



Palm Beach County Amendment Round 26-B2 Transmittal Executive Summary

A. County Proposed Text Amendment

A.1 Compatibility Amendment

Summary: The item before the Board is a set of proposed revisions to the Comprehensive Plan related to Compatibility due to recently enacted law. The proposal consists of changes to the Plan as indicated:

- Revisions to the **Future Land Use Element** to establish new policy and factors that ensure compatibility between residential uses.

Staff Recommendation: *Approval*, the proposed modifications to the County's Comprehensive Plan will bring the County into compliance with new statutory regulations effective January 1, 2027. The proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments will help ensure regulatory predictability and standardize objective considerations in evaluating compatibility for residential to residential uses.

Planning Commission/LPA Recommendation: *Approval*, motion by Cedric Thomas, seconded by Gary Brown, passed in an 8 to 0 vote at the August 14, 2026 public hearing. Commission discussion included clarifications that the compatibility requirements apply only to residential-to-residential situations, and the assessment of compatibility and potential mitigation measures contemplated for inclusion in the ULDC. There was no public comment.

BCC Action: *Transmit*, motion by Commissioner Marino, seconded by Commissioner Weiss, passed in a 7 to 0 vote at the August 26, 2026 public hearing. There was no Board discussion. There was no public comment.

B. Privately Proposed FLUA

B.1 West Boynton Ranches (LGA 2025-012)

Request: From Agricultural Reserve (AGR) to Essential Housing with an underlying Agricultural Reserve (EH/AGR) with conditions

Size: 32.35 acres total **BCC District:** Commissioner Sachs, District 5

Location: **Parcel 1-A:** South side of Boynton Beach Blvd., approximately 0.25 miles west of Lyons Road (development area & contiguous preserve area), and **Parcel 1-B:** South side of Happy Hollow Road, between Smith Sundy Road and Lyons Road (offsite preserve area)

Summary: The applicant is proposing a FLUA amendment on two parcels, one comprised of a proposed development area with contiguous preserve, and the other as a proposed offsite preserve area, that together total 32.35 acres, for a change from the Agricultural Reserve (AGR) to Essential Housing with an underlying Agricultural Reserve (EH/AGR) FLU designation. The applicant is proposing the maximum 8 units per acre, or 259 dwelling units with 25% (65)

required as on-site workforce housing. The concurrent zoning application is proposing to locate the majority of the required 60% preserve area contiguous to the development area with a smaller offsite preserve.

Staff Recommendation: *Approval with conditions*

Planning Commission/LPA Recommendation: *Denial*, a motion to approve with conditions by Rick Stopek, seconded by Serge D'Haiti, failed in a 2 to 6 vote (with Varisa Lall Dass, Raphael Clemente, Rossy Matos, Brian Stenberg, Rick Stopek and Serge D'Haiti dissenting) at the April 11, 2025 public hearing. Commission discussion included comments regarding reducing the maximum density, compatibility, alternative development layout, traffic concerns, and balancing the need for workforce housing and the existing community desires and character. Comments were generally supportive of workforce housing but not at the proposed higher density on the subject site. One member of the public spoke in support of the proposed amendment citing the need for workforce housing that would support employees of the area. Twelve members of the public, including a representative from COBWRA, were generally supportive of workforce housing but spoke in opposition citing that the density is too high, height as out of character, incompatibility with the adjacent and surrounding residential area, traffic congestion impacts on emergency response, loss of agricultural land, and delayed improvements to surrounding roadways. Two residents of adjacent five-acre parcels also cited concerns related to agreements for maintaining existing historical access through the subject site, drainage within the access, and utility easements. Speakers were supportive of a reduction to the maximum density and additional buffering.

BCC Action: *Transmit with Modifications*, motion by Commissioner Marino, seconded by Vice Mayor Woodward, passed in a 5 to 2 vote (with Mayor Baxter and Commissioner Sachs dissenting) at the August 26, 2026 public hearing. The modification consisted of a revision to condition number one (1) limiting the maximum number of dwelling units to 198 units instead of the staff recommended limit of 259 units, as shown in strike out and underline in Exhibit 1-A. The Board discussion included inquiries and comments related to concessions the applicant agreed to with community representatives and adjacent property owners, specifically related to an existing tree farm use, preserving and relocating existing access through the site for adjacent properties, protection of farming activities, balancing community desires and agriculture, and reducing density. Further, the Board discussion focused on the provision of workforce housing, the applicant's proposal to limit the maximum density, the appropriateness of considering specific unreviewed site plan changes and issues related to the proposed concurrent Zoning application, and the timing of the proposed amendment. Two members of the public, members of the Sierra Club, spoke in opposition citing concern over the appropriateness of the proposed non-contiguous preserve area, citing the lack of additional bus routes on Boynton Beach Boulevard, travel time and distance to Tri-Rail, and the Planning Commission recommendation of denial. Four members of the public spoke in support, including an adjacent property owner, representatives of COBWRA, and Velencia Reserve, citing support for Essential Housing, concessions or changes proposed by the applicant related to access, density and height. In addition, eighteen additional items of correspondence were received (see Exhibit 12).

May 13, 2025: *Postpone*, granting a request by the applicant for postponement to next Round BCC Transmittal Public Hearing (Round 25-B2, August 27, 2025), motion by Commissioner Flores, seconded by Commissioner Weiss, passed in a 6 to 0 vote (with Commissioner Powell absent) at the May 13, 2025 public hearing. One member of the public spoke in opposition to the postponement citing that the project could not be improved. Two members of the public, one representing the Coalition of Boynton West Residential Associations (COBWRA) and one as the COBWRA delegate representing Valencia Reserve, spoke in support of the postponement citing

support for additional time and continued discussions with the applicant.

Subsequent to the BCC granting the applicant's request for a postponement to a subsequent Round, the applicant requested and was granted, several administrative postponements of the application to subsequent rounds.

April 29, 2026: *Postpone*, granting a request by the applicant for postponement to the May 28 BCC Zoning public hearing, motion by Vice Mayor Woodward, seconded by Commissioner Weiss, passed in a 6 to 0 vote (with Commissioner Sachs absent) at the April 29, 2026 public hearing. Six members of the public spoke in support of the postponement.

May 28, 2026: *Postpone*, granting a request by the applicant for postponement to the next Comprehensive Plan Amendment Round BCC Transmittal Public Hearing (Round 26-B2, August 26, 2026), motion by Vice Mayor Woodward, seconded by Commissioner Marino, passed in a 6 to 0 vote (with Commissioner Weiss absent) at the May 28, 2026 BCC Zoning Public Hearing. Three members of the public spoke in support of the postponement citing opportunity for more time for community and applicant discussion. One member of public spoke in opposition of the postponement.