorporation of sustainable design features, community-based improvements and overall design excellence as part of a development proposal.

Per Policy 1.2.3.4 of the City's Comprehensive Plan, a residential planned development may obtain a $25 \%$ bonus on density, intensity (FAR), and height over the base line as outlined in Table 1 of the Comprehensive Plan. The Applicant is asking for bonus height that is less than the maximum allowance permitted via the SBIP in a planned development in the MU-W zoning district. The square footage of the bonus area above the second floor (3rd, 4th, and 5th floors) is +/12,691 square feet per floor for all three buildings. The SBIP incentive value for all three buildings (Tier One - LDR) is $\$ 856,642.50$ ( 12,691 sf X 3 Floors X 3 Buildings X $\$ 7.50$ per sf). Fifty percent ( $50 \%$ ) of the incentive award value is $\$ 428,321.25$, which the applicant is required to pay to the City. For the remaining $50 \%$ of the incentive award value ( $\$ 428,321.25$ ), the applicant is proposing qualified improvements per Resolution 23-2021 \& LDR Section 23.2-33, which include a Florida Green Building certification ( $\$ 214,160.63$ ) and six ( 6 ) EV charging stations and conduits $(\$ 50,000$ ). The total value of the qualifying improvements is $\$ 264,160.63$. The total payment by the applicant to the City for the additional height includes the $50 \%$ required to be paid to the City ( $\$ 428,321.25$ ), plus the remaining value not mitigated by qualifying improvements ( $\$ 164,160.62$ ). Conditions of approval have been proposed to address the required schedule to pay the SBIP fees. The applicant may propose qualified on-site improvements or provide additional payment to the City.

## CONCLUSION AND CONDITIONS

The MU-W district is intended to provide for the establishment and expansion of a broad range of office and commercial uses, including moderate intensity and higher intensity commercial, hotel/motel and medium-density multiple-family residential development along the city's western thoroughfares. The establishment of certain uses is subject to conditional use review to ensure they will not create excessive problems for through traffic, or have a negative impact on nearby residential areas or the commercial viability of their neighbors. Based on the data and analysis in this report and the supporting materials by the applicant, the use is not anticipated to negatively impact adjacent residential property or have a negative impact on the commercial viability of neighboring commercial businesses. Further, the proposed site improvements are consistent with the City's LDR requirements. Therefore, a recommendation of approval is provided to the PZB with the following conditions:

## Planning \& Zoning

1. Fifty percent of the sustainable bonus fee $(\$ 428,321.25)$ shall be paid to the City within two years of approval, or prior to the issuance of the building permit, whichever comes first.
2. The applicant shall provide qualifying sustainable bonus features equal to $\$ 428,321.25$, or shall be required to pay the remaining portion of the $50 \%$ of the incentive value $(\$ 428,321.25)$ prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy.
3. Thirty (30) units shall be restricted for workforce housing in accordance with the City's Affordable/Workforce Housing Program prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the buildings
4. A unity of title shall be required to applied for and shall be recorded prior to the issuance of a building permit.
5. An address application shall be required to be submitted prior to application for building permit.
6. A video security system shall be required for the property.
7. Exterior lighting shall be required to comply dark sky lighting guidelines, including using fully shielded fixtures and led lighting that has a color temperature of no more than 3000 Kelvins. www.darksky.org Specifically, the lighting fixtures shall be reviewed at building permit for consistency with the dark sky guidelines and the architecture of the buildings.
8. A designated delivery and/or ride share space shall be provided.
9. Dumpster enclosure material shall be reviewed for architectural consistency and for compliance with all applicable City requirements at building permit.
10. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a minor site plan amendment or modification shall be approved to update the site plan data table to remove errors.

## Utilities (Water, Sewer \& Stormwater)

1. There are several locations where proposed storm chamber overlaps with the water/storm utility easements. The easement shall be free of obstructions.
2. Provide inlet protection on the storm collection structures in 2nd Avenue North and show the erosion control and sedimentation plan.
3. Capacity fees are due prior to building permit issuance.
4. The title block of all plans shall be updated to say Lake Worth Beach instead of Lake Worth.

## Public Works

1. The issuance of any permits shall comply with all provisions of the Lake Worth Municipal Code and all other applicable standards including but not limited to the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), and City of Lake Worth Public Services Construction Standards and Policy and Procedure Manual. No Certificate of Occupancy shall be granted until all conditions of approval have been satisfied under jurisdiction of the Department of Public Services.
2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall contact the Lake Worth Drainage (LWDD) District's Engineering Department and obtain any required permit(s), if necessary, and furnish to the City. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall contact the South Florida Water Management District's (SFWMD) Engineering Department and obtain any required permit(s), if necessary.
3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Applicant shall contact and meet with a representative from the Public Works Solid Waste and Recycling Division to confirm dumpster enclosure location, accessibility and demand on property and that it is compatible with the requirements of the Department of Public Works. Solid Waste Division contact number is 561-533-7344.
4. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the Applicant shall ensure the entire surrounding offsite infrastructure inclusive of the roadway, sidewalk, curbing, stormwater system piping and structures, valve boxes, manholes, landscaping, striping, signage, and other improvements are in the same condition as prior to construction.
5. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit an Erosion Control plan and indicate the BMP's and NPDES compliance practices.
6. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the applicant shall fine grade and sod all disturbed areas with bahia sod.
7. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the applicant shall broom sweep all areas of the affected right of way and remove of all silt and debris collected as a result of construction activity.
8. Prior to performing work in the right of way, the applicant shall apply for and receive issuance of a "Right of Way/Utility Permit" application.

## Electric Utility

1. Before or at the time of application for a Building Permit, Developer must provide the Load Calculation, Voltage requirements and Riser diagram. We will need to know the location of the Pad-Mount Transformers for the building. The Transformer locations must be accessible to our vehicles, and must have 8-ft minimum clearance in front of them and 3-ft clearance to the side or rear, including landscaping (None trees, plants, shrubs or vegetations are allowed within the clearance). The Transformers also must not be under or inside any structure.
2. Before the issuance of a Building permit, we will need a $10-\mathrm{ft}$ wide utility easement for the underground electric, transformers and other equipment that will need to be installed to provide power to this project.
3. The customer will be responsible for installing All Schedule 40 PVC Conduit that will be needed by Lake Worth Beach for this project for the primary cable. This conduit must be installed at a 24 " minimum depth. Pad specs will be given to the customer to show the proper orientation of conduit at the pad mount transformers.
4. Before the issuance of a Building permit, we will need to know if any other services will be needed for the project such as irrigation, lift station, lighting, gates, etc., and where these services will be.
5. Developer to show the location of the meter center on the site plan.
6. Developer will be responsible for installing their own lightning for the parking areas.
7. Developer will be responsible for the cost of Lake Worth Beach's materials and labor for this project.
8. Before the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the utility easement must be recorded.
9. Before the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy (CO) a final electrical inspection must be done.

## Building Division

1. Pedestrian connections to the club house will require enhanced striping.

## BOARD POTENTIAL MOTION:

I move to approve with conditions of Ordinance 2022-17 for a Residential Planned Development, Major Site Plan, Conditional Use, and Sustainable Bonus Incentive Program to construct a 195-unit multifamily residential development at the subject site based on upon the competent and substantial evidence provided in the staff report and in the testimony at the public hearing.

I move to disapprove Ordinance 2022-17 for a Residential Planned Development, Major Site Plan, Conditional Use, and Sustainable Bonus Incentive Program to construct a 195-unit multifamily residential development at the subject site. The project does not meet the conditional use criteria for the following reasons [Board member please state reasons.].

Consequent Action: The Planning \& Zoning Board's decision will be final decision for the Conditional Use Permit and Major Site Plan. The Applicant may appeal the Board's decision to the City Commission.

## ATTACHMENTS

A. Qualitative Development Standards
B. Conditional Use Findings
C. Application Package (survey, site plan, architectural plans \& supporting documents)

## ATTACHMENT A - Qualitative Development Standards

## Section 23.2-31(c) -Qualitative Development Standards

normal and orderly development or improvement of surrounding property for uses permitted in these LDRs.
2. Preservation of natural conditions. The natural (refer to landscape code, Article 6 of these LDRs) landscape shall be preserved in its natural state, insofar as practical, by minimizing tree and soil removal and by such other site planning approaches as are appropriate. Terrain and vegetation shall not be disturbed in a manner likely to significantly increase either wind or water erosion within or adjacent to a development site. Natural detention areas and other means of natural vegetative filtration of stormwater runoff shall be used to minimize ground and surface water pollution, particularly adjacent to major waterbodies. Fertilizer/pesticide conditions may be attached to development adjacent to waterbodies. Marinas shall be permitted only in water with a mean low tide depth of four feet or more.
3. Screening and buffering. Fences, walls or vegetative screening shall be provided where needed and practical to protect residents and users from undesirable views, lighting, noise, odors or other adverse off-site effects, and to protect residents and users of off-site development from on-site adverse effects. This section may be interpreted to require screening and buffering in addition to that specifically required by other sections of these LDRs, but not less.
4. Enhancement of residential privacy. The site plan shall provide reasonable, visual and acoustical privacy for all dwelling units located therein and adjacent thereto. Fences, walks, barriers and vegetation shall be arranged for the protection and enhancement of property and to enhance the privacy of the occupants.
5. Emergency access. Structures and other site features shall be so arranged as to permit emergency vehicle access by some practical means to all sides of all buildings.
6. Access to public ways. All buildings, dwelling units and other facilities shall have safe and convenient access to a public street, walkway or other area dedicated to common use; curb cuts close to railroad +crossings shall be avoided.
7. Pedestrian circulation. There shall be provided a pedestrian circulation system which is insulated as completely as reasonably possible from the vehicular circulation system.
8. Design of ingress and egress drives. The location, size and numbers of ingress and egress drives to the site will be arranged to minimize the negative impacts on public and private ways and on adjacent private property. Merging and turnout lanes traffic dividers shall be provided where they would significantly improve safety for vehicles and pedestrians.
9. Coordination of on-site circulation with off-site circulation. The arrangement of public or common ways for vehicular and pedestrian circulation shall be coordinated with the pattern of existing or planned streets and pedestrian or bicycle pathways in the area. Minor streets shall not be connected to major streets in such a way as to facilitate improper utilization.
10. Design of on-site public right-of-way (ROW). On-site public street and rights-of-way shall be designed to for maximum efficiency. They shall occupy no more land than is required to provide access, nor shall they unnecessarily fragment development into small blocks. Large developments containing extensive public rights-of-way shall have said rights-of-way arranged in a hierarchy with local streets providing direct access to parcels and other streets providing no or limited access to parcels.
11. Off-street parking, loading and vehicular circulation areas. Off-street parking, loading and vehicular circulation areas shall be located, designed and screened to minimize the impact of noise, glare and odor on adjacent property.
12. Refuse and service areas. Refuse and service areas shall be located, designed and screened to minimize the impact of noise, glare and odor on adjacent property.
13. Protection of property values. The elements of the site plan shall be arranged so as to have minimum negative impact on the property values of adjoining property.
14. Transitional development. Where the property being developed is located on the edge of the zoning district, the site plan shall be designed to provide for a harmonious transition between districts. Building exteriors shall complement other buildings in the vicinity in size, scale, mass, bulk, rhythm of openings and character. Consideration shall be given to a harmonious transition in height and design style so that the change in zoning districts is not accentuated. Additional consideration shall be given to complementary setbacks between the existing and proposed development.
15. Consideration of future development. In finding whether or not the above standards are met, the review authority shall consider likely future development as well as existing development.

In compliance

In compliance

In compliance

In compliance

In compliance

Section 23.2-31(d) - Qualitative Buildings, generally

1. Buildings or structures which are part of a present or future group or complex shall have a unity of character and design. The relationship of forms of the use, texture and color of material shall be such as to create one (1) harmonious whole. When the area involved forms an integral part of, is immediately adjacent to, or otherwise clearly affects the future of any established section of the city, the design, scale and location of the site shall enhance rather than detract from the character, value and attractiveness of the surroundings. Harmonious does not mean or require that the buildings be the same.
2. Buildings or structures located along strips of land or on a single site, and not a part of a unified multi-building complex shall achieve as much visual harmony with the surroundings as is possible under the circumstances. If a building is built in an undeveloped area, three (3) primary requirements shall be met, including honest design construction, proper design concepts, and appropriateness to the city.
3. All façades visible to public or adjacent property shall be designed to create a harmonious whole. Materials shall express their function clearly and not appear foreign to the rest of the building.
4. The concept of harmony shall not infer that buildings must look alike or be of the same style. Harmony can be achieved through the proper consideration of scale, mass, bulk, proportion, height, orientation, site planning, landscaping, materials, rhythm of solids to voids and architectural components including but not limited to porches, roof types, fenestration, orientation and stylistic expression.
5. Look-alike buildings shall not be allowed unless, in the opinion of the board, there is sufficient separation to preserve the aesthetic character of the present or evolving neighborhood. This is not to be construed to prohibit the duplication of floor plans and exterior treatment in a planned

In compliance

In compliance

In compliance

In compliance

In compliance
development where, in the opinion of the board, the aesthetics or the development depend upon, or are enhanced by the look-alike buildings and their relationship to each other.
6. Buildings, which are of symbolic design for reasons of advertising, unless otherwise compatible with the criteria herein, will not be approved by the board. Symbols attached to the buildings will not be allowed unless they are secondary in appearance to the building and landscape and are an aesthetic asset to the building, project and neighborhood.
7. Exterior lighting may be used to illuminate a building and its grounds for safety purposes, but in an aesthetic manner. Lighting is not to be used as a form of advertising in a manner that is not compatible to the neighborhood or in a manner that draws considerably more attention to the building or grounds at night than in the day. Lighting following the form of the building or part of the building will not be allowed if, in the opinion of the board, the overall effect will be detrimental to the environment. All fixtures used in exterior lighting are to be selected for functional as well as aesthetic value.
8. Building surfaces, walls and roofs shall be compatible and in harmony with the neighborhood.
9. "Take-out" or "pick-up" windows of retail or wholesale establishments shall not be located on a building façade that faces a public right-of-way, unless they are designed in such a manner as to constitute an aesthetic asset to the building and neighborhood.
10. All exterior forms, attached to buildings, shall be in conformity to and secondary to the building. They shall be an asset to the aesthetics of the site and to the neighborhood.
11. All telephones, vending machines, or any facility dispensing merchandise, or a service on private property, shall be confined to a space built into the building or buildings or enclosed in a separate structure compatible with the main building, and where appropriate and feasible, should not be readily visible from off-premises.
12. Buildings of a style or style-type foreign to south Florida or its climate will not be allowed. It is also to be understood that buildings which do not conform to the existing or to the evolving atmosphere of the city, even though possessing historical significance to south Florida, may not be approved.
13. No advertising will be allowed on any exposed amenity or facility such as benches and trash containers.
14. Light spillage restriction. The applicant shall make adequate provision to ensure that light spillage onto adjacent residential properties is minimized.

In compliance

In compliance

In compliance
Not applicable

In compliance

Not applicable

In compliance

In compliance

In compliance

1. Parking lots and other vehicular use areas are to be designed as an aesthetic asset to a neighborhood and to the building, group of buildings, or facility they serve. A parking lot is to be considered an outside space; a transitional space that is located between access areas (such as roads) and the building, group of buildings or other outside spaces which it serves. The parking lot, because it is viewed from above as well as at eye level, should be designed accordingly.
2. Parking lots, vehicular use areas, and vehicles parked therein are to be effectively screened from the public view and from adjacent property in a manner that is attractive and compatible with safety, the neighborhood and the facility served.
3. The responsibility for beautification and design of a parking lot is the same as that which a homeowner has to his residential lot. The atmosphere within a parking lot or vehicular use area is to be as pleasant and park-like as possible, rather than a harsh stand of paving. Trees are of primary importance to the landscape and are not to be minimized in either height or quantity. Trees impart a sense of three-dimensional space in a relatively flat area. Trees cast shadows that help to reduce the monotony of an expanse of paving and create a refuge from the tropical sun. Signs designating entrances, exits and regulations are to be of a tasteful design and shall be subject to review by the board. Consideration may be given to use of pavement which is varied in texture or color to designate lanes for automobile traffic, pedestrian walks and parking spaces. Brightly colored pavement is to be used with restraint. In order to create a pleasant atmosphere, it is recommended that consideration be given to sculpture, fountains, gardens, pools and benches. Design emphasis is to be given to the entrance and exit areas of the lot. Trash, refuse and unaesthetic storage and mechanical equipment shall be screened from the parking lot.
4. Lighting is to be designed for visual effects as well as safety and resistance to vandalism. Care should be taken not to create a nuisance to the neighborhood from brightness or glare. Low lights in modest scale can be used along with feature lighting emphasizing plants, trees, barriers, entrances and exits. The fixtures are to be selected for functional value and aesthetic quality. Fixtures should be regarded as "furniture of the parking lot" which are visible both day and night.

## Section 23.2-31(I) - Community Appearance Criteria

1. The plan for the proposed structure or project is in conformity with good taste, good design, and in general contributes to the image of the city as a place of beauty, spaciousness, harmony, taste, fitness, broad vistas and high quality.
2. The proposed structure or project is not, in its exterior design and appearance, of inferior quality such as to cause the nature of the local environment or evolving environment to materially depreciate in appearance and value.
3. The proposed structure or project is in harmony with the proposed developments in the general area, with code requirements pertaining to site plan, signage and landscaping, and the comprehensive plan for the city, and with the criteria set forth herein.
4. The proposed structure or project complies with this section and 23.2-29, Conditional Use Permits (CUP), as applicable.

In compliance

In compliance

In compliance

Analysis
In compliance

In compliance

In compliance

In compliance

## ATTACHMENT B - Findings for Granting Conditional Uses

Prior to approving any conditional use permit, the decision-making authority shall find based on competent and substantial evidence that the following criteria related to conditional uses are met:

1. The conditional use exactly as proposed at the location where proposed will be in harmony with the uses which, under these LDRs and the future land use element, are most likely to occur in the immediate area where located.
2. The conditional use exactly as proposed at the location where proposed will be in harmony with existing uses in the immediate area where located.
3. The conditional use exactly as proposed will not result in substantially less public benefit or greater harm than would result from use of the site for some use permitted by right or some other conditional use permitted on the site.
4. The conditional use exactly as proposed will not result in more intensive development in advance

In compliance

In compliance

In compliance

In compliance of when such development is approved by the future land use element of the comprehensive plan.

## Section 23.2-29(e) Specific findings for all conditional uses.

1. The proposed conditional use will not generate traffic volumes or movements which will result in a significant adverse impact or reduce the level of service provided on any street to a level lower than would result from a development permitted by right.
2. The proposed conditional use will not result in a significantly greater amount of through traffic on local streets than would result from a development permitted by right and is appropriately located with respect to collector and arterial streets
3. The proposed conditional use will not produce significant air pollution emissions, or will appropriately mitigate anticipated emissions to a level compatible with that which would result from a development permitted by right.
4. The proposed conditional use will be so located in relation to the thoroughfare system that neither extension nor enlargement nor any other alteration of that system in a manner resulting in higher net public cost or earlier incursion of public cost than would result from development permitted by right.
5. The proposed conditional use will be so located in relation to water lines, sanitary sewers, storm sewers, surface drainage systems and other utility systems that neither extension nor enlargement nor any other alteration of such systems in a manner resulting in higher net public cost or earlier incursion of public cost than would result from development permitted by right.
6. The proposed conditional use will not place a demand on municipal police or fire protection service beyond the capacity of those services, except that the proposed facility may place a demand on municipal police or fire protection services which does not exceed that likely to result from a development permitted by right.
7. The proposed conditional use will not generate significant noise, or will appropriately mitigate anticipated noise to a level compatible with that which would result from a development permitted by right. Any proposed use must meet all the requirements and stipulations set forth in section 15.24, Noise control.

## Analysis

In compliance

In compliance

In compliance

In compliance

In compliance

In compliance

In compliance
8. The proposed conditional use will not generate light or glare which encroaches onto any In compliance residential property in excess of that allowed in section 23.4-10, Exterior lighting.

January 10, 2022

City of Lake Worth Beach
Planning \& Zoning
1900 2nd Avenue North
Lake Worth Beach, FL 33461

## Re: Residences at Lake Worth Justification Statement <br> Original Intake: March 1, 2022

## Property Location

The property is located approximately $1 / 2$ mile east of the intersection of $2^{\text {nd }}$ Ave N and S Congress Ave, on the north side of $2^{\text {nd }}$ Ave N . The 7.40 acres site is located within the City of Lake Worth Beach and is identified by the following Property Control Numbers:

Parcel 1: 38-43-44-20-01-097-0020
Parcel 2: 38-43-44-20-01-097-0010
Parcel 3: 38-43-44-20-01-096-0020

## Property History

In 2014, the City of Lake Worth Beach approved a Mixed-Use development called Village of Valor, which consisted of 3 fourstory buildings and 104 units. However, the
 development was never constructed and has remained vacant, cleared of vegetation, since approval.

Notably, there is an existing cell tower located in the northeast corner of the property. The cell tower will remain in its existing location and accessed from the recorded easement ORB 10659 PG 1697 and ORB 12273 PG 1143 which is located on the far east side of the property.

## Application Request

The applicant has submitted this application to request Major Site Plan approval of a multi-family residential development, consisting of 195 units. In addition, a Conditional Use has been requested to allow the proposed density of $26.35 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ac}$ across the 7.40 acres property. The proposed development is considered a Development of Significant Impact, this request is also included in the application.

The proposed development is a gated community that includes three, five-story multi-family buildings that will accommodate 195 units which will be equally distributed between the three buildings, 65 units per building. The proposed units will be divided between 105 one-bedroom units and 90 two-bedroom units.

Residents will have access to multiple amenities on the property including a $4,980 \mathrm{sf}$ clubhouse with a management office, club room, fitness facility, yoga room and mail center. These amenities are located in the center of the property and will be the focal point entering into the community. Exterior to the clubhouse is a covered terrace and expansive pool deck with a central bar and grill area covered by an architectural pergola structure. Other site amenities include a fully connected sidewalk system that extends completely around the retention pond on the north and provides for access to a fenced dog park on the west side of the property.

In order to achieve the proposed five-story building, the applicant has requested to participate in the Sustainable Bonus Incentive. As discussed with staff, this application will occur closer to the time of building permit.

The applicant is using the City's affordable/workforce housing program and commits to cap rents for 30 units ( $15 \%$ of the total) in categories consistent with the Palm Beach County's Workforce Housing Program; in order to ensure affordable / workforce housing opportunities within the City. The workforce housing units will be comprised of the following:

- Low income (60-80\% AMI)
- 3-1 bedroom
- 4-2 bedroom
- Moderate 1 ( 80 - 100\% AMI)
- 3-1 bedroom
- 4-2 bedroom
- Moderate 2 (100 - 120\% AMI)
- 4-1 bedroom
- 4-2 bedroom
- Middle (120 - 140\% AMI)
- 4-1 bedroom
- 4-2 bedroom


## Surrounding Uses

Below are descriptions of the zoning and land uses of the adjacent properties:

North: Identified by PCN 38-43-44-20-01-081-0010 and is located within the City of Lake Worth Beach. The property directly north of subject site consists of a multi-family residential development. The property has a Mixed-Used-West (MU-W) FLU designation within the Mixed-Used-West (MUW) Zoning District.

South: Identified by PCN 00-43-44-20-25-000-0010 and 38-43-44-20-01-110-0010, located within Unincorporated Palm Beach County and the City of Lake Worth Beach. Both properties are existing multi-family residential development. The properties have PBC High Residential, 12 units per acre (HR-12) and Mixed-Used-West (MU-W) FLU designations and are within PBC High Residential (RH) and Mixed-Used-West (MU-W) Zoning Districts.

East: Identified by PCN 38-43-44-20-01-081-0010 and is located within the City of Lake Worth Beach. The property directly east of subject site consists of a multi-family residential development. The property has a Mixed-Used-West (MU-W) FLU designation within the Mixed-Used-West (MU-W) Zoning District.

West: Identified by PCN 00-43-44-20-00-000-1010 and is located within Unincorporated Palm Beach County. The property directly west of the subject site is the Lake Worth Drainage District E-4 Canal. The property has a High Residential, 8 units per acre (HR-8) FLU and is within the Medium Residential (RM) Zoning District.

## Site Design Qualitative Standards

Land Development Regulations Section 23.2-31.
Pursuant to Section 23.2-31, the applicant shall demonstrate that the requested site plan approval of a multi-family residential development is consistent with the City of Lake Worth Beach standards.

## 1. Harmonious and efficient organization; <br> All elements of the site plan shall be harmoniously and efficiently organized in relation to topography, the size and type of plot, the character of adjoining property and the type and size of buildings. The site shall be developed so as to not impede the normal and orderly development or improvement of surrounding property for uses permitted in these LDRs.

The proposed plan adheres property development regulations with the Mixed Use - West (MU-W) Zoning District and is consistent in character to the area which includes a variety of multi-family residential development along the $2^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue North corridor. The building height as proposed as five stories is also compatible with the transforming character of the surrounding community. This site is unique with natural barrier of LWDD canals on the north and west along with the cellular tower and access easements along the east which create separation from existing developments.

The plan has been organized to center the buildings internal to the site and along the $2^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue N to the help create an activated and integrated streetscape.
2. Preservation of natural conditions;

The natural (refer to landscape code, Article 6 of these LDRs) landscape shall be preserved in its natural state, insofar as practical, by minimizing tree and soil removal and by such other site planning approaches as are appropriate. Terrain and vegetation shall not be disturbed in a manner likely to significantly increase either wind or water erosion within or adjacent to a development site. Natural detention areas and other means of natural pollution, particularly adjacent to major waterbodies. Fertilizer/pesticide conditions may be attached to development adjacent to waterbodies. Marinas shall be permitted only in water with a mean low tide depth of four feet or more.

The site has minimal topography and the site has very limited vegetation. There is a line of various trees and shrubs along the Northeast and East boundary of the subject parcel adjacent to the communication tower that will be supplemented within the proposed development plans. The development area has been focused to the middle and south side of the property to limit any concern or impact to the adjacent LWDD canals on the west and north sides of the property. Additionally, the retention area has been located on the north side of the site which creates a natural transition from the development to the canal and waterway.

## 3. Screening and buffering;

Fences, walls, or vegetative screening shall be provided where needed and practical to protect residents and users from undesirable views, lighting, noise, odors, or other adverse off-site effects, and to protect residents and users of off-site development from on-site adverse effects. This section may be interpreted to require screening and buffering in addition to that specifically required by other sections of these LDRs, but not less.

The site is located in the Mixed Use-West Zoning District and is surrounded by high density, residential uses. Specifically, multi-family residential developments are located directly north, east and to the south of the subject site. A LWDD canal runs adjacent to the west property boundary and further west is a residential lot with multiple units. The proposed development will comply with all screening and buffering requirements outlined in Section 23.6-1 of the City's Land Development Regulations. Specifically, a 5' landscape buffer has been provided along the north, east and west property boundaries. A 20' landscape buffer has been provided along the south property boundary, along $2^{\text {nd }}$ Ave N . In addition to the landscape buffering methods provided by the proposed development we are proposing a 5 ' tall fence around the entire perimeter of the property and there are existing buffers for the neighboring developments along the north and east parcel boundaries. The combination of landscape buffer material will create sufficient screening for future and neighboring residents.

## 4. Enhancement of residential privacy;

The site plan shall provide reasonable, visual and acoustical privacy for all dwelling units located therein and adjacent thereto. Fences, walls, barriers and vegetation shall be arranged for the protection and enhancement of property and to enhance the privacy of the occupants.

As mentioned above, the proposed development shall comply with all screening and buffering requirements outlined in the City's Land Development Regulations. A 5' buffer is provided along the property boundaries and lush landscape buffers currently exist on the neighboring properties. The combination of both buffers will provide adequate security and privacy for residents. In addition, the proposed development will be a gated community and security access will be provided for all residents and guests with a 5 ' tall fence around the entire perimeter of the property.
5. Emergency access;

Structures and other site features shall be so arranged as to permit emergency vehicle access by some practical means to all sides of the buildings.

The proposed development has been designed to allow efficient and maneuverable access for emergency vehicles through the primary entrance from $2^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue N and through the proposed ingress and egress gates. A secondary access point has also been provided on the east side of the property by way of the existing communication tower access easement which also connects to $2^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue N. All gated access points have been designed at 20 ' width and will have a knox box will be provided to ensure prompt access to the site. The applicant has been working with PBC Fire directly on plan review and approval.
6. Access to public ways;

All buildings, dwelling units and other facilities shall have safe and convenient access to a public street, walkway or other area dedicated to common use; curb cuts close to railroad crossings shall be avoided.

The proposed development has been designed to provide vehicular access from $2^{\text {nd }}$ Ave N with a logical internal circulation of driveways and pedestrian sidewalks that lead to the public right-ofway. With this development, improvements will be made to $2^{\text {nd }}$ Ave N by providing twenty new parallel parking spaces and a new six-foot wide sidewalk. The accessibility and character of the public roadway will be significantly improved.
7. Pedestrian circulation;

There shall be provided a pedestrian circulation system which is insulated as completely as reasonably possible from the vehicular circulation system.

As mentioned, an internal walkway and sidewalk system has been provided to provide pedestrian circulation within the development, as well as provide access to the existing sidewalk along $2^{\text {nd }}$ Ave N. All buildings are connected to the central clubhouse in a logical and direct manner and access to the walking path that circulates around the retention pond.
8. Design of ingress and egress drives;

The location, size and numbers of ingress and egress drives to the site will be arranged to minimize the negative impacts on public and private ways and on adjacent private property. Merging and turnout lanes traffic dividers shall be provided where they would significantly improve safety for vehicles and pedestrians.

The proposed development will provide a single entrance driveway along $2^{\text {nd }}$ Ave N which has been coordinated with the City's staff. The development will be providing a roadway improvement that includes a left turn lane at the development entrance to ensure east bound traffic is not impacted. Additionally, the gated access points have been pushed well north of the property line to maximize resident / guest stacking.
9. Coordination of on-site circulation with off-site circulation;

The arrangement of public or common ways for vehicular and pedestrian circulation shall be coordinated with the pattern of existing or planned streets and pedestrian or bicycle pathways in the area. Minor streets shall not be connected to major streets in such a way as to facilitate improper utilization.

As mentioned above, the proposed development will provide vehicular access from the existing right-of-way $2^{\text {nd }}$ Ave N and pedestrian connection will be provided from the sidewalk along this street via an internal walkway system.
10. Design of on-site public right-of-way;

On-site public street and rights-of-way shall be designed for maximum efficiency. They shall occupy no more land than is required to provide access, nor shall they unnecessarily fragment development into small blocks. Large developments containing extensive public rights-of-way shall be said rights-of-way arranged in a hierarchy with local streets providing direct access to parcels and other streets providing no or limited direct access to parcels.

The development will have access from the existing right-of-way $2^{\text {nd }}$ Ave North, there are no internal public rights-of-way.
11. Off-street parking, loading and vehicular circulation areas;

Off-street parking, loading and vehicle circulation areas shall be located, designed and screened to minimize the impact of noise, glare and odor on adjacent property.

The main parking areas will not be visible from the public right-of-way as they are located behind the residential buildings that front on $2^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue N. Perimeter landscape buffering has been provided on both the east and west boundaries to screen any impacts to adjacent properties. All lighting within the parking area will be "night sky" compliant and have been located to assure there are no offsite impacts. There are twenty proposed parallel parking spaces that will be provided along $2^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue N that will help to activate the roadway and create a more urban feel to the roadway.

The development utilizes the Affordable / Workforce Housing Program's parking reduction incentive and provides $15 \%$ of the total units within appropriate workforce housing income categories. Therefore, the parking requirement for the 195 units has been reduced by $25 \%$. Parking calculations are shown in the site plan data table.
12. Refuse and service areas;

Refuse and service areas shall be located, designed and screened to minimize the impact of noise, glare and odor on adjacent property.

The proposed plan includes a dumpster and recycling area in the northeast corner of the parking lot, and adjacent to the communication tower minimizing visibility to resident on-site and off-site. Landscape buffering is also being provided to screen the structures on both side elevations.
13. Protection of property values;

The elements of the site plan shall be arranged so as to have minimum negative impacts on the property values of adjoining property.

The proposed development will not have a negative impact on adjacent property values. The property is currently cleared and vacant, the proposed development will provide added value and community tax revenue on an underutilized property within the City. The investment will beautify the public right-of-way and property and will be a positive influence on surrounding property values within the area.

## 14. Transitional development;

Where the property being developed is located on the edge of the zoning district, the site plan shall be designed to provide for a harmonious transition between districts. Building exteriors shall complement other buildings in the vicinity of size, scale, mass, bulk, rhythm of openings and character. Consideration shall be given to a harmonious transition in
height and design style so that the change in zoning districts is not accentuated. Additional consideration shall be given to complementary setbacks between the existing and proposed development.

The subject site is not located on the edge of the zoning district. The subject site is compatible and consistent with the adjacent properties in the area.
15. Consideration of future development;

In finding whether or not the above standards are met, the review authority shall consider likely future development as well as existing development.

According to the 2020 US Census, Palm Beach County is the third largest county in the state, with a $13 \%$ growth since 2010 . However, this data does not accommodate for the influx of residents that the state and county have experienced during the Covid-19 pandemic and currently. A report from the state's Office of Economic and Demographic Research, revealed that the state gained approximately 330,000 new residents between April 2020 and April 2021. In addition, multiple reports utilizing internal metrics and U.S. Census Bureau data, discovered that Florida was the third most popular place to move in the past year. Specifically, Palm Beach County saw an influx of more than 13,000 new residents. As the County's population continues to grow, the housing demand has drastically risen, causing a need for more residential development.

With the current housing demand in Palm Beach County, this project supplies needed housing. In the future, additional housing will be needed to meet growing population demand.

## Compliance with Community Appearance Criteria Section 23.2-31(I)

Land Development Regulations Section 23.2-31.
Pursuant to Section 23.2-31, the applicant shall demonstrate that the requested site plan approval of a Multi-Family development consisting of 195 units is consistent with the City of Lake Worth Beach's standards.

1. The plan for the proposed structure or project is in conformity with good taste good design and in general contributes to the image of the City as a place of beauty, spaciousness, harmony, taste, fitness, broad vistas and high quality.

The proposed development is in conformity with the surrounding area and other sites within the area, which consist of other multi-family developments. In fact, currently the existing site is vacant and underutilized. The proposed plan will enhance the property, as well provide an architectural aesthetic that is consistent with a more modern style while maintaining a character that is unique to the City of Lake Worth Beach.
2. The proposed structure or project is not, in its exterior design and appearance, of inferior quality such as to cause the nature of the local environment or evolving environment to materially depreciate in appearance and value.

The proposed project will enhance the existing conditions of the site and provide a more appealing exterior design and appearance for the area.
3. The proposed structure or project is in harmony with the proposed developments in the general area, with code requirements pertaining to site plan, signage and landscaping, and the comprehensive plan for the City, and with the criteria set forth herein.

The proposed project is in harmony with the development regulations of the zoning district, as demonstrated by the criteria above.
4. The proposed structure or project is in compliance with this section and 23.2-29, as applicable.

The proposed project is in compliance with this section and the development regulations, as demonstrated above.

## Conditional Use Criteria Section 23.2-29(d) \& Section 23.2-29(e)

Land Development Regulations Section 23.2-31.
General findings relating to harmony with LDRs and protection of public interest. Prior to approving any Conditional Use permit, the decision making authority shall find based on competent and substantial evidence that:

1. The Conditional Use exactly as proposed at the location where proposed will be in harmony with the uses which, under these LDRs and the Future Land Use Element, are most likely to occur in the immediate area where located.

The proposed multi-family development is permitted within the existing Zoning District and Future Land Use designation. The subject property is also surrounded by similar multi-family residential communities, which is compatible with the proposed use. As demonstrated by the proposed site plan and supporting documents, the proposed development complies with required development regulations including setbacks, parking and landscape requirements.
2. The Conditional Use exactly as proposed at the location where proposed will be in harmony with existing uses in the immediate area where located.

The proposed multi-family development is consistent with the projected use characteristics of the area and is surrounded by other residential communities. The proposed density and height further promote the intention of the zoning district to provide for new residential development and will be supplying a demand for housing opportunities within the City of Lake Worth Beach.
3. The conditional use exactly as proposed will not result in substantially less public benefit or greater harm than would result from use of the site for some use permitted by right or some other conditional use permitted on the site.

The proposed multi-family development will not result in less public benefit or harm. The proposed use offers more housing to an area experiencing tremendous growth while maintaining compatibility with the surrounding area. With the proposed improvements to $2^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue N , the public will benefit greatly from the roadway improvements, parking and site beautification.
4. The Conditional Use exactly as proposed will not result in more intensive development in advance of when such development is approved by the Future Land use Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

The proposed multi-family development is the most efficient use of the site and will not result in more intensive development in advance.

Specific findings for all conditional uses. Prior to approving any Conditional Use, the decision making authority shall find that:

1. The proposed Conditional Use will not generate traffic volumes or movements which will result in a significant adverse impact or reduce the level of service provided on any street to a level lower than would result from a development permitted by right.

The proposed multi-family development will not produce a significantly greater amount of traffic trips or have a negative impact on the roadway. A traffic impact analysis has also been provided and reviewed by the City and Palm Beach County and found to be in compliance with the required levels of service. Roadway improvement are being provided on $2^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue N , including and new east bound left turn-lane which will minimize any impacts to the current functionality of the roadway.
2. The proposed conditional use will not result in a significantly greater amount of through traffic on local streets than would result from a development permitted by right and is appropriately located with respect to collector and arterial streets.

As mentioned above, the proposed multi-family development will not produce a significantly greater amount of traffic trips or have a negative impact on the roadway then what would be
allowed by right within the zoning district. The surrounding roadway network has been analyzed in the traffic report provided by our traffic engineer Simmons \& White.
3. The proposed conditional use will not produce significant air pollution emissions, or will appropriately mitigate anticipated emissions to a level compatible with that which would result from a development permitted by right.

The proposed multi-family development will not produce significant air pollution emissions as a residential development consistent with the surrounding community.
4. The proposed conditional use will be so located in relation to the thoroughfare system that neither extension nor enlargement nor any other alteration of that system in a manner resulting in higher net public cost or earlier incursion of public cost than would result from development permitted by right.

The proposed multi-family development provides access from the existing right-of-way, $2^{\text {nd }}$ Ave N and expansion of the roadway network is not required.
5. The proposed Conditional Use will be so located in relation to water lines, sanitary sewers, storm sewers, surface drainage systems and other utility systems that neither extension nor enlargement nor any other alteration of such systems in a manner resulting in higher net public cost than would result from development permitted by right.

A conceptual water and sewer plan has been provided with the development and is utilizing existing infrastructure and will not result in any increased public cost to serve this community.
6. The proposed Conditional Use will not place a demand on municipal police or fire protection service beyond the capacity of those services, except that the proposed facility may place a demand on municipal police or fire protection services which does not exceed that likely to result from a development permitted by right.

The proposed multi-family development will not place a demand on municipal police or fire protection. Security measures and fire safety accessibility will be provided to ensure safe maneuverability within the site. The site is already in the service area for both police and fire protection and this does not create an expansion or burden on those services.
7. The proposed Conditional Use will not generate significant noise, or will appropriately mitigate anticipated noise to a level compatible with that which would result from a development permitted by right. Any proposed use must meet all the requirements and stipulations set forth in Section 15.24 - Noise Control.

The proposed multi-family development will not generate significant noise or disturbances.
8. The proposed Conditional Use will not generate light or glare which encroaches onto any residential property in excess of that allowed in Section 23.4-10 - Exterior Lighting

The proposed multi-family development consisting of 195 units shall ensure that there will not be light or glare generated that disturbs the surrounding developments. A Photometrics plan has been included in this application to ensure compliance.

Prior to approving any Conditional Use Permit, the decision making authority shall ensure that the following requirements have been met:

1. Any and all outstanding code enforcement fees and fines related to the project site have been paid to the City.

There are no outstanding code enforcement violations on the property.
2. Any previously imposed conditions of approval for the use at the site have been met, if applicable, unless request for amendment of conditions is part of the current Conditional Use Permit application.

Although, no previous conditions of approval exist currently for the property, the proposed development shall comply with the standard above.

## Sustainable Bonus Incentive Program Criteria

Land Development Regulations Section 23.2-33(2)
The proposed multi-family development is comprised of 5 -stories buildings, in order to achieve the additional stories and building height, the applicant is requesting to participate in the Sustainable Bonus Incentive Program. The proposed building square foot bonus is approximately 38,073 SF for floors 35 of each building.

The approved value of the required improvements for the SBIP is $\$ 7.50$ per square for the bonus area. Based on a typical building story of $10,001 \mathrm{SF}$ of leasable area, and with each building obtaining three bonus stories (floors 3-5), there is a total bonus building area of $90,009 \mathrm{SF}$. This will equate to a value of $\$ 675,068$ ( $\$ 7.50 \times 90,009 \mathrm{SF}$ ) of which $50 \%$ will be paid to the City and the remaining $50 \%$ is met through a variety of on and offsite improvements that will exceed the required value of the second 50\% .
\$337,500 Florida Green Building Silver Certification
$\$ 50,000 \quad 6$ EV Charging Stations and conduits
$\$ 50,000 \quad$ Additional Open Space (beyond requirements of the code)

| $\$ 200,000$ | Coastal Hazards - Improvement of LWDD Canal Banks |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\$ 50,000$ | Urban Form and Density - Buildings framing the street and high density residential |
| $\$ 100,000$ | Public Parking - 20 On-Street Parking spaces provided |
| $\$ 50,000$ | Complete Streets - On-street Parking, Sidewalk, Landscaping along street frontage |
| $\$ 260,000$ | Workforce housing (\$10,000 for 1 bedroom @ 26 units) |
| $\$ 440,000$ | Workforce housing ( $\$ 20,000$ for 2 bedroom @ 22 units) |
| $\$ 50,000$ | Character and aesthetic excellence |
| $\$ 1,587,500$ | Total provided |

Prior to approving any application, the decision-making authority shall find based on competent and substantial evidence that:
(a) Is the award calculated correctly, consistent with the square footage and height requested and the value of the features and improvements included in the development proposal; and

The applicant believes the award is calculated correctly and consistent with square footage for the three residential buildings and height requested as outlined in the narrative above. This has been reviewed with the City staff and we have received verbal feedback that the plans met the requirements for the bonus building heights.
(b) Do the proposed on-site features or improvements adequately provide sustainable project enhancements, beyond those otherwise required by these LDRs for the development proposal, that are attainable and reasonable in the context of the proposed project; and

The proposed on-site features or improvements well exceed the value of the sustainable project enhancements required by this code section. As outlined above the total value of sustainable project enhancements is in excess of $\$ 1,500,000$ and touches on a variety of focus areas that are recommended within the code including FGBC certification of the buildings.
(c) Do the proposed off-site improvements meet the priorities of the city for community sustainability; and

The proposed off-site improvements will meet the priorities of the city for community sustainability as the proposal exceeds the requirements of this code by utilizing a variety of improvements both architecturally, site development and through the provision of workforce housing.
(d) Do the proposed features, improvements or fees in-lieu meet the intent of the Sustainable Bonus Incentive Program?

This application would require a total value of $\$ 675,068(\$ 7.50 \times 675,068 \mathrm{SF}$ ) based on the amount of bonus building SF area proposed above two-stories. The applicant is proposing over $\$ 1,500,000$ of sustainable bonus value that meet the intent of the SBIP.

Thank you for your consideration of this application. If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact me at 561-249-0940.

Sincerely,
Brian Terry, PLA
Principal
Insite Studio, Inc.



(2) ENLARGED SECTION

(1) RESIDENTIAL BUILDING SECTION
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| Statistics |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dosacton | smmad | An | max | mn | max |
|  | + | ${ }^{256}$ | ${ }^{5210}$ | ${ }_{176} 1.10$ | 471 |
| Proeser ine $(2-0)$ | + | 0010 | 0.56 | 000 | N/A |


| Luminare Locations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | ${ }_{\text {Labed }}$ | $\times$ | Lataten | , | w+ | orematan | тw |
| 1 | s | 3862 | 1342 | 200 | 20 | 1800 | 0 |
| $\stackrel{2}{2}$ | s | ${ }^{647}$ | ${ }^{1342}$ | 20 | 200 | 180 | 0 |
| ${ }^{3}$ | 5 | 583 | 1342 | 200 | 200 | 1200 | 0 |
| 4 | s | ${ }^{920}$ | 1342 | 200 | 200 | 1800 | 00 |
| 5 | s | ${ }^{324}$ | ${ }^{684}$ | 200 | 200 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | s | 583 | 695 | 200 | 200 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | s | ${ }_{4} 84$ | 68 | 200 | 200 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | s | ${ }^{813}$ | ${ }_{1814}$ | 200 | 200 | -200 | 0 |
| . | s | ${ }^{213}$ | 0.4 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 0 |
| 10 | s | 7008 | 199 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 0 |
| ${ }^{11}$ | s | ${ }^{2005}$ | ${ }^{537}$ | 20 | 20 |  | 0 |
| 12 | s | sad | ${ }_{189} 8$ | 200 | 200 | \%00 | 0 |
| ${ }^{13}$ | s | 593 | 68 | 200 | 200 | 80 | 0 |
| 14 | s | ${ }^{2925}$ | -760 | 200 | 200 | 0 | 0 |
| ${ }^{15}$ | 5 | ${ }^{303}$ | -760 | 200 | 200 | 0 | 0 |
| ${ }_{16}$ | S | 2918 | 780 | 200 | 200 | 0 | 0 |
| 17 | s | 689 | ${ }^{7} 84$ | 200 | 200 | 0 | 0 |
| 18 | s | ${ }^{6168}$ | .754 | 200 | 200 | 0 | 0 |
| ${ }^{19}$ | s | 4665 | Q, | 200 | 200 | 80 | 0 |
| 20 | s | 4665 | -1453 | 200 | 200 | no | 0 |
| 21 | s | 800 | -1455 | 200 | 200 | -200 | 0 |
| 2 | 5 | 5655 | ${ }^{\text {as }}$ | 200 | 200 | 536 | 0 |
| ${ }_{2}$ | s | 238 | ${ }^{24} 3$ | 200 | 200 | ${ }^{11.1}$ | 0 |
| 24 | s | 27. | 368 | 200 | 200 | ${ }^{11.0}$ | 0 |
| ${ }_{25}$ | s | $3{ }^{34} 1$ | 109 | 200 | 200 | 110 | 00 |
| 26 | s | 4152 | 453 | 200 | 200 | ${ }^{124}$ | 0 |
| ${ }^{2}$ | s | 395 | ${ }^{6}$ | 200 | 200 | ${ }^{124}$ | 0 |
| ${ }^{28}$ | 5 | se9 | 28 | 200 | 200 | 20 | 00 |
| 5 | s | ra4 | 216.1 | 200 | 200 | 1800 | 0 |
| 30 | 82 | 719 | ${ }^{12,8}$ | 200 | 20 | 00 | 0 |
| 3 | 82 | ${ }_{32} 37$ | 807 | 200 | 200 | 877 | 0 |
| 32 | s2 | 300 | ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 200 | 20 | 87 | 0 |
| ${ }^{3}$ | s2 | 696 | 1651 | 200 | 200 | 90 | 0 |
| ${ }_{3}$ | s2 | ${ }^{196}$ | ${ }^{0 .}$ | 200 | 200 | $\infty$ | 0 |
| ${ }^{35}$ | 32 | 79 | ${ }^{62}$ | 200 | 200 | \%00 | 0 |
| ${ }^{6}$ | s2 | 698 | 654 | 200 | 200 | \%00 | 0 |
| ${ }^{37}$ | 38 | 638 | ${ }^{24}$ | 200 | 200 | 90 | 0 |
| ${ }^{38}$ | s | 447 | . 9 | 200 | 200 | 1800 | 0 |
| ${ }^{89}$ | s | s32 | .s | 200 | 200 | 1800 |  |
| ${ }^{40}$ | s | $5{ }^{520}$ | 110 | 200 | 200 | 1200 | 0 |
| 4 | 5 | 608 | 2161 | 200 | 200 | 1800 | 0 |

notes
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### 1.0 SITE DATA

The subject parcel is located on the north side of $2^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue North, east of Lake Worth Drainage District E-4 Canal in the City of Lake Worth Beach, Florida and contains approximately 6.65 acres. The Property Control Numbers (PCNs) for the subject parcel are 38-43-44-20-01-096-0020, 38-43-44-20-01-097-0010, and 38-43-44-20-01-097-0020. Proposed site development on the currently unimproved parcel consists of 195 multifamily dwelling units with a project buildout of 2026. Site access is proposed via an easterly ingress only driveway and a westerly egress only driveway to $2^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue North.

### 2.0 PURPOSE OF STUDY

This study will analyze the proposed development's impact on the surrounding major thoroughfares within the project's radius of development influence in accordance with the Palm Beach County Unified Land Development Code Article 12 - Traffic Performance Standards. The Traffic Performance Standards state that a Site Specific Development Order for a proposed project shall meet the standards and guidelines outlined in two separate "Tests" with regard to traffic performance.

Test 1, or the Build-Out Test, relates to the build-out period of the project and requires that a project not add traffic within the radius of development influence which would have total traffic exceeding the adopted LOS at the end of the buildout period. This Test 1 analysis consists of two parts and no project shall be approved for a Site Specific Development Order unless it can be shown to satisfy the requirements of Parts One and Two of Test 1.

Part One - Intersections, requires the analysis of major intersections, within or beyond a project's radius of development influence, where a project's traffic is significant on a link within the radius of development influence. The intersections analyzed shall operate within the applicable threshold associated with the level of analysis addressed.

Part Two - Links, compares the total traffic in the peak hour, peak direction on each link within a project's radius of development influence with the applicable LOS "D" link service volumes. The links analyzed shall operate within the applicable thresholds associated with the level of analysis addressed.

Test 2, or the Five Year Analysis, relates to the evaluation of project traffic five years in the future and requires that a project not add traffic within the radius of development influence which would result in total traffic exceeding the adopted LOS at the end of the Five Year Analysis period.

This test requires analysis of links and major intersections as necessary within or beyond the radius of development influence, where a project's traffic is significant on a link within the radius of development influence.

### 2.0 PURPOSE OF STUDY (CONTINUED)

This analysis shall address the total traffic anticipated to be in place at the end of the build out year. This study will verify that the proposed development's traffic impact will meet the above Traffic Performance Standards.

### 3.0 TRAFFIC GENERATION

Trip generation has been calculated in accordance with the ITE Trip Generation Manual, $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition and the Palm Beach County Trip Generation Rates. Table 1 shows the daily traffic generation associated with the proposed development in trips per day (TPD). Tables 2 and 3 show the AM and PM peak hour traffic generation, respectively, in peak hour trips (pht). The net traffic to be generated by 195 multifamily dwelling units may be summarized by as follows:

## Proposed Development

| Daily Traffic Generation | $=1,061 \mathrm{tpd}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| AM Peak Hour Traffic Generation (In/Out) | $=70 \mathrm{pht}(18 \ln / 52$ Out $)$ |
| PM Peak Hour Traffic Generation (In/Out) | $=86 \mathrm{pht}(52 \ln / 34$ Out $)$ |

### 4.0 RADIUS OF DEVELOPMENT INFLUENCE

Based on Table 12.B.2.D-7 3A of the Palm Beach County Unified Land Development Code Article 12 - Traffic Performance Standards, for a net trip generation of 86 peak hour trips, the development of influence shall be a one (1) mile radius.

For Test 1, a project must address those links within the radius of development influence on which its net trips are greater than $1 \%$ of the LOS "D" of the link affected on a peak hour, peak direction basis AND those links outside of the Radius of development influence on which its net trips are greater than five percent of the LOS "D" of the link affected on a peak hour, peak direction basis up to the limits set forth in Table 12.B.2.C-1 1A: LOS "D" Link Service Volumes.

For Test 2, a project must address those links within the radius of development influence on which its net trips are greater than $3 \%$ of the LOS " $E$ " of the link affected on a peak hour, peak direction basis AND those links outside of the radius of development influence on which its net trips are greater than five percent of the LOS "E" of the link affected on a peak hour, peak direction basis up to the limits set forth in Table 12.B.2.C-4 2A: LOS "E" Link Service Volumes.

### 5.0 EXISTING TRAFFIC

Existing AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes for the links within the project's radius of development influence were available from the Palm Beach County Engineering Traffic Division. Background traffic data from the Palm Beach County Engineering Traffic Division consisting of historical growth rates, major project traffic, and anticipated development in the area was also considered. Table 4 presents the area wide growth rate calculations.

### 6.0 TRIP DISTRIBUTION

The project trips were distributed and assigned on the links within the radius of development influence based on the existing and anticipated traffic patterns. Figure 1 presents the trip distribution percentages.

### 7.0 TRAFFIC ASSIGNMENT/DISTRIBUTION TEST 1 - PART 2

Tables 5 and 6 (in Appendix A) show the project's AM and PM peak hour trip assignment, respectively, as well as the applicable Level of Service Standard for each of the links within the project's radius of development influence. Links with a project assignment greater than 1\% of the applicable Level of Service "D" have been outlined as links with significant project assignment.

Tables 7 and 8 (in Appendix A) shows the projected total AM peak hour traffic volumes and threshold volumes for the links with significant project assignment within the project's radius of development influence. For the links, the 2026 total traffic has been calculated using the higher value between the link historical growth rate and the combination of a $1.0 \%$ background growth rate and the approved committed development trips.

A review of Tables 5-8 indicates this project meets Test 1 - Part 2 of the Palm Beach County Traffic Performance Standards on all links within the project's radius of development influence.

### 8.0 INTERSECTION ANALYSIS TEST 1 - PART 1

As a requirement of Part 1 of Test 1 of the Palm Beach County Traffic Performance Standards, all major intersections in each direction nearest to the point at which the project's traffic enters each project accessed link, and where the project traffic entering or exiting the intersection from/to the project accessed link is significant, must be analyzed. Therefore, the following intersections must be analyzed for the 2026 projected AM and PM peak hours:

## $2^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue North at Congress Avenue

For each intersection, the 2026 total traffic has been calculated using the higher value between the background growth rate and the combination of a $1.0 \%$ background growth rate and the approved committed development trips. The 2026 build-out volume reports from the Palm Beach County Engineering Traffic Division TPS Database are included in Appendix B.

Each intersection has been analyzed using the adjusted turning movement volumes in accordance with the methodology set forth in the Transportation Research Board Special Report 209, Planning Analysis. The intersection analyses are included in Appendix C. The analysis results show that the sum of the critical movements during the peak season, peak hours at project build-out is less than the adopted Level of Service volume of 1,400 vehicles per hours (vph) for the subject intersections.

### 8.0 INTERSECTION ANALYSIS TEST 1 - PART 1 (CONTINUED)

INTERSECTION<br>$2^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue North at Congress Avenue<br>CRITICAL SUM<br>AM PM<br>$1,236 \quad 1,385$

### 9.0 TEST 2 BUILD-OUT ANALYSIS

Test 2, or the Five Year Analysis, relates to the evaluation of project traffic five years in the future and requires that a project not add traffic within the radius of Development influence which would result in total traffic exceeding the adopted LOS at the end of the Five Year Analysis Period.

Tables 9 and 10 (in Appendix D) show the project's AM and PM peak hour trip assignment, respectively, as well as the applicable Level of Service Standard for each of the links within the project's radius of development influence. Links with a project assignment greater than $3 \%$ of the applicable Level of Service "E" have been outlined as links with significant project assignment.

Tables 11 and 12 (in Appendix D) shows the projected total AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes and threshold volumes for the links with significant project assignment within the project's radius of development influence.

A review of Tables 9-12 indicates this project meets Test 2 of the Palm Beach County Traffic Performance Standards on all links within the project's radius of development influence.

### 10.0 SITE RELATED IMPROVEMENTS

The AM and PM peak hour volumes at the project entrances for the overall development with no reduction for pass by credits are shown in Tables 2 and 3 and may be summarized as follows:

> DIRECTIONAL DISTRIBUTION (TRIPS IN/OUT)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{AM}=18 / 52 \\
& \mathrm{PM}=52 / 34
\end{aligned}
$$

Figure 2 presents the AM and PM peak turning movement volume assignments at the project driveway based on the directional distributions. As previously mentioned, site access is proposed via an easterly ingress only driveway and a westerly egress only driveway to $2^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue North. Based on the Palm Beach County Engineering Guidelines used in determining the need for turn lanes of 75 right turns or 30 left turns in the peak hour, and on the low traffic volumes on $2^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue North, additional turn lanes are not warranted or recommended.

### 11.0 CONCLUSION

The proposed development has been estimated to generate 1,061 trips per day, 70 AM peak hour trips, and 86 PM peak hour trips at project build-out in 2026. Based on an analysis of existing and project traffic characteristics and distribution, as well as the existing and future roadway network geometry and traffic volumes, this overall project meets the Link/Build-Out Test and Five Year Analysis test as required by the Palm Beach County Traffic Performance Standards.

## TABLE 1 - Daily Traffic Generation

| Landuse | ITE | Intensity |  |  |  | Split |  | Internalization |  |  | Pass-by |  | Net Trips |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Code |  |  | Rate/Equation | In | Out | Gross Trips | \% | Total | External Trips | \% | Trips |  |
| Multifamily Mid-Rise Housing 3-10 story (Apartment/Condo/TH) | 221 | 195 | Dwelling Units | 5.44 |  |  | 1,061 |  | 0 | 1,061 | 0\% | 0 | 1,061 |
|  |  |  | Grand Totals: |  |  |  | 1,061 | 0.0\% | 0 | 1,061 | 0\% | 0 | 1,061 |

## TABLE 2 - AM Peak Hour Traffic Generation

| Landuse | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ITE } \\ & \text { Code } \end{aligned}$ | Intensity |  | Rate/Equation | Dir Split |  | Gross Trips |  |  | Internalization |  |  |  | External Trips |  |  | Pass-by |  | Net Trips |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | In | Out | Total | \% | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total | \% | Trips | In | Out | Total |
| Multifamily Mid-Rise Housing 3-10 story (Apartment/Condo/TH) | 221 | 195 | Dwelling Units |  | 0.36 | 0.26 | 0.74 | 18 | 52 | 70 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 52 | 70 | 0\% | 0 | 18 | 52 | 70 |
|  |  |  | Grand Totals: |  |  |  | 18 | 52 | 70 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 52 | 70 | 0\% | 0 | 18 | 52 | 70 |

TABLE 3 - PM Peak Hour Traffic Generation

| Landuse | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ITE } \\ & \text { Code } \end{aligned}$ | Intensity |  | Rate/Equation | Dir Split |  | Gross Trips |  |  | Internalization |  |  |  | External Trips |  |  | Pass-by |  | Net Trips |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | In | Out | In | Out | Total | \% | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total | \% | Trips | In | Out | Total |
| Multifamily Mid-Rise Housing 3-10 story (Apartment/Condo/TH) | 221 | 195 | Dwelling Units |  | 0.44 | 0.61 | 0.39 | 52 | 34 | 86 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 34 | 86 | 0\% | 0 | 52 | 34 | 86 |
|  |  |  | Grand Totals: |  |  |  | 52 | 34 | 86 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 34 | 86 | 0\% | 0 | 52 | 34 | 86 |




TABLE 4
AREA WIDE GROWTH RATE CALCULATION


* 2016 and 2019 peak season daily traffic volumes were used for links where 2017 or 2020 volumes were unavailable.
** 2015 and 2018 peak season daily traffic volumes were used for links where 2016, 2017, 2019 or 2020 volumes were unavailable.


## APPENDIX A

TEST 1 PART 2: LINK ANALYSIS

TABLE 5
TEST 1 - PROJECT SIGNIFICANCE CALCULATION AM PEAK HOUR
2026 BUILD OUT
1 MILE RADIUS OF DEVELOPMENT INFLUENCE
1 MILE RADIUS OF DEVELOPMENT INFIPENCE
TOTAL AM PEAK HOUR PROJECT TRIPS (EXITING) $=\quad 52$

| STATION | ROADWAY | FROM | TO | AM PEAK HOUR DIRECTIONAL |  |  |  | TOTAL |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4677 | 2ND AVENUE | LAKE WORTH ROAD | CONGRESS AVENUE | 5\% | 3 | 2 | 1 | 880 | 0.34\% | NO |
| 4679 | 2ND AVENUE | CONGRESS AVENUE | SITE | 60\% | 31 | 2 | 1 | 880 | 3.52\% | YES |
| 4679 | 2ND AVENUE | SITE | BOUTWELL ROAD | 40\% | 21 | 2 | 1 | 880 | 2.39\% | YES |
| 4647 | LAKE WORTH ROAD | KIRK ROAD | 2ND AVENUE | 23\% | 12 | 6D | II | 2680 | 0.45\% | NO |
| 4647 | LAKE WORTH ROAD | 2ND AVENUE | CONGRESS AVENUE | 19\% | 10 | 6D | II | 2680 | 0.37\% | NO |
| 4651 | LAKE WORTH ROAD | CONGRESS AVENUE | BOUTWELL ROAD | 10\% | 5 | 4D | II | 1770 | 0.28\% | NO |
| N/A | LAKE WORTH ROAD | BOUTWELL ROAD | A STREET | 9\% | 5 | 4D | 11 | 1770 | 0.28\% | NO |
| 4604 | CONGRESS AVENUE | 10TH AVENUE N | FRENCH AVENUE | 24\% | 12 | 6D | II | 2680 | 0.45\% | NO |
| 4620 | CONGRESS AVENUE | FRENCH AVENUE | 2ND AVENUE | 24\% | 12 | 6D | II | 2680 | 0.45\% | NO |
| 4620 | CONGRESS AVENUE | 2ND AVENUE | LAKE WORTH AVENUE | 30\% | 16 | 6D | II | 2680 | 0.60\% | NO |
| 4622 | CONGRESS AVENUE | LAKE WORTH AVENUE | 6TH AVENUE S | 10\% | 5 | 6D | 11 | 2680 | 0.19\% | NO |
| 4676 | BOUTWELL ROAD | 10TH AVENUE N | 2ND AVENUE NORTH | 30\% | 16 | 2 | 1 | 880 | 1.82\% | YES |
| N/A | BOUTWELL ROAD | 2ND AVENUE NORTH | LAKE WORTH ROAD | 10\% | 5 | 2 | 1 | 880 | 0.57\% | NO |

TABLE 6
TEST 1 - PROJECT SIGNIFICANCE CALCULATION PM PEAK HOUR

## 2026 BUILD OUT

1 MILE RADIUS OF DEVELOPMENT INFLUENCE
TOTAL PM PEAK HOUR PROJECT TRIPS (ENTERING) = 52
TOTAL PM PEAK HOUR PROJECT TRIPS (EXITING) $=\quad 34$

| STATION | ROADWAY | FROM | TO | PM PEAK HOUR DIRECTIONAL |  |  |  | TOTAL |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4677 | 2ND AVENUE | LAKE WORTH ROAD | CONGRESS AVENUE | 5\% | 3 | 2 | 1 | 880 | 0.34\% | NO |
| 4679 | 2ND AVENUE | CONGRESS AVENUE | SITE | 60\% | 31 | 2 | 1 | 880 | 3.52\% | YES |
| 4679 | 2ND AVENUE | SITE | BOUTWELL ROAD | 40\% | 21 | 2 | 1 | 880 | 2.39\% | YES |
| 4647 | LAKE WORTH ROAD | KIRK ROAD | 2ND AVENUE | 23\% | 12 | 6 D | II | 2680 | 0.45\% | NO |
| 4647 | LAKE WORTH ROAD | 2ND AVENUE | CONGRESS AVENUE | 19\% | 10 | 6 D | II | 2680 | 0.37\% | NO |
| 4651 | LAKE WORTH ROAD | CONGRESS AVENUE | BOUTWELL ROAD | 10\% | 5 | 4D | 11 | 1770 | 0.28\% | NO |
| N/A | LAKE WORTH ROAD | BOUTWELL ROAD | A STREET | 9\% | 5 | 4D | 11 | 1770 | 0.28\% | NO |
| 4604 | CONGRESS AVENUE | 10TH AVENUE N | FRENCH AVENUE | 24\% | 12 | 6D | II | 2680 | 0.45\% | NO |
| 4620 | CONGRESS AVENUE | FRENCH AVENUE | 2ND AVENUE | 24\% | 12 | 6D | II | 2680 | 0.45\% | NO |
| 4620 | CONGRESS AVENUE | 2ND AVENUE | LAKE WORTH AVENUE | 30\% | 16 | 6D | II | 2680 | 0.60\% | NO |
| 4622 | CONGRESS AVENUE | LAKE WORTH AVENUE | 6TH AVENUE S | 10\% | 5 | 6D | 11 | 2680 | 0.19\% | NO |
| 4676 | BOUTWELL ROAD | 10TH AVENUE N | 2ND AVENUE NORTH | 30\% | 16 | 2 | 1 | 880 | 1.82\% | YES |
| N/A | BOUTWELL ROAD | 2ND AVENUE NORTH | LAKE WORTH ROAD | 10\% | 5 | 2 | 1 | 880 | 0.57\% | NO |

## \title{ TABLE 7 

 <br> AM PEAK HOUR-TEST 1}2026 BUILD OUT
Mile radius of development influence
AREA WIDE GROWTH RATE =
TOTAL AM PEAK HOUR PROJECT TRIPS (ENTERING)
3.48\%

TOTAL AM PEAK HOUR PROJECT TRIPS (EXITING) =

| 18 |
| :--- |
| 52 |



| PM PEAKKBLE 8 -TEST 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2026 BUILD OUT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 MILE RADIUS OF DEVELOPMENT INFLUENCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AREA WIDE GROWTH RATE = |  | 3.48\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL PM PEAK HOUR PROJECT TRIPS (ENTERING) = |  | 52 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL PM PEAK HOUR PROJECT TRIPS (EXITING) |  | 34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ROADWAY | FROM | то | DIRECTION | TRAFFIC COUNT YEAR | PM PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC | PROJECT DISTRIBUTION | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PM PEAK } \\ \text { HOUR } \\ \text { PROJECT } \\ \text { TRIPS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | LINK GROWTH | MAJOR PROJECT | $\begin{gathered} 1.0 \% \\ \text { GROWTH } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL <br> BACKGROUNL TRAFFIC USED | 2026TOTAL | ASSUREDLANES | CLASS | LOS D | MEETS LOS STD. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TRAFFIC |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | EB | 2020 | 320 | 60\% | 31 | 73 | 33 | 20 | 73 | 424 | 2 | 1 | 880 | YES |
| 2ND AVENUE | CONGRESS AVENUE | SITE | WB | 2020 | 391 | 60\% | 20 | 89 | 25 | 24 | 89 | 500 | 2 | 1 | 880 | YES |
|  |  |  | EB | 2020 | 320 | 40\% | 14 | 73 | 33 | 20 | 73 | 407 | 2 | 1 | 880 | YES |
| 2ND AVENUE | SITE | BOUTWELL ROAD | WB | 2020 | 391 | 40\% | 21 | 89 | 25 | 24 | 89 | 501 | 2 | 1 | 880 | YES |
| BOUTWELL ROAD | 10TH AVENUE N |  | NB | 2020 | 397 | 30\% | 10 | 90 | 74 | 24 | 98 | 505 | 2 | 1 | 880 | YES |
| boutwell road | 10th AVENUEN | 2ND AVENUENORTH | SB | 2020 | 549 | 30\% | 16 | 125 | 67 | 34 | 125 | 690 | 2 | 1 | 880 | YES |

# APPENDIX B 

## PBC TPS DATABASE 2026 BUILD-OUT LINK \& INTERSECTION VOLUME SHEETS (WITH APPROVED COMMITTED TRIPS)

Input Data

ROAD NAME: 2nd Ave N
CURRENT YEAR: 2020
ANALYSIS YEAR: 2026
GROWTH RATE: 9.43\%

STATION: 4679
FROM: Congress Ave
TO: MIDPOINT
COUNT DATE: 02/12/2020
PSF: 1

Time Period
Direction
Existing Volume
Peak Volume
Diversion(\%)
Volume after Diversion

| Committed Developments |  |  |  |  |  |  | Type \% Complete |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ADOPT A FAMILY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | 100\% |
| Lake Worth Corners | 15 | 3 | 12 | 32 | 18 | 13 | Res | 0\% |
| Palm Springs Park of Commerce | 3 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 6 | 4 | NR | 75\% |
| Lake Worth Middle School | 6 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | NR | 77.20\% |
| Mavericks High School | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | 100\% |
| Race-Trac | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | 100\% |
| The Village at Lake Worth | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Res | 100\% |
| McDonalds Congress Ave | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | 81\% |
| APEC Petroleum | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | NR | 66\% |
| Value Place Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | 100\% |
| The Villages II at Lake Osborne | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Res | 100\% |
| Kingswood Academy of Palm Springs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | 100\% |
| WAWA-Lakeworth \& Congress | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | 100\% |
| Boutwell Road Apartments | 8 | 3 | 5 | 9 | 6 | 4 | Res | 0\% |
| Golden Roads Apartments | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Res | 0\% |
| Waterside Plaza | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | NR | 75\% |
| Fontana Townhomes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Res | 0\% |
| 2209 7th Ave N | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | NR | 0\% |
| Total Committed Developments | 37 | 14 | 25 | 60 | 35 | 27 |  |  |
| Total Committed Residential | 24 | 6 | 18 | 42 | 25 | 18 |  |  |
| Total Committed Non-Residential | 13 | 8 | 7 | 18 | 10 | 9 |  |  |
| Double Count Reduction | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 |  |  |
| Total Discounted Committed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Developments | 34 | 12 | 24 | 56 | 33 | 25 |  |  |
| Historical Growth | 374 | 234 | 141 | 484 | 229 | 280 |  |  |
| Comm Dev+1\% Growth | 66 | 32 | 36 | 98 | 53 | 49 |  |  |
| Growth Volume Used | 374 | 234 | 141 | 484 | 229 | 280 |  |  |
| Total Volume | 896 | 560 | 338 | 1159 | 549 | 671 |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS D Capacity | 1480 | 880 | 880 | 1480 | 880 | 880 |  |  |
| Link Meets Test 1? | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |  |  |
| LOS E Capacity | 1570 | 880 | 880 | 1570 | 880 | 880 |  |  |
| Link Meets Test 2? | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |  |  |

A
B Cnput Data

ROAD NAME: 2nd Ave N CURRENT YEAR: 2020

ANALYSIS YEAR: 2026
GROWTH RATE: 9.43\%
STATION: 4679
FROM: MIDPOINT
TO: Boutwell Rd
COUNT DATE: 02/12/2020
PSF: 1
Link Analysis
AM
PM
2-way NB/EB SB/WB 2-way NB/EB SB/WB

| 522 | 326 | 197 | 675 | 320 | 391 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 522 | 326 | 197 | 675 | 320 | 391 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 522 | 326 | 197 | 675 | 320 | 391 |


|  |  |  |  |  | Type $\%$ Complete |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | $100 \%$ |
| 15 | 3 | 12 | 32 | 18 | 13 | Res | $0 \%$ |
| 3 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 6 | 4 | NR | $75 \%$ |
| 6 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | NR | $77.20 \%$ |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | $100 \%$ |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | $100 \%$ |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Res | $100 \%$ |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | $81 \%$ |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | NR | $66 \%$ |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | $100 \%$ |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Res | $100 \%$ |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | $100 \%$ |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | $100 \%$ |
| 8 | 3 | 5 | 9 | 6 | 4 | Res | $0 \%$ |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Res | $0 \%$ |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | NR | $75 \%$ |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Res | $0 \%$ |
| 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | NR | $0 \%$ |

Input Data

ROAD NAME: Boutwell Rd
CURRENT YEAR: 2020
ANALYSIS YEAR: 2026
GROWTH RATE: 0\%

STATION: 4676
FROM: Midpoint
TO: 10th Ave N
COUNT DATE: 02/24/2020
PSF: 1
Link Analysis

Report Created
02/10/2022

AM
PM
2-way NB/EB SB/WB 2-way NB/EB SB/WB

| 869 | 553 | 316 | 925 | 397 | 549 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 869 | 553 | 316 | 925 | 397 | 549 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 869 | 553 | 316 | 925 | 397 | 549 |


| Committed Developments |  |  |  |  | Type $\%$ Complete |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lake Worth Corners | 0 | 6 | 23 | 63 | 36 | 27 | Res | $0 \%$ |
| Palm Springs Park of Commerce | 29 | 16 | 13 | 8 | 4 | 4 | NR | $77.20 \%$ |
| Lake Worth Middle School | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | NR | $49 \%$ |
| Mid-County Center | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | $100 \%$ |
| Race-Trac | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Res | $100 \%$ |
| The Village at Lake Worth | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | NR | $66 \%$ |
| APEC Petroleum | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | $100 \%$ |
| Value Place Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Res | $100 \%$ |
| The Villages II at Lake Osborne | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Res | $100 \%$ |
| Waterville | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | $100 \%$ |
| WAWA-Lakeworth \& Congress | 15 | 10 | 5 | 18 | 7 | 11 | Res | $0 \%$ |
| Boutwell Road Apartments | 6 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 3 | Res | $0 \%$ |
| Golden Roads Apartments | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Res | $100 \%$ |
| Banyan Court | 2 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 4 | NR | $75 \%$ |
| Waterside Plaza | 17 | 9 | 8 | 15 | 8 | 8 | NR | $10 \%$ |
| 7-Eleven - 1900 10th Ave | 8 | 6 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 4 | Res | $0 \%$ |
| 3322 Boutwell Road | 20 | 16 | 4 | 15 | 5 | 10 | NR | $0 \%$ |
| 2209 7th Ave N | 129 | 66 | 63 | 144 | 74 | 72 |  |  |
| Total Committed Developments | 58 | 23 | 35 | 95 | 50 | 45 |  |  |
| Total Committed Residential | 71 | 43 | 28 | 49 | 24 | 27 |  |  |
| Total Committed Non-Residential | 14 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 5 | 5 |  |  |
| Double Count Reduction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Discounted Committed | 115 | 60 | 57 | 134 | 69 | 67 |  |  |
| Developments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Historical Growth | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Comm Dev+1\% Growth | 168 | 94 | 76 | 191 | 93 | 101 |  |  |
| Growth Volume Used | 168 | 94 | 76 | 191 | 93 | 101 |  |  |
| Total Volume | 1037 | 647 | 392 | 1116 | 490 | 650 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  | $2 L$ |  |  |  |  |
| LOS D Capacity | 1480 | 880 | 880 | 1480 | 880 | 880 |  |  |
| Link Meets Test 1? | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |  |  |
| LOS E Capacity | 1570 | 880 | 880 | 1570 | 880 | 880 |  |  |
| Link Meets Test 2? | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |  |  |

Total Committed Developments
Total Committed Residential
Total Committed Non-Residential
Double Count Reduction
Total Discounted Committed Developments

Historical Growth
Comm Dev+1\% Growth
Growth Volume Used
Total Volume

Lanes
LOS D Capacity
Link Meets Test 1?
LOS E Capacity
Link Meets Test 2?
Time Period Direction

Existing Volume
Peak Volume
Diversion(\%)
Volume after Diversion
A
B
C
Input Data
ROAD NAME: Boutwell Rd CURRENT YEAR: 2020
ANALYSIS YEAR: 2026
GROWTH RATE: 0\%
STATION: 4676
FROM: 2nd Ave N
TO: Midpoint
COUNT DATE: 02/24/2020
PSF: 1
Link Analysis
AM
PM
2-way NB/EB SB/WB 2-way NB/EB SB/WB

| 869 | 553 | 316 | 925 | 397 | 549 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 869 | 553 | 316 | 925 | 397 | 549 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 869 | 553 | 316 | 925 | 397 | 549 |




Input Data
E-W Street: 2nd Ave N
N-S STREET: Congress Ave
TIME PERIOD: PM
GROWTH RATE: 5.09\%
SIGNAL ID: 36800

COUNT DATE: 05/01/2019 Report Created CURRENT YEAR: $201902 / 10 / 2022$ ANALYSIS YEAR: 2026 PSF: 1.02

| Intersection Volume Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |
| Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| 85 | 59 | 80 | 53 | 113 | 199 | 90 | 1514 | 57 | 178 | 1537 | 165 |
| 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| 87 | 60 | 82 | 54 | 115 | 203 | 92 | 1544 | 58 | 182 | 1568 | 168 |


|  | Type $\%$ Complete |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 0 | NR | $20 \%$ |
| 0 | NR | $81 \%$ |
| 0 | Res | $70 \%$ |
| 0 | NR | $77.20 \%$ |
| 0 | Res | $0 \%$ |
| DR | $66 \%$ |  |
| 0 | NR | $0 \%$ |
| 0 | Res | $0 \%$ |
| 0 | NR | $75 \%$ |
| 0 | NR | $49 \%$ |
| 0 | NR | $0 \%$ |
| 0 | NR | $75 \%$ |
| 0 | NR | $75 \%$ |
| 0 | Res | $0 \%$ |

Existing Volume
Diversions
$\begin{array}{llllllllllll}87 & 60 & 82 & 54 & 115 & 203 & 92 & 1544 & 58 & 182 & 1568 & 168\end{array}$

Peak Season Volume
Committed Developments
WAWA - SEC 10th and Military Trail McDonalds Congress Ave The Villages II at Lake Osborne
Lake Worth Middle School Boutwell Road Apartments APEC Petroleum
Lantana Airport SDA1
Lake Worth Corners
Waterside Plaza
Mid-County Center
Lantana Airport SDA2
Walmart-Palm Springs
Palm Springs Park of Commerce
Golden Roads Apartments
Total Committed Developments
Total Committed Residential
Total Committed Non-Residential
Double Count Reduction
Total Discounted Committed

Historical Growth
Comm Dev+1\% Growth
Growth Volume Used
Total Volume

| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\theta$ |
| $\theta$ | $\theta$ | 0 | 0 | $\theta$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\theta$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 18 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\theta$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\theta$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\theta$ | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 | 20 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 18 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 2 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 | 20 | 0 |


| 36 | 25 | 34 | 22 | 48 | 84 | 38 | 642 | 24 | 76 | 652 | 70 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | 4 | 6 | 19 | 8 | 15 | 7 | 215 | 24 | 13 | 173 | 12 |
| 36 | 25 | 34 | 22 | 48 | 84 | 38 | 642 | 24 | 76 | 652 | 70 |
| 123 | 85 | 116 | 76 | 163 | 287 | 130 | 2186 | 82 | 258 | 2220 | 238 |

Note: Removed insignificant trips.


|  | Input Data |  |
| :---: | :---: | ---: |
| E-W Street: 2 nd Ave N | COUNT DATE: 05/01/2019 | Report Created |
| N-S STREET: Congress Ave | CURRENT YEAR: 2019 | $02 / 10 / 2022$ |
| TIME PERIOD: PM | ANALYSIS YEAR: 2026 |  |
| GROWTH RATE: $5.09 \%$ | PSF: 1.02 |  |
| SIGNAL ID: 36800 |  |  |


| Intersection Volume Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| 85 | 59 | 80 | 53 | 113 | 199 | 90 | 1514 | 57 | 178 | 1537 | 165 |
| 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| 87 | 60 | 82 | 54 | 115 | 203 | 92 | 1544 | 58 | 182 | 1568 | 168 |


| Type $\%$ Complete |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| NR | $20 \%$ |
| NR | $81 \%$ |
| Res | $70 \%$ |
| NR | $77.20 \%$ |
| Res | $0 \%$ |
| NR | $66 \%$ |
| NR | $0 \%$ |
| Res | $0 \%$ |
| NR | $75 \%$ |
| NR | $49 \%$ |
| NR | $0 \%$ |
| NR | $75 \%$ |
| NR | $75 \%$ |
| Res | $0 \%$ |

Existing Volume
Diversions
Peak Season Volume
Committed Developments
WAWA - SEC 10th and Military Trail McDonalds Congress Ave The Villages II at Lake Osborne
Lake Worth Middle School Boutwell Road Apartments APEC Petroleum
Lantana Airport SDA1
Lake Worth Corners
Waterside Plaza
Mid-County Center
Lantana Airport SDA2
Walmart-Palm Springs
Palm Springs Park of Commerce
Golden Roads Apartments
Total Committed Developments
Total Committed Residential
Total Committed Non-Residential
Double Count Reduction
Total Discounted Committed

Historical Growth
Comm Dev+1\% Growth
Growth Volume Used
Total Volume

| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| 6 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 7 | 4 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 18 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 |
| 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 |
| 12 | 10 | 0 | 22 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 171 | 30 | 3 | 104 | 8 |
| 7 | 7 | 0 | 18 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 36 | 25 | 2 | 25 | 5 |
| 5 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 135 | 5 | 1 | 79 | 3 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 1 |
| 11 | 9 | 0 | 21 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 162 | 29 | 3 | 98 | 7 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 36 | 25 | 34 | 22 | 48 | 84 | 38 | 642 | 24 | 76 | 652 | 70 |
| 17 | 13 | 6 | 25 | 15 | 17 | 7 | 273 | 33 | 16 | 211 | 19 |
| 36 | 25 | 34 | 25 | 48 | 84 | 38 | 642 | 33 | 76 | 652 | 70 |
| 123 | 85 | 116 | 79 | 163 | 287 | 130 | 2186 | 91 | 258 | 2220 | 238 |

## APPENDIX C

## TEST 1 PART 1: INTERSECTION ANALYSIS



[^1]| SIGNAL ID | E-W STREET | N-S STREET | DATE | TIME | NBU | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBU | SBL | SBT | SBR | EBU | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBU | WBL | WBT | WBR | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25500 | 15th St/LA Kirksey | Tamarind Ave | 12/20/2017 | 7:30 AM | 0 | 31 | 261 | 53 | 0 | 31 | 259 | 91 | 0 | 52 | 133 | 36 | 0 | 31 | 58 | 95 | 1131 |
| 25500 | 15th St/LA Kirksey | Tamarind Ave | 12/20/2017 | 4:45 PM | 0 | 25 | 274 | 30 | 0 | 19 | 243 | 83 | 0 | 58 | 64 | 36 | 0 | 27 | 133 | 28 | 1020 |
| 20500 | 20th St | US-1/Broadway | 5/20/2020 | 7:45 AM | 0 | 13 | 516 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 673 | 10 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1239 |
| 20500 | 20th St | US-1/Broadway | 5/20/2020 | 4:45 PM | 1 | 19 | 793 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 670 | 15 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 1545 |
| 24600 | 25th St | Australian Ave | 1/31/2019 | 7:30 AM | 1 | 0 | 952 | 253 | 0 | 163 | 885 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 246 | 0 | 114 | 2614 |
| 24600 | 25th St | Australian Ave | 1/31/2019 | 12:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 454 | 151 | 2 | 91 | 363 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 168 | 0 | 91 | 1320 |
| 24600 | 25th St | Australian Ave | 1/31/2019 | 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 880 | 240 | 5 | 171 | 776 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 320 | 0 | 144 | 2536 |
| 24600 | 25th St | Australian Ave | 9/7/2016 | 7:30 AM | 3 | 0 | 786 | 297 | 4 | 169 | 786 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 230 | 0 | 148 | 2423 |
| 24600 | 25th St | Australian Ave | 9/7/2016 | 12:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 489 | 216 | 6 | 104 | 490 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 216 | 0 | 137 | 1659 |
| 24600 | 25th St | Australian Ave | 9/7/2016 | 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 754 | 253 | 6 | 155 | 886 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 281 | 0 | 181 | 2517 |
| 24670 | 25th St | US-1/Broadway | 2/21/2019 | 7:30 AM | 0 | 6 | 138 | 9 | 0 | 286 | 405 | 177 | 0 | 79 | 74 | 24 | 0 | 2 | 28 | 173 | 1401 |
| 24670 | 25th St | US-1/Broadway | 2/21/2019 | 12:00 PM | 0 | 10 | 148 | 6 | 0 | 180 | 312 | 108 | 0 | 74 | 44 | 19 | 0 | 12 | 64 | 185 | 1162 |
| 24670 | 25th St | US-1/Broadway | 2/21/2019 | 4:30 PM | 0 | 21 | 372 | 11 | 0 | 232 | 352 | 213 | 0 | 81 | 39 | 12 | 0 | 10 | 70 | 313 | 1726 |
| 24670 | 25th St | US-1/Broadway | 9/8/2016 | 7:30 AM | 0 | 14 | 132 | 3 | 0 | 373 | 470 | 166 | 0 | 75 | 66 | 18 | 0 | 3 | 38 | 203 | 1561 |
| 24670 | 25th St | US-1/Broadway | 9/8/2016 | 11:30 AM | 0 | 11 | 143 | 7 | 1 | 170 | 263 | 88 | 0 | 66 | 60 | 22 | 0 | 10 | 36 | 219 | 1096 |
| 24670 | 25th St | US-1/Broadway | 9/8/2016 | 4:30 PM | 0 | 13 | 305 | 6 | 0 | 178 | 282 | 186 | 0 | 66 | 28 | 17 | 0 | 6 | 44 | 373 | 1504 |
| 36800 | 2nd Ave N | Congress Ave | 5/1/2019 | 7:00 AM | 8 | 32 | 1206 | 29 | 18 | 203 | 1332 | 90 | 0 | 99 | 101 | 110 | 0 | 44 | 53 | 153 | 3478 |
| 36800 | 2nd Ave N | Congress Ave | 5/1/2019 | 12:00 PM | 27 | 34 | 1139 | 34 | 37 | 111 | 1165 | 91 | 0 | 73 | 39 | 60 | 0 | 42 | 26 | 135 | 3013 |
| 36800 | 2nd Ave N | Congress Ave | 5/1/2019 | 4:45 PM | 21 | 69 | 1514 | 57 | 25 | 153 | 1537 | 165 | 0 | 85 | 59 | 80 | 0 | 53 | 113 | 199 | 4130 |
| 36925 | 2nd Ave N | US-1 DIXIE HWY | 4/1/2021 | 7:45 AM | 3 | 2 | 365 | 41 | 0 | 43 | 533 | 17 | 0 | 23 | 19 | 8 | 0 | 20 | 4 | 16 | 1094 |
| 36925 | 2nd Ave N | US-1 DIXIE HWY | 4/1/2021 | 11:30 AM | 7 | 21 | 610 | 91 | 0 | 65 | 709 | 28 | 0 | 27 | 32 | 19 | 0 | 45 | 11 | 22 | 1687 |
| 36925 | 2nd Ave N | US-1 DIXIE HWY | 4/1/2021 | 4:45 PM | 1 | 20 | 698 | 132 | 0 | 80 | 849 | 34 | 0 | 32 | 26 | 25 | 0 | 53 | 6 | 30 | 1986 |
| 36925 | 2nd Ave N | US-1 DIXIE HWY | 9/19/2018 | 7:30 AM | 2 | 2 | 449 | 38 | 0 | 38 | 625 | 27 | 0 | 28 | 21 | 7 | 0 | 28 | 1 | 6 | 1272 |
| 36925 | 2nd Ave N | US-1 DIXIE HWY | 9/19/2018 | 1:00 PM | 0 | 3 | 625 | 41 | 0 | 81 | 670 | 22 | 0 | 20 | 27 | 8 | 0 | 49 | 1 | 31 | 1578 |
| 36925 | 2nd Ave N | US-1 DIXIE HWY | 9/19/2018 | 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 802 | 126 | 0 | 57 | 836 | 28 | 0 | 24 | 35 | 14 | 0 | 52 | 1 | 21 | 1996 |
| 36950 | 2nd Ave N | US-1 FEDEREAL HWY | 5/3/2018 | 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 356 | 7 | 0 | 31 | 341 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 16 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 823 |
| 36950 | 2nd Ave N | US-1 FEDEREAL HWY | 5/3/2018 | 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 425 | 10 | 0 | 31 | 352 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 29 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 958 |
| 23800 | 36th St | Australian Ave | 10/18/2017 | 7:15 AM | 1 | 0 | 869 | 46 | 4 | 144 | 880 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 170 | 0 | 228 | 2342 |
| 23800 | 36th St | Australian Ave | 10/18/2017 | 12:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 526 | 63 | 1 | 147 | 583 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 139 | 1524 |
| 23800 | 36th St | Australian Ave | 10/18/2017 | 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 968 | 121 | 1 | 235 | 1187 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 147 | 0 | 198 | 2857 |
| 23815 | 36th St | US-1/Broadway | 5/20/2019 | 7:30 AM | 0 | 14 | 539 | 39 | 0 | 113 | 980 | 16 | 0 | 23 | 12 | 19 | 0 | 26 | 35 | 156 | 1972 |
| 23815 | 36th St | US-1/Broadway | 5/20/2019 | 12:15 PM | 0 | 12 | 500 | 9 | 0 | 46 | 566 | 16 | 0 | 24 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 17 | 6 | 87 | 1298 |
| 23815 | 36th St | US-1/Broadway | 5/20/2019 | 4:45 PM | 0 | 24 | 826 | 10 | 0 | 72 | 900 | 37 | 0 | 38 | 10 | 13 | 0 | 24 | 18 | 143 | 2115 |
| 26915 | 3rd St | N Quadrille BI | 10/23/2019 | 7:05 AM | 0 | 34 | 394 | 33 | 0 | 5 | 172 | 116 | 0 | 109 | 84 | 12 | 0 | 10 | 39 | 2 | 1010 |
| 26915 | 3rd St | N Quadrille BI | 10/23/2019 | 11:45 AM | 0 | 32 | 345 | 47 | 0 | 3 | 289 | 195 | 0 | 47 | 30 | 21 | 0 | 15 | 54 | 2 | 1080 |
| 26915 | 3rd St | N Quadrille BI | 10/23/2019 | 4:30 PM | 0 | 25 | 408 | 10 | 0 | 3 | 414 | 486 | 0 | 75 | 25 | 24 | 0 | 18 | 78 | 7 | 1573 |

## Monday, June 7, 2021
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2019 PEAK SEASON FACTOR CATEGORY REPORT - REPORT TYPE: ALL CATEGORY: 9301 CEN.-W OF US1 TO SR7

MOCF: 0.97


* PEAK SEASON


## APPENDIX D

## TEST 2 ANALYSIS: LINK ANALYSIS

## TABLE 9

TEST 2 - PROJECT SIGNIFICANCE CALCULATION
AM PEAK HOUR
TEST 2 - FIVE YEAR ANALYSIS
1 MILE RADIUS OF DEVELOPMENT INFLUENCE
TOTAL AM PEAK HOUR PROJECT TRIPS (ENTERING) = 18
TOTAL AM PEAK HOUR PROJECT TRIPS (EXITING) = 52

| STATION | ROADWAY | FROM | TO | AM PEAK HOUR DIRECTIONAL |  |  |  | LOS E STANDARD | TOTAL PROJECT IMPACT | PROJECT SIGNIFICANT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4677 | 2ND AVENUE | LAKE WORTH ROAD | CONGRESS AVENUE | 5\% | 3 | 2 | I | 880 | 0.34\% | NO |
| 4679 | 2ND AVENUE | CONGRESS AVENUE | SITE | 60\% | 31 | 2 | 1 | 880 | 3.52\% | YES |
| 4679 | 2ND AVENUE | SITE | BOUTWELL ROAD | 40\% | 21 | 2 | 1 | 880 | 2.39\% | NO |
| 4647 | LAKE WORTH ROAD | KIRK ROAD | 2ND AVENUE | 23\% | 12 | 6D | 11 | 2830 | 0.42\% | NO |
| 4647 | LAKE WORTH ROAD | 2ND AVENUE | CONGRESS AVENUE | 19\% | 10 | 6D | II | 2830 | 0.35\% | NO |
| 4651 | LAKE WORTH ROAD | CONGRESS AVENUE | BOUTWELL ROAD | 10\% | 5 | 4D | II | 1870 | 0.27\% | NO |
| N/A | LAKE WORTH ROAD | BOUTWELL ROAD | A STREET | 9\% | 5 | 4D | 11 | 1870 | 0.27\% | NO |
| 4604 | CONGRESS AVENUE | 10TH AVENUE N | FRENCH AVENUE | 24\% | 12 | 6D | II | 2830 | 0.42\% | NO |
| 4620 | CONGRESS AVENUE | FRENCH AVENUE | 2ND AVENUE | 24\% | 12 | 6D | II | 2830 | 0.42\% | NO |
| 4620 | CONGRESS AVENUE | 2ND AVENUE | LAKE WORTH AVENUE | 30\% | 16 | 6D | II | 2830 | 0.57\% | NO |
| 4622 | CONGRESS AVENUE | LAKE WORTH AVENUE | 6TH AVENUE S | 10\% | 5 | 6D | 11 | 2830 | 0.18\% | NO |
| 4676 | BOUTWELL ROAD | 10TH AVENUE N | 2ND AVENUE NORTH | 30\% | 16 | 2 | 1 | 880 | 1.82\% | NO |
| N/A | BOUTWELL ROAD | 2ND AVENUE NORTH | LAKE WORTH ROAD | 10\% | 5 | 2 | 1 | 880 | 0.57\% | NO |

## TABLE 10

TEST 2 - FIVE YEAR ANALYSIS
1 MILE RADIUS OF DEVELOPMENT INFLUENCE
TOTAL PM PEAK HOUR PROJECT TRIPS (ENTERING) = 52
TOTAL PM PEAK HOUR PROJECT TRIPS (EXITING) $=34$

| STATION | ROADWAY | FROM | TO | PROJECT DISTRIBUTION | M PEAK HOUR DIRECTIONAL PROJECT TRIPS | EXISTING LANES | CLASS | LOS E STANDARD | TOTAL PROJECT IMPACT | PROJECT SIGNIFICANT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4677 | 2ND AVENUE | LAKE WORTH ROAD | CONGRESS AVENUE | 5\% | 3 | 2 | 1 | 880 | 0.34\% | NO |
| 4679 | 2ND AVENUE | CONGRESS AVENUE | SITE | 60\% | 31 | 2 | 1 | 880 | 3.52\% | YES |
| 4679 | 2ND AVENUE | SITE | BOUTWELL ROAD | 40\% | 21 | 2 | 1 | 880 | 2.39\% | NO |
| 4647 | LAKE WORTH ROAD | KIRK ROAD | 2ND AVENUE | 23\% | 12 | 6D | I | 2830 | 0.42\% | NO |
| 4647 | LAKE WORTH ROAD | 2ND AVENUE | CONGRESS AVENUE | 19\% | 10 | 6D | 11 | 2830 | 0.35\% | NO |
| 4651 | LAKE WORTH ROAD | CONGRESS AVENUE | BOUTWELL ROAD | 10\% | 5 | 4D | II | 1870 | 0.27\% | NO |
| N/A | LAKE WORTH ROAD | BOUTWELL ROAD | A STREET | 9\% | 5 | 4D | 11 | 1870 | 0.27\% | NO |
| 4604 | CONGRESS AVENUE | 10TH AVENUE N | FRENCH AVENUE | 24\% | 12 | 6 D | II | 2830 | 0.42\% | NO |
| 4620 | CONGRESS AVENUE | FRENCH AVENUE | 2ND AVENUE | 24\% | 12 | 6 D | II | 2830 | 0.42\% | NO |
| 4620 | CONGRESS AVENUE | 2ND AVENUE | LAKE WORTH AVENUE | 30\% | 16 | 6D | II | 2830 | 0.57\% | NO |
| 4622 | CONGRESS AVENUE | LAKE WORTH AVENUE | 6 TH AVENUE S | 10\% | 5 | 6D | 11 | 2830 | 0.18\% | NO |
| 4676 | BOUTWELL ROAD | 10TH AVENUE N | 2ND AVENUE NORTH | 30\% | 16 | 2 | 1 | 880 | 1.82\% | NO |
| N/A | BOUTWELL ROAD | 2ND AVENUE NORTH | LAKE WORTH ROAD | 10\% | 5 | 2 | 1 | 880 | 0.57\% | NO |

# TABLE 11 

TEST 2 - FIVE YEAR ANALYSIS
1 MILE RADIUS OF DEVELOPMENT INFLUENCE
$\begin{array}{ll}1 \text { MILE RADIUS OF DEVELOPMENT INFLUENCE } & \\ \text { AREA WIDE GROWTH RATE }= & 3.48 \% \\ \text { TOTAL AM PEAK HOUR PROJECT TRIPS (ENTERING) }= & 18\end{array}$
TOTAL AM PEAK HOUR PROJECT TRIPS (ENTERING)
18
52


TABLE 12

## PM PEAK HOUR - TEST 2

EST 2 - FIVE YEAR ANALYSIS

## mile radius of development influence <br> 1 MILE RADI GROWTH RATE $=$ AREA WIDE TOTAL PM PEAK HOUR PROJECT TRIPS (ENTERING) = <br> 3.48\%

TOTAL PM PEAK HOUR PROJECT TRIPS (EXITING) =

TOTAL PM PEAK HOUR PROJECT TRIPS (EXITING) $=$|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |

| ROADWAY | FROM | T0 | DIRECTION | TRAFFIC COUNT YEAR | PM PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC | PROJECT DISTRIBUTION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { HOUR } \\ & \text { PROJECT } \\ & \text { TRIPS } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { LINK } \\ \text { GROWTH } \end{gathered}$ | MAJOR PROJECT | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \text { 1.0\% } \\ \text { GROWTH } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | BACKGROUNL TRAFFIC USED | $\begin{gathered} 2026 \\ \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { TRAFFIC } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ASSURED } \\ & \text { LANES } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | CLASS | LOS E | $\begin{gathered} \text { MEETS } \\ \text { LOS } \\ \text { STD. } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | GRESS AVE |  | EB | 2020 | 320 | 60\% | 31 | 73 | 33 | 20 | 73 | 424 | 2 | 1 | 880 | YES |
| A | GRess Aven |  | WB | 2020 | 391 | 60\% | 20 | 89 | 25 | 24 | 89 | 500 | 2 | 1 | 880 | YES |

Department of Engineering and Public Works
P.O. Box 21229

West Palm Beach, FL 33416-1229
(561) 684-4000

FAX: (561) 684~4050
www.pbcgov.com

## Palm Beach County Board of County Commissioners

Robert S. Weinroth, Mayor
Gregg K. Weiss, Vice Mayor
Maria G. Marino
Dave Kerner
Maria Sachs

Melissa McKinlay
Mack Bernard

## County Administrator

Verdenia C. Baker

May 13, 2022

Anna Lai, P.E., PTOE
Simmons \& White, Inc.
2581 Metrocentre Blvd, Suite 3
West Palm Beach, FL 33407

## RE: Residences at Lake Worth Project \#: 220317 <br> Traffic Performance Standards (TPS) Review

Dear Ms. Lai:
The Palm Beach County Traffic Division has reviewed the above referenced project Traffic Impact Statement, revised April 15, 2022, pursuant to the Traffic Performance Standards in Article 12 of the Palm Beach County (PBC) Unified Land Development Code (ULDC). The project is summarized as follows:

Municipality:
Location:
PCN:
Access:

Existing Uses:
Proposed Uses:
New Daily Trips:
New Peak Hour Trips: 70 (18/52) AM; 86 (52/34) PM
Build-out: December 31, 2026
Based on the review, the Traffic Division has determined that the proposed development meets the TPS of Palm Beach County.

The County is strongly encouraging the City to require the Property Owner:

1. To align proposed driveway with the driveway to the south to eliminate conflict between left turning vehicles.
2. To construct eastbound left turn lane at the approach to the driveway.
3. To remove proposed on street parking on $2^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue $N$.

Please note the receipt of a TPS approval letter does not constitute the review and issuance of a Palm Beach County Right-of-Way (R/W) Construction Permit nor does it eliminate any requirements that may be deemed as site related. For work within Palm Beach County R/W, a detailed review of the project will be provided upon submittal for a $\mathrm{R} / \mathrm{W}$ permit application. The project is required to comply with all Palm Beach County standards and may include R/W dedication.

Anna Lai, P.E., PTOE
May 13, 2022
Page 2

No buiiding permits are to be issued by the City after the build-out date specified above. The County traffic concurrency approval is subject to the Project Aggregation Rules set forth in the Traffic Performance Standards Ordinance.

The approval letter shall be valid no longer than one year from date of issuance. unless an application for a Site Specific Development Order has been approved, an application for a Site Specific Development Order has been submitted, or the approval letter has been superseded by another approval letter for the same property.

If you have any questions regarding this determination, please contact me at 561-684-4030 or email HAkif@pbcgov.org.


Hanane Akif, P.E.
Professional Engineer
Traffic Division

QB:HA:cw
ec:
Erin Fitzhugh Sita, AICP, Assistant Director-Planning, Zoning, \& Preservation Community Sustainability Department, City of Lake Worth Beach
Quazi Bari, P.E., PTOE, Manager - Growth Management, Traffic Division Alberto Lopez, Technical Assistant III, Traffic Division

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF KRISTIN K. GARRISON

## SCHOOL CAPACITY AVAILABILITY DETERMINATION (SCAD)



Joyce Cai
School District Representative Signature

Joyce C. Cai, Senior Planner
Print Name \& Title of School District Representative

October 11, 2022

Date
joyce.cai@palmbeachschools.org
Email Address

CC: Erin Sita, Assistant Director, City of Lake Worth Beach Joyell Shaw, PIR Manager, School District of Palm Beach County

March 25, 2022
Job No. 21-173

## DRAINAGE STATEMENT

Residences at Lake Worth
City of Lake Worth Beach, Florida

## SITE DATA

The subject parcel is located at the City of Lake Worth Beach, Florida and contains approximately 7.40 acres. The site is currently undeveloped with an existing utility tower in the northeast corner of the property. Proposed site development will consist of 195 apartment units, 4100 SF of clubhouse and associated parking. For additional information regarding site location and layout, please refer to the site plan prepared by Insite Studios.

## PROPOSED DRAINAGE

The site is located within the boundaries of the South Florida Water Management District C-51 Basin (Sub-Basin 33), the Lake Worth Drainage District and City of Lake Worth Beach. It is proposed that runoff be directed to the on-site water management areas including a lake and storm chambers by means of paved or on-site grass swales and/or inlets and storm sewer. Legal positive outfall is available through a control structure and into the Lake Worth Drainage District's E-4 Canal.

Drainage design is to address the following:

1. Due consideration for water quality.
2. No runoff to leave the site except through an approved control structure up to the level produced by the 25 year -3 day rainfall event.
3. Building floor elevations to be set at or above the level produced by the 100 year-3 day (zero discharge) rainfall event.
4. Allowable discharge to be in accordance with South Florida Water Management District and Lake Worth Drainage District Criteria.

Drainage Statement
Job No. 21-173
March 25, 2022 - Page 2

## PROPOSED DRAINAGE (CONTINUED)

5. Roads to be protected from flooding during the 3 year -24 hour event.
6. Compliance with the South Florida Water Management District C-51 Drainage Basin Criteria with regard to compensating storage via water management areas and storm chambers. Based on preliminary water management calculations, the site plan as presented will meet the South Florida Water Management District C-51 Basin requirements.

Required Permits/Approvals:

1. Lake Worth Drainage District Drainage Permit
2. South Florida Water Management District Environmental Resource Permit
3. City of Lake Worth Beach Engineering

Erik R. Cooper, P.E.
FL Reg. No. 56934
Erik R. Cooper, P.E., State of Florida, Professional
Engineer, License No. 56934
This item has been electronically signed and
sealed by Erik R. Cooper, P.E., on $04 / 05 / 2022$.
Printed copies of this document are not considered signed
and sealed and the signature must be verified on
any electronic copies.

Return to:

Nelson Mullins<br>1905 NW Corporate Boulevard, Suite 310<br>Boca Raton, FL 33431<br>(561) 483-7000<br>File Number:<br>Parcel Identification No.<br>38-43-44-20-01-096-0020;<br>38-43-44-20-01-097-0010; and<br>38-43-44-20-01-097-0020

[Space Above This Line For Recording Data]

## Warranty Deed

This Indenture made this 7th day of December, 2021 between Village of Valor LTD, a Florida Limited Partnership whose post office address is 3175 S. Congress Ave., Suite 310 - Palm Springs, FL 33461 of the County of Palm Beach, State of Florida, grantor*, and Richman Lake Worth Apartments, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company whose post office address is 777 West Putnam Ave., Greenwich, CT 06830 of the County of Fairfield, State of Comnecticut, grantee*,

Witnesseth that said grantor, for and in consideration of the sum of TEN AND NO/100 DOLLARS (\$10.00) and other good and valuable considerations to said grantor in hand paid by said grantee, the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, has granted, bargained, and sold to the said grantee, and grantee's heirs and assigns forever, the following described land, situate, lying and being in Palm Beach County, Florida, to-wit:

## Parcel 1:

The West Two acres of Tract 96 of MODEL LAND CO. SUBDIVISION OF SECTION 20, TOWNSHIP 44 SOUTH, RANGE 43 EAST, according to the Plat thereof, recorded in Plat Book 5, Page 79 of the Public Records of Palm Beach County, Florida.

Less and Except the South 25.00 feet by Deed to Palm Beach County, recorded in Official Records Book 6431, Page 1748.

## Parcel 2:

The East 117.68 feet of Lot 97 of MODEL LAND CO. SUBDIVISION OF SECTION 20, TOWNSHIP 44 SOUTH, RANGE 43 EAST, according to the Plat thereof, recorded in Plat Book 5, Page 79 of the Public Records of Palm Beach County, Florida. fronting 117.68 feet on North 2nd Avenue and 625 feet deep thereof.

Less and Except the South 25.00 feet of the East 117.00 feet by Deed to Palm Beach County, recorded in Miscellaneous Record Book 29, Page 193.

Parcel 3:
A portion of Lot 97 of MODEL LAND CO. SUBDIVISION OF SECTION 20, TOWNSHIP 44 SOUTH, RANGE 43 EAST, according to the Plat thereof, recorded in Plat Book 5, Page 79 of the Public Records of Palm Beach County, Florida, being more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point where the North line of Lake Worth Road intersects with the East line of the right of way of the First Lateral Canal West of the Town of Lake Worth, running East a distance of 394.32 feet; Thence North parallel with the East line of Lot 97 of the Subdivision of MODEL LAND CO. SUBDIVISION OF SECTION 20, TOWNSHIP 44 SOUTH, RANGE 43 EAST, a distance of 625 feet to the North line of Lot 97;

Thence West to a point where said North line intersects the East line of the right of way of said First Lateral Canal;

Thence Southwesterly following the right of way of said First Lateral Canal to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

Less and Except the South 25 feet, shown as Parcel No. 3 in the Order of Taking by Palm Beach County, and an additional 10 feet, shown as Parcel 12, recorded in Official Record Book 12863, Page 1606 of the Public Records of Palm Beach County, Florida.

Also known as 2431, 2441 and 2559 2nd Ave N, Lake Worth, FL 33461
and said grantor does hereby fully warrant the title to said land, and will defend the same against lawful claims of all persons whomsoever.

* "Grantor" and "Grantee" are used for singular or plural, as context requires.

In Witness Whereof, grantor has hereunto set grantor's hand and seal the day and year first above written.
Signed, sealed and delivered in our presence:


Village of Valor LTD, a Florida Limited Partnership


Roy J. Foster, Managing Partner
Village of Valor LLC, its General Partner

## State of Florida

County of Palm Beach
The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me by means of $\square$ physical presence or [] online notarization, this 7th day of December, 2021 by Roy J. Foster, Managing Partner of Village of Valor, LLC; general partner of Village of Valor LTD, a Florida Limited Partnership who [ 1 is personally known or [ ] has produced a driver's license as identification.


## Transmittal Letter

| To: PBC Dept. of Environmental Resources |
| :--- |
| Management |

Date: 04/08/2022 Management

Project Name: $\quad$ Residences at Lake Worth
Attention: PBC ERM If enclosures are not as noted, please notify our office.

Subject: _Residences at Lake Worth - Lake Worth Beach Jurisdiction Project

| We Transmit: | $\square$ herewith | $\square$ under separate cover via |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $\square$ as requested |  |  |
| For Your: | $\square$ approval | $\square$ distribution to parties | $\square$ information |
|  | $\square$ review \& comment | $\square$ record | $\square$ use |


| Copies | Date | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 1 | $4 / 08 / 2022$ | Wellfield Affidavit of Notification |
| 1 | $4 / 08 / 2022$ | Owner/Agent Consent Form |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## AFFIDAVIT OF NOTIFICATION

Pursuant to the Palm Beach County Unified Land Development Code, Article 14 Chapter B, Wellfield Protection, you shall provide notification to the Palm Beach County Department of Environmental Resources Management for the following activities should you store, handle, use, or produce Regulated Substances that exceed the threshold of 5 gallons, if liquid, or 25 pounds, if solid, within a wellfield zone:
a. Application for nonresidential building permits.
b. Application for residential building permits of 25 units or more.
c. Applications for development subject to review by advisory planning bodies and approval by local governing authority or zoning board of appeals.
A. Project Information:

1. Name of Project Residences at Lake Worth
2. Property Control \# N/A
3. Address of Project $\frac{2559 \text { 2nd Ave } N}{\text { (Street) }} \quad$ Lake Worth $\quad$ FL $\begin{array}{ll}\text { (City) } & \text { (State) }\end{array}$ (ZIP)
B. Owner of Property, Developer or Agent Signing Affidavit (If agent, a letter of authorization to sign for the owner must be attached.)
4. If individual, provide full legal name Brian Terry - Insite Studio, Inc.

| Address 8144 Okeechobee Blvd, Suite A | West Palm Beach | FL | 33411 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Street) | (City) | (State) | (ZIP) |

Telephone 561.249.0940
Owner of Property (if signed by agent) Richman Lake Worth Apartments LLC
2. If corporation or partnership, provide full name of corporation or partnership and relationship to corporation or partnership.

Name of Corporation or Partnership $\qquad$
Address $\qquad$
Telephone $\qquad$
Relationship to corporation or partnership $\qquad$
3. List any Regulated Substances (chemicals, fuels, oils, paints, etc.) that you intend to store, handle, use or produce at this site:

Type of Substance Approximate Quantity
No regulated substances will be stored, handled, used or produced


I have received a copy of "Palm Beach County Unified Land Development Code, Article 14 Chapter B, Wellfield Protection Prohibitions, Restrictions, and Best Management Practices." I understand that there are restrictions and prohibitions concerning the use, handling and storage of regulated substances pursuant to the Wellfield Protection Ordinance. I also understand that certain facilities are prohibited or


Return Completed Original to Department of Environmental Resources Management
2300 N. Jog Road West Palm Beach, Florida 33411-2743 telephone (561) 233-2400
Copy to Applicant/ Copy to Local Government



## LEGEND

$\square$ Project location

WELLFIED PROTECTION ZONE 44
AS SHOWN ON THE WELLEELD AS SHOWN ON THE WELLFIELD INFLLENCE IN PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA
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# STAFF REPORT REGULAR MEETING 

AGENDA DATE: February 7, 2023
DEPARTMENT: City Manager

## TITLE:

Selection of final redistricting map

## SUMMARY:

Pursuant to the City's Professional Services Agreement with FAU, representatives from The John Scott Dailey Florida Institute of Government at Florida Atlantic University (the "Institute") presented the analysis of the City's existing election districts and discussed with the City Commission the details of such analysis, advising that redistricting was strongly recommended.

## BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION:

Every ten years, after a census, updated population data often results in election districts with unequal populations, which requires the redrawing of districts to maintain compliance with the United States Constitution and the Voting Rights Act. The City of Lake Worth Beach has never done redistricting since its incorporation in 1913. Generally, redistricting redefines election districts based on changes in the population. The Equal Protection Clause of the United States Constitution guarantees the right of "one person, one vote" to municipal residents, such that a municipality must redraw its election districts periodically to maintain equal population.

The City Commission entered into an Agreement with FAU to analyze the City's 2020 Census data and population projections and the City's existing election districts. FAU's report recommending redistricting was presented at the September 12, 2022 work session. Four possible map options were presented at the October 6, 2022 commission meeting as well as at two public meetings, on October 13 and October 15. A fifth map option was presented at the January 3, 2023 commission meeting and at a public meeting on February 4.

At the January 3, 2023 City Commission meeting, consensus was given to proceed with alternative map options 3 and 5 and hold an additional public meeting on Saturday, February 4. The next step is to select a final map and proceed with a redistricting ordinance.

## MOTION:

Move to accept map option xxx and proceed to a final map option ordinance.

## ATTACHMENTS:

FAU report - revised to only include map alternatives 3 and 5 Alternative Maps 3 and 5

# Final Consultant Report: Redistricting Alternatives for the City of Lake Worth Beach 

December 19, 2022

John Scott Dailey Florida Institute of Government
Florida Atlantic University

Steven Bourassa, Ph.D.
Professor and Chair, Runstad Department of Real Estate, University of Washington;
formerly Professor and Chair, Department of Urban and Regional Planning,
Florida Atlantic University
James Gammack-Clark, M.A., Ph.D. candidate (ABD)
Senior Instructor, Department of Geosciences, Florida Atlantic University
Ronald R. Schultz, Ph.D.
Professor Emeritus, Department of Geosciences, Florida Atlantic University
Michael Stamm Jr. MURP
Adjunct Faculty, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Florida Atlantic University

## Introduction

The City of Lake Worth Beach contracted with Florida Atlantic University (FAU) to conduct an analysis of their City Commission election districts. The contract outlines a two-part process: Part A, a population analysis of the current election districts and recommendation for redistricting and Part B, if necessary, the creation of redistricting options for the City. On September 7, 2022 the FAU redistricting team submitted the District Analysis for the City of Lake Worth Beach that provided a population analysis of the existing City Commission Districts, a population projection through 2024 for the Commission Districts and a recommendation to proceed to Part B of the contract. The City Commission at their September 12, 2022 meeting voted to proceed to Part B of the contract, creating map alternatives for the City Commission election districts.

This report transmits redistricting map alternatives (Part B) for dissemination to the City Commission and public as part of the City's redistricting process. The population data used to create the map options is from the 2020 U.S. Census apportionment dataset, adjusted for future growth to the year 2024.

The Final Redistricting Alternatives report summarizes the input obtained during the City Commission meeting held on October 6, public meetings held on October 13, 2022 and October 15, 2022 as well as direction from the November 1, 2022 City Commission meeting. Further, to increase public access to the redistricting process, the City has created a webpage; https://lakeworthbeachfl.gov/redistricting/ to disseminate the redistricting map alternatives, reports and public comments.

## Redistricting Criteria and Data Sources

The City's Charter defines the geographic boundaries of the election districts, but does not clarify the process as to how and when election districts should be evaluated. To conduct the City's redistricting process, the consultant has used the following standards by which rational districts are developed nationwide and which are supported by case law and practice throughout the nation:

1) Reasonable population equality across districts:

- Districts should have approximately the same number of people when all persons, regardless of age, are counted. Ideal district size is based on the total population divided by the number of districts.
- Redistricting should adhere to Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, as amended and interpreted through case law. This criterion requires that minority population clusters be respected in the development of district boundaries. Arbitrary dilution and other discriminatory practices are prohibited.
- Redistricting should adhere to Florida's Fair Districting Amendment.
- Although deviations should be avoided wherever possible, there must be no more than a $10 \%$ overall deviation from the ideal size across districts.

2) Geographic contiguity and appropriate compactness:

- Follow major natural and manmade boundaries to the extent possible in defining boundaries of voting districts.
- Maintain the integrity of communities of interest based on race, life cycle/age, income, and other community identity characteristics such as subdivisions.
- Minimize the degree of change in pre-existing patterns of districts, to promote continuity of citizen identification with a district.
- Maintain district compactness and spatial contiguity. A compact shape for each district will be sought in each redistricting option presented to the city.

The first criterion is of primary importance; the second is significant in guiding decisions in reaching reasonable population balance.

In developing revised Lake Worth Beach City Commission election districts, the spatial units used in composing or building the districts are residential housing subdivisions (communities) and U.S. Census blocks. Subdivisions are typically homogeneous in their housing characteristics and thus serve households with broadly similar interests. Therefore, district borders are typically subdivision boundaries and associated major roadways or other obvious physical features. U.S. Census blocks are typically subunits in subdivisions and are the smallest spatial unit used in tabulating Census data.

## Lake Worth Beach City Charter

This redistricting process was motivated by a change to the City's Charter that was approved March 8, 2022. This change provided for election of City Commissioners by District rather than City-wide (the mayor will continue to be elected City-wide). This Charter amendment led to a concern about possible imbalance in population across the current districts, which presently divide the City into four quadrants without any
consideration for population equity.

The Charter does not provide procedural language pertaining to redistricting or evaluation of election district population. However, Article II (Territorial Boundaries: Election Precincts) Sec. 2 - Election Districts, defines the boundaries of the current districts:

The City of Lake Worth is hereby divided into four (4) election districts, as follows:
District 1. All that territory lying west of Dixie Highway and south of Lake Avenue.
District 2. All that territory lying west of Dixie Highway and north of Lake Avenue.
District 3. All that territory lying east of Dixie Highway and north of Lake Avenue.
District 4. All that territory lying east of Dixie Highway and south of Lake Avenue.

## Current Districts

## An Evaluation of the Existing Districts:

Referring to the 2020 Census Blocks, the City of Lake Worth Beach has a population of 42,219 , which implies that the ideal district size for each of the four election districts is 10,555 people. District 2 is the largest district with 14,149 people and District 4 is the smallest District with 6,539 people. Based on 2020 data, the election districts have a total deviation of $\mathbf{1 3 3 . 3 1 \%}$ and a spread between the largest and smallest districts of $\mathbf{7 2 . 1 0 \%}$. Based on the 2020 Census Block data, the current districts are well above the $10 \%$ deviation (spread) threshold used to evaluate election districts for population equity.

## An Evaluation of Future Growth:

To ensure that any recommendations for redistricting reflect the most up-to-date information about population growth, they are based on projections to 2024. City staff identified developments that were not included in the 2020 Census counts but are expected to be constructed and occupied by 2024. The projected population was amended after the submission of the initial Part A report. Following discussions with the City Commission and City staff, February of 2024 was specified as the new planning horizon for this Redistricting project. Consequently, the FAU team reduced the projected new units total from 1,554 to 1,364 . The reduction in units resulted in a projected population growth of 3,958 instead of 4,508.

## Table 1 - City of Lake Worth Beach

## Population Estimates for Approved Developments

| Subdivision | Units | Population Estimate | Current District | Completion Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The One | 14 | 41 | 4 | 2020 |
| The Mid | 230 | 667 | 2 | 2021 |
| Aviara | 49 | 142 | 3 | 2022 |
| The Bohemian | 200 | 580 | 1 | 2022 |
| 129 South K Street | 4 | 12 | 4 | 2023 |
| 1303/1305 Lucerne Avenue | 4 | 12 | 2 | 2023 |
| 15 North E Street | 2 | 6 | 2 | 2023 |
| 211 Ocean Breeze | 3 | 9 | 4 | 2023 |
| 230 North L Street | 6 | 17 | 3 | 2023 |
| 320 Lake Osborne Drive | 6 | 17 | 1 | 2023 |
| 509 North H Street | 3 | 9 | 2 | 2023 |
| Advantix | 189 | 548 | 2 | 2023 |
| Alora | 12 | 35 | 4 | 2023 |
| Casa Bella | 18 | 52 | 2 | 2023 |
| Deco Green | 125 | 363 | 2 | 2023 |
| Detroit Street Apartments | 81 | 235 | 2 | 2023 |
| Lake Worth Apartments | 24 | 70 | 2 | 2023/2024 |
| Lake Worth Station | 81 | 235 | 2 | 2023/2024 |
| Serendipity | 12 | 35 | 2 | 2023/2024 |
| Solimar | 8 | 23 | 3 | 2023/2024 |
| The Avery | 200 | 580 | 2 | 2023/2024 |
| The Cloisters Phase III | 15 | 44 | 4 | 2023/2024 |
| The Lord's Place | 7 | 21 | 4 | 2023/2024 |
| The Perch | 18 | 52 | 2 | 2023/2024 |
| Village Flats Phase I | 41 | 119 | 2 | 2023/2024 |
| Village Flats Phase II and III | 12 | 35 | 2 | 2023/2024 |
|  | 1,364 | 3,959 |  |  |

Note: The U.S. Census average persons per household (2016-2020) for the City of Lake Worth Beach (2.9) was used to calculate the population estimate, rounded to the nearest whole number.

Population projections were established for each of these projects by multiplying the number of units by the Persons Per Household (PPH) value established by the U.S. Census American Community Survey for the City of Lake Worth Beach (2016-2020): 2.9 (with the result rounded to the nearest whole number).

These results are listed in Table $\mathbf{1}$ above. (Note: Population projections were made at the Census Block
level, rather than on a project-by-project basis. Rounding error will thus produce a slight discrepancy in the population column if the reader attempts to multiply the total units per project by the PPH value, rather than summing the projected population for each block, as was done in this case.) In total, 3,958 people will be added to the city's total population count, with the majority $(3,018)$ being allotted to the District 2 population count.

Accounting for this anticipated growth, the 2024 projected population for the City will be 46,177 . Dividing by four puts the projected average population for each district at 11,544. The Existing Districts Map and Table 2 show the geographic boundaries and projected population counts for the current districts. The district with the greatest projected population is District 2 with 17,166 residents; the district with the smallest projected population is District 4 with 6,701 residents.

## Table 2 - Current Commission Districts - City of Lake Worth Beach

## 2020 Enumeration and 2024 Population Projection

| Current | 2020 Population | \% of City | Deviation From <br> Average | $\mathbf{2 0 2 4}$ Population <br> Projection | \% of City | Deviation From <br> Average |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts | 13,996 | 33.15 | $32.60 \%$ | 14,593 | 31.60 | $26.41 \%$ |
| District 1 | 14,149 | 33.51 | $34.05 \%$ | 17,166 | 37.17 | $48.70 \%$ |
| District 2 | 7,535 | 17.85 | $-28.61 \%$ | 7,717 | 16.71 | $-33.15 \%$ |
| District 3 | 6,539 | 15.49 | $-38.05 \%$ | 6,701 | 14.51 | $-41.95 \%$ |
| District 4 | 42,219 | 100 | $\mathbf{1 3 3 . 3 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 , 1 7 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 0 . 2 1 \%}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 , 5 5 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 . 3 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 , 5 4 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 7 . 5 5 \%}$ |
| Average |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Under these projections, District 2 will account for the greatest portion of the city's population at 37.17\%. This deviates from the theoretical average population of 11,544 by $48.7 \%$. District4, the smallest district, has $14.51 \%$ of the population and deviates from the average by $-41.95 \%$. This represents a difference of 10,465 people between the two districts, and a spread of $90.65 \%(48.7 \%+41.95 \%)$. The sum deviation of all districts, meanwhile, is $\mathbf{1 5 0 . 2 1 \%}$ and the mean deviation is $\mathbf{3 7 . 5 5 \%}$. As such, the current districts are severely unbalanced and the anticipated growth will exacerbate the situation. While the current district configuration is geographically compact and utilizes easy to understand boundaries consistent with the descriptions in the City Charter, the projected population imbalance exceeds the standard criterion for redistricting: there must be no more than a $10 \%$ deviation between districts.

The overall pattern of district boundary changes would need to increase the population of District 3 and District 4. This will, of course, necessitate an adjustment of their geographic boundaries where District 3 and 4 gain territory, while districts 1 and 2 lose territory.
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## Alternatives

Given the necessity for redistricting, four alternatives were initially developed for review and discussion by the City Commission and the citizens of Lake Worth Beach. All of the map alternatives presented by the FAU team met the standard districting guidelines. Each map represented alternative ways to better balance district populations, while also keeping with the intent of the other identified guidelines.

The high degree of population inequality across districts means that significant changes to district boundaries are required to achieve compliance with redistricting standards. Consequently, all the proposed alternatives involve substantial modifications to current boundaries and impact nearly a quarter of the City's residents.

At the November 1, 2022 meeting, the City Commission, voted to accept map alternatives 2 and 3 for consideration; thus eliminating alternatives 1 and 4. Additionally, direction was provided by the City Commission to both create a fifth map alternative and to evaluate a publically provided map option. Upon evaluation it was discovered that the public proposal did not meet the required population standards as the spread between the largest and smallest districts exceeded $10 \%$. However, the FAU consultant team modified the public submission and created a proposal that complied with population standards. During the various public meetings, hypothetical map configurations were discussed including an option described as a "layer cake" where the city would be split into four east-west bands that would sit one atop the another. However, following discussion, the Commission determined that approach should not be presented. This final consultant report presents a total of four map alternatives for consideration by the City Commission: Alternatives 2, 3, 5 and the Modified Public Proposal.

## Alternative 1

The City Commission voted to remove Alternative 1 from consideration. For further details, refer to the Interim Consultant Report of September 25, 2022.

## Alternative 3

Alternative 3 shifts territory in all the districts to achieve population equity. The impacts of these modifications on the districts' 2024 projected populations and geographic boundaries are reflected in Table 4, the Existing vs. Alternative 3 Comparison Map, the Neighborhoods \& Alternative 3 Map, and the Alternative $\mathbf{3}$ Map.

Table 4 - Alternative Districts 3 - City of Lake Worth Beach

## 2024 Population Projections

| Alt. 3 | 2020 Population | \% of City | Deviation From <br> Average | 2024 Population <br> Projection | \% of City | Deviation From <br> Average |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District 1 | 11,315 | 26.80 | $7.20 \%$ | 11,436 | 24.77 | $-0.94 \%$ |
| District 2 | 10,121 | 23.97 | $-4.11 \%$ | 11,606 | 25.13 | $0.53 \%$ |
| District 3 | 10,024 | 23.74 | $-5.03 \%$ | 11,634 | 25.19 | $0.78 \%$ |
| District 4 | 10,759 | 25.48 | $1.94 \%$ | 11,501 | 24.91 | $-0.37 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{4 2 , 2 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 . 2 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 , 1 7 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 6 2 \%}$ |
| Average | $\mathbf{1 0 , 5 5 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 5 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 , 5 4 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6 6 \%}$ |

Alternative 3 is a variant of Alternative 2 that creates a more compact and balanced District 1 while leaving District 4 unchanged. District 1's border extends north to 3rd Ave N, while the East-West border remains E Street. As with Alternative 2, this somewhat maintains the city's four quarters alignment, though again without a common intersection. Lake Worth Road remains the North-South border. The population balance between Districts 2 and 3 is improved by sacrificing the straight East-West border found in Alternative 2. It now makes several westerly jogs as it runs from the north to the south: first from Dixie Highway to the FEC railway south of Worthmore Drive, and then again to E Street south of 7th Avenue North. Seven neighborhoods are split in this alternative. The mean deviation of Alternative 3 is $0.66 \%$, while the spread between the largest and smallest districts is $\mathbf{1 . 7 2 \%}(0.94+0.78)$. Both measures are the lowest among the alternatives presented for consideration.
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## Alternative 5

Alternative 5 shifts territory in all the districts to achieve population equity. The impacts of these modifications on the districts' 2024 projected populations and geographic boundaries are reflected in Table 5, the Existing vs. Alternative 5 Comparison Map, the Neighborhoods \& Alternative 5 Map, and the Alternative 5 Map.

## Table 5 - Alternative Districts 5 - City of Lake Worth Beach

## 2024 Population Projections

| Alt. 5 | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ Population | \% of City | Deviation From <br> Average | $\mathbf{2 0 2 4}$ Population <br> Projection | \% of City | Deviation From <br> Average |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District 1 | 11,220 | 26.58 | $6.30 \%$ | 11,237 | 24.33 | $-2.66 \%$ |
| District 2 | 9,249 | 21.91 | $-12.37 \%$ | 11,764 | 25.48 | $1.90 \%$ |
| District 3 | 11,293 | 26.75 | $6.99 \%$ | 11,754 | 25.45 | $1.82 \%$ |
| District 4 | 10,457 | 24.77 | $-0.93 \%$ | 11,422 | 24.74 | $-1.06 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{4 2 , 2 1 9}$ | 100 | $\mathbf{2 6 . 5 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 , 1 7 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 4 4 \%}$ |
| Average | $\mathbf{1 0 , 5 5 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 6 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 , 5 4 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 8 6 \%}$ |

Alternative 5 was created by the FAU team based on input received from both the City Commission and members of the public throughout the redistricting process.

District 1's border follows Lake Worth Road to South A Street, then south to $4^{\text {th }}$ Avenue South, then east to the FEC Railway, and then south and east to the municipal border. District 4's northern boundary follows Lucerne Avenue east to North Federal Highway, and then jogs north to $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North, which it then follows and continues east to the municipal boundary. District 3 grows by obtaining the area north of Lucerne Avenue, east of North A Street and south of $10^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North. Alternative 5 maintains the basic quadrant appearance of the existing district boundaries with improved deviations in contrast to alternative 2. The mean deviation of Alternative 5 is $1.86 \%$, while the spread between the largest and smallest districts is 4.56\% (1.90 + 2.66).

## City of Lake Worth Beach



## City of Lake Worth Beach



District 1
District 2
$\square$ District $3 \square$ Neighborhoods District 4
$\square$ trict 2

## Summary of Map Alternatives

All of the redistricting map alternatives achieve population equity by adjusting the geographic boundaries of the existing City Commission election districts, with districts 1 and 2 contracting and districts 3 and 4 expanding. Due to the extreme population deviation that exists between districts in their current configuration, it is unavoidable that a large number of residents will be moved to new election districts. In the case of Alternatives 3 and 5, approximately 10,000 residents are so moved. Table 7 below compares each of the map options with respect to the population that they affect, the number of neighborhoods that they split, and their population deviation. Each of the alternatives reduces the spread between the largest and smallest districts to acceptable levels (less than $10 \%$ ). Alternative 3 is the most balanced of the options presented having both the lowest spread and mean deviation. Alternative 5 provides population equity while addressing feedback received from both the public and the Commission during the public participation phase of this redistricting effort. Additionally, Alternative 5 is the only proposal that does not place two existing commissioners in the same election district; in Alternative 3, the Commissioners from districts 1 and 4 are placed into the same district.

## Table 7 - Map Alternatives Summary Table - City of Lake Worth Beach

2024 Population Projections

| Configuration | Impacted <br> Population | Split <br> Neighborhoods | Total <br> Deviation | Mean <br> Deviation | Spread |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Districts | N/A | 3 | 150.21 | 37.55 | 90.65 |
| Alternative 2 | 10,073 | 8 | 11.27 | 2.82 | 8.28 |
| Alternative 3 | 10,360 | 7 | 2.62 | 0.66 | 1.72 |
| Alternative 5 | 9,739 | 4 | 7.44 | 1.86 | 4.56 |
| MPP | 15,067 | 5 | 4.24 | 1.06 | 3.39 |

## Appendix

## The 2020 Census

There are two primary differences that make the 2020 U.S. Census stand out from those that preceded it: a significant delay in its release due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and the implementation of a new 'differential privacy' policy. We will briefly address both of these here for the sake of posterity and context.

The decennial census aims to capture a snapshot in time of the population of the United States of America. Understanding that the population is constantly changing, with births, deaths, and migration patterns continuously adjusting the fabric of the American people, Census Day represents a single moment in time for which the U.S. population is enumerated with the greatest precision possible. This day is always April $1^{\text {st }}$. By this date, every household in America received an invitation to participate in the 2020 census, with three options to respond: online, by mail, or by phone. 2020 represented the first census to include an online response option. Subsequent to this day is a period of time in which the U.S. Census Bureau follows up with non-responders and begins a quality control process. Traditionally, the Census Bureau would deliver an apportionment count to the U.S. President on December $31^{\text {st }}$, followed by a distribution of redistricting data to the states exactly one year to the day after Census Day: in this case, April 1, 2021.

However, due to complications caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, the Census Bureau sought statutory relief from Congress that would allow for apportionment counts to be delivered to the President by April 30, 2021, and redistricting data to be delivered to the states no later than September 30, 2021. Additionally, the Census Bureau compressed the typical three-month nonresponse follow up enumeration period to two and half months. Ultimately, redistricting data were released in a 'legacy format' on August 12, 2021. This delay inevitably and unavoidably complicated redistricting efforts for every electoral district in the nation. It also meant that the amount of error in the data, inherent to every census where 100\% accuracy is impossible, would likely be greater in the 2020 census. The Census Bureau has since confirmed that the rate of missing information was higher in the 2020 census than in the 2010 census. However, they have also stated that this rate was lower than they initially feared.

The 2020 redistricting data are the first to employ 'differential privacy protection'. This represents the Census Bureau's introduction of 'noise' into the data at the more local geographic scale (Blocks and Block Groups) with the intent to strike a balance between data protection and precision. The effect is that while
the enumeration counts can be trusted at the Census Tract level, we must anticipate a certain degree of 'fuzziness' at the Block level. Specifically, while the aggregate count of population for a Census Tract will be accurate, a certain proportion of people and housing units will have been deliberately misallocated by the Census Bureau at the Block level. While this may not be problematic in the realignment of Congressional Districts, for example, it certainly represents a challenge for Municipal Districts, for which the geographic precision of Census Blocks is highly desirable.

Taken together, therefore, the complications related to the COVID-19 pandemic and the implementation of 'differential privacy' introduce a certain amount of additional uncertainty to the primary source of data for this analysis (2020 Census Redistricting Data (PL 94-171)) that is unprecedented. Nevertheless, these data remain the standard upon which municipal redistricting efforts shall be based across the nation.

## District Demographics

The tables below depict the demographics taken from the 2020 U.S. Census for the existing commission districts and the four proposed alternatives. Note that the columns 'White' through 'Other' sum to the City's population total. These categories represent the U.S. Census' definition of race. The 'Other' column, which accounts for a significant portion of the city's population, represents all of those people who identified as belong to two or more races. The last two columns are 'Hispanic or Latino' and 'Not Hispanic or Latino' (the U.S. Census' classification of ethnicity) also sum to the City's population total.

## Current Commission Districts - City of Lake Worth Beach

Expanded Demographics, U.S. Census 2020

| District <br> (Existing) | Total Population | White | Black or African American | American Indian and Alaska Native | Asian | Native <br> Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander | Other | Hispanic or Latino | Not Hispanic or Latino |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 13,996 | 3,785 (27.04\%) | 3,515 (25.11\%) | 993 (7.09\%) | 89 (0.64\%) | 8 (0.06\%) | 5,606 (40.05\%) | 7,422 (53.03\%) | 6,574 (46.97\%) |
| 2 | 14,149 | 4,490 (31.73\%) | 2,767 (19.56\%) | 1,087 (7.68\%) | 182 (1.29\%) | 14 (0.1\%) | 5,609 (39.64\%) | 7,740 (54.7\%) | 6,409 (45.3\%) |
| 3 | 7,535 | 5,056 (67.1\%) | 512 (6.79\%) | 134 (1.78\%) | 77 (1.02\%) | 6 (0.08\%) | 1,750 (23.22\%) | 1,950 (25.88\%) | 5,585 (74.12\%) |
| 4 | 6,539 | 3,149 (48.16\%) | 1,266 (19.36\%) | 237 (3.62\%) | 69 (1.06\%) | 0 (0\%) | 1,818 (27.8\%) | 2,245 (34.33\%) | 4,294 (65.67\%) |
|  | 42,219 | 16,480 (39.03\%) | 8,060 (19.09\%) | 2,451 (5.81\%) | 417 (0.99\%) | 28 (0.07\%) | 14,783 (35.02\%) | 19,357 (45.85\%) | 22,862 (54.15\%) |

Alternative 2 - City of Lake Worth Beach
Expanded Demographics, U.S. Census 2020

| District <br> (Alt 2) | Total Population | White | Black or African American | American Indian and Alaska Native | Asian | Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander | Other | Hispanic or Latino | Not Hispanic or Latino |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 11,594 | 3,504 (30.22\%) | 2,743 (23.66\%) | 670 (5.78\%) | 97 (0.84\%) | 4 (0.03\%) | 4,576 (39.47\%) | 5,997 (51.73\%) | 5,597 (48.27\%) |
| 2 | 10,420 | 3,467 (33.27\%) | 1,878 (18.02\%) | 899 (8.63\%) | 146 (1.4\%) | 13 (0.12\%) | 4,017 (38.55\%) | 5,572 (53.47\%) | 4,848 (46.53\%) |
| 3 | 9,446 | 5,636 (59.67\%) | 786 (8.32\%) | 294 (3.11\%) | 91 (0.96\%) | 7 (0.07\%) | 2,632 (27.86\%) | 3,179 (33.65\%) | 6,267 (66.35\%) |
| 4 | 10,759 | 3,873 (36\%) | 2,653 (24.66\%) | 588 (5.47\%) | 83 (0.77\%) | 4 (0.04\%) | 3,558 (33.07\%) | 4,609 (42.84\%) | 6,150 (57.16\%) |
|  | 42,219 | 16,480 (39.03\%) | 8,060 (19.09\%) | 2,451 (5.81\%) | 417 (0.99\%) | 28 (0.07\%) | 14,783 (35.02\%) | 19,357 (45.85\%) | 22,862 (54.15\%) |

## Alternative 3 - City of Lake Worth Beach

Expanded Demographics, U.S. Census 2020

| District <br> (Alt 3) | Total Population | White | Black or African American | American Indian and Alaska Native | Asian | Native <br> Hawailan and Other Pacific Islander | Other | Hispanic or Latino | Not Hispanic or Latino |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 11,315 | 3,541 (31.29\%) | 2,459 (21.73\%) | 774 (6.84\%) | 101 (0.89\%) | 6 (0.05\%) | 4,434 (39.19\%) | 5,804 (51.29\%) | 5,511 (48.71\%) |
| 2 | 10,121 | 3,297 (32.58\%) | 2,095 (20.7\%) | 691 (6.83\%) | 147 (1.45\%) | 11 (0.11\%) | 3,880 (38.34\%) | 5,330 (52.66\%) | 4,791 (47.34\%) |
| 3 | 10,024 | 5,769 (57.55\%) | 853 (8.51\%) | 398 (3.97\%) | 86 (0.86\%) | 7 (0.07\%) | 2,911 (29.04\%) | 3,614 (36.05\%) | 6,410 (63.95\%) |
| 4 | 10,759 | 3,873 (36\%) | 2,653 (24.66\%) | 588 (5.47\%) | 83 (0.77\%) | 4 (0.04\%) | 3,558 (33.07\%) | 4,609 (42.84\%) | 6,150 (57.16\%) |
|  | 42,219 | 16,480 (39.03\%) | 8,060 (19.09\%) | 2,451 (5.81\%) | 417 (0.99\%) | 28 (0.07\%) | 14,783 (35.02\%) | 19,357 (45.85\%) | 22,862 (54.15\%) |

Alternative 5 - City of Lake Worth Beach
Expanded Demographics, U.S. Census 2020

| District <br> (Alt 5) | Total Population | White | Black or African American | American Indian and Alaska Native | Asian | Native <br> Hawailan and Other Pacific Islander | Other | Hispanic or Latino | Not Hispanic or Latino |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 11,220 | 3,222 (28.72\%) | 3,067 (27.34\%) | 586 (5.22\%) | 83 (0.74\%) | 6 (0.05\%) | 4,256 (37.93\%) | 5,503 (49.05\%) | 5,717 (50.95\%) |
| 2 | 9,249 | 3,081 (33.31\%) | 2,231 (24.12\%) | 233 (2.52\%) | 146 (1.58\%) | 10 (0.11\%) | 3,548 (38.36\%) | 4,495 (48.6\%) | 4,754 (51.4\%) |
| 3 | 11,293 | 5,651 (50.04\%) | 969 (8.58\%) | 971 (8.6\%) | 98 (0.87\%) | 10 (0.09\%) | 3,594 (31.83\%) | 4,961 (43.93\%) | 6,332 (56.07\%) |
| 4 | 10,457 | 4,526 (43.28\%) | 1,793 (17.15\%) | 661 (6.32\%) | 90 (0.86\%) | 2 (0.02\%) | 3,385 (32.37\%) | 4,398 (42.06\%) | 6,059 (57.94\%) |
|  | 42,219 | 16,480 (39.03\%) | 8,060 (19.09\%) | 2,451 (5.81\%) | 417 (0.99\%) | 28 (0.07\%) | 14,783 (35.02\%) | 19,357 (45.85\%) | 22,862 (54.15\%) |

## City of Lake Worth Beach

## Alternative Districts: Option 3



# City of Lake Worth Beach 

 Alternative Districts: Option 5 Mex
# STAFF REPORT <br> REGULAR MEETING 

AGENDA DATE: February 7, 2023
DEPARTMENT: Public Works

## TITLE:

Mobile Home Park Solid Waste \& Recycling Rate Modification

## SUMMARY:

The rates currently charged to the City's Mobile Home Parks for solid waste and recycling services are not consistent and require modification to ensure equitability.

## BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION:

Back in 2018, there was an update to Chapter 12 (Health and Sanitation) in the City's Code of Ordinances. Also that year, there was discussion with the different mobile home parks (MHP's) regarding the type of collection services being received and if they would continue being serviced as residential or be converted to commercial. Under that Code of Ordinances Chapter 12, the MHPs fall under commercial properties as they contain nine or more dwelling units. Historically, however, the parks have been collected as residential with the exception of Orange Grove. In looking statewide, you'll find that MHPs can be billed both ways depending on what the municipality or County they reside in requires. You'll also find some parks have much wider rights-of-way, allowing heavy equipment to maneuver easier. Another factor is whether the governmental entity self-hauls or privatizes their solid waste and recycling operations.

Ultimately, the decision was made to not move forward with the transition to centralized collection (multiple dumpsters located on the property like within Orange Grove) and maintain the residential curbside collection with each unit having their own set of containers, just as a single-family residential property does. While centralized collection would provide for more efficient routes and eliminate the need for heavy equipment to traverse some of the small road rights-of-way within the parks, the City acknowledged the community convenience of door-to-door service for these locations, which consist of a generally more senior customer base. What was not addressed back then, however, was how these MHP properties are billed.

It would appear that incorrect billing of the MHPs in the City has been a long-standing issue and there is a high likelihood that they have never been billed correctly. Staff is currently trying to correct this practice. Residential properties within the City pay $\$ 245.15$ annually as part of their non-ad valorem taxes, which equates to $\$ 20.43$ if it were broken down monthly. While being serviced as residential properties, staff is recommending that monthly fees should reflect this collection method and be set at the same $\$ 20.43 /$ unit (currently, there are two parks below this amount and two above it). In addition to this residential rate option, based on Commission direction given at the $1 / 03 / 23$ meeting, staff is also bringing forward two additional commercial rate options.
Staff is currently seeking approval to proceed with this fee modification as part of a future FY2023 budget amendment that will be brought forward for Commission approval at a later date.

## MOTION:

Move to approve/disapprove setting the Mobile Home Park solid waste and recycling collection monthly rate at $\$ 20.43 /$ unit in the FY2023 budget amendment.

## ATTACHMENT(S):

Fiscal Impact Analysis
MHP Rate Comparison

FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS
Five Year Summary of Fiscal Impact:

| Fiscal Years | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Inflows |  |  |  |  |  |
| Current Appropriation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Program Income | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grants | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| In Kind | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Outflows |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operating | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Capital | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Fiscal Impact | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. of Addn'l Full-Time |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employee Positions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| New Appropriation Fiscal Impact: |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Revenue Source | Expenditure |
| Department | Refuse |  |
| Division |  |  |
| GL Description | Refuse Fee - Residential |  |
| GL Account Number | $343.40-10$ |  |
| Project Number |  |  |
| Requested Funds |  |  |


| Budget Transfer Impact |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Revenue Source | Expenditure |
| Department |  |  |
| Division |  |  |
| GL Description |  |  |
| GL Account Number |  |  |
| Project Number |  |  |
| Requested Funds |  |  |


| Contract Award - Existing Appropriation |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Expenditure |
| Department |  |


|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Division |  |
| GL Description |  |
| GL Account Number |  |
| Project Number |  |
| Requested Funds |  |

## SOLID WASTE \& RECYCLING SERVICES - MOBILE HOME PARKS

| EXISTING MHP RATE STRUCTURE |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location | Units * | Current <br> Monthly Rate | Per Unit Cost <br> Per Month |
| Orange Grove Mobile Home Park | 108 | $\$ 3,505.48$ | $\$ 32.46$ |
| Palm Beach Mobile Home Park | 333 | $\$ 6,553.60$ | $\$ 19.68$ |
| Holiday II Mobile Home Park | 102 | $\$ 1,380.84$ | $\$ 13.54$ |
| Holtz Mobile Home Park | 131 | $\$ 2,694.24$ | $\$ 20.57$ |


| PROPOSED MHP RATE STRUCTURE |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location | Units * | Proposed <br> Monthly Cost | Per Unit Cost <br> Per Month |
| Orange Grove Mobile Home Park | 108 | $\$ 2,206.44$ | $\$ 20.43$ |
| Palm Beach Mobile Home Park | 333 | $\$ 6,803.19$ | $\$ 20.43$ |
| Holiday II Mobile Home Park | 102 | $\$ 2,083.86$ | $\$ 20.43$ |
| Holtz Mobile Home Park | 131 | $\$ 2,676.33$ | $\$ 20.43$ |


| RATE COMPARISON: EXISTING MHP RATE VS. PROPOSED RATE STRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location | Units * | EXISTING MHP RATES (per unit/month) | PROPOSED <br> MHP RATES <br> (per <br> unit/month) | DIFFERENCE PER UNIT (per month) | MONTHLY COST DIFFERENCE ALL UNITS | ANNUAL COST DIFFERENCE |
| Orange Grove Mobile Home Park | 108 | \$32.46 | \$20.43 | -\$12.03 | -\$1,299.24 | -\$15,590.88 |
| Palm Beach Mobile Home Park | 333 | \$19.68 | \$20.43 | \$0.75 | \$249.75 | \$2,997.00 |
| Holiday Mobile Home Park | 102 | \$13.54 | \$20.43 | \$6.89 | \$702.78 | \$8,433.36 |
| Holtz Mobile Home Park | 131 | \$20.57 | \$20.43 | -\$0.14 | -\$18.34 | -\$220.08 |

ADJUSTED CITY REVENUE

| RATE COMPARISON: EXISTING MHP <br> RATE VS. PROPOSED COMMERCIAL <br> RATE STRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location | Units * | EXISTING <br> MHP RATES <br> (per <br> unit/month) | PROPOSED <br> MHP RATES <br> (per <br> unit/month) | DIFFERENCE <br> PER UNIT <br> (per month) | MONTHLY <br> COST <br> DIFFERENCE <br> ALL UNITS | ANNUAL COST <br> DIFFERENCE |
| Orange Grove Mobile Home Park | 108 | $\$ 32.46$ | $\$ 46.13$ | $\$ 13.67$ | $\$ 1,476.36$ | $\$ 17,716.32$ |
| Palm Beach Mobile Home Park | 333 | $\$ 19.68$ | $\$ 46.13$ | $\$ 26.45$ | $\$ 8,807.85$ | $\$ 105,694.20$ |
| Holiday Mobile Home Park | 102 | $\$ 13.54$ | $\$ 46.13$ | $\$ 32.59$ | $\$ 3,324.18$ | $\$ 39,890.16$ |
| Holtz Mobile Home Park | 131 | $\$ 20.57$ | $\$ 46.13$ | $\$ 25.56$ | $\$ 3,348.36$ | $\$ 40,180.32$ |

\$203,481.00 ADJUSTED CITY REVENUE

| RATE COMPARISON: EXISTING MHP RATE VS. PROPOSED COMMERCIAL DUMPSTER RATE STRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location | Units * | EXISTING <br> MHP RATES <br> (per <br> unit/month) | PROPOSED <br> MHP RATES (per unit/month) | DIFFERENCE <br> PER UNIT (per month) | MONTHLY COST DIFFERENCE ALL UNITS | ANNUAL COST DIFFERENCE |
| Orange Grove Mobile Home Park | 108 | \$32.46 | \$33.82 | \$1.36 | \$146.88 | \$1,762.56 |
| Palm Beach Mobile Home Park | 333 | \$19.68 | \$33.72 | \$14.04 | \$4,675.32 | \$56,103.84 |
| Holiday Mobile Home Park | 102 | \$13.54 | \$33.93 | \$20.39 | \$2,079.78 | \$24,957.36 |
| Holtz Mobile Home Park | 131 | \$20.57 | \$33.59 | \$13.02 | \$1,705.62 | \$20,467.44 |

\$103,291.20 ADJUSTED CITY REVENUE
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