

City of Kalamazoo
PLANNING COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes
July 8, 2024
FINAL

Members Present: Mitchell Curtiss; Gregory Milliken, Chair; Christine Dascenzo; Ian Smith, Wendell Tolber; Brian Pittelko; Michelle Audette-Bauman

Members Excused: Shardae Chambers; Jennifer Swan

City Staff: Christina Anderson, City Planner; Bobby Durkee, Assistant City Planner; Beth Cheeseman, Executive Administrative Assistant; Charlie Bear, Assistant City Attorney

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Commissioner Milliken called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

Planner Durkee proceeded with roll call and determined there was a quorum.

B. ADOPTION OF FORMAL AGENDA

Commissioner Curtiss, seconded by Commissioner Pittelko, moved approval of the July 8, 2024 Planning Commission agenda as presented. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Dascenzo, seconded by Commissioner Curtiss, moved approval of the June 6, 2024 minutes as presented. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

D. COMMUNICATIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Planner Durkee shared that communications were provided via email and copies at the dais.

E. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Commissioner Milliken explained the process of public comment for in-person and call-in comments.

1. A public hearing to consider a rezoning from Driesenga & Associates, Inc. on behalf of Friendship Village to amend the Friendship Village Planned Unit Development (PUD) located at 1400 & 1402 N Drake Rd and on the western One-Thousand Four-Hundred-Forty (1,440) feet of 4300 Beech Avenue.

Planner Durkee apologized for not including the number of the public hearing (P.C. #2024.08) on the agenda.

Planner Durkee explained that the proposed development in the Friendship Village Planned Unit Development (PUD) exceeded the level of administrative approval and was required to go before the Planning Commission and the City Commission for approval. He gave the official definition of a Planned Unit Development (PUD), but said it is considered a stand-alone zoning ordinance.

Planner Durkee outlined the history and growth of the Friendship Village PUD spanning from 1972-2024. The last site plan for the PUD was in 2013.

Planner Durkee reviewed maps, previously approved PUD plans, and the proposed PUD plan. He spoke about an overlap. At the time of the Garden Homes PUD, part of the approval was that the northern 225' from that parcel went to the Garden Homes PUD. He said the proposed amendment would make the line clear. However, the overlap doesn't exactly line up with the protective buffer. Planner Durkee mentioned the stormwater needs of the future development and that Friendship Village has a commercial classification. He mentioned that the Drake Road parcels are in the Natural Features Protection (NFP) Overlay. Planner Durkee reviewed the 132' buffer to the east. Using all available information (density, setbacks, NFP), staff informed the applicant that the underlying zone district for the development was RM-15. The applicant provided information based on RM-15 standards.

Commissioner Curtiss commented that the current and future land use maps show the zoning as different from each other. He asked if there was a reason for the change from commercial to residential. Planner Durkee said that the zoning land use is residential, however, because of the full nursing care facility, Assessing classified it as commercial. Planner Durkee confirmed for Commissioner Curtiss that the change of land use has no effect on the way it is considered under the zoning code and that a PUD is not a typical zoning classification.

Commissioner Dascenzo asked if the City Commission had any discussion about the overlap when the Garden Homes PUD was approved. Planner Durkee reported that the Garden Homes PUD did not go to the City Commission. At the time the zoning ordinance only required the PUD to go to the Planning Commission.

Planner Durkee reviewed the proposed development. He noted that Friendship Village included the bed measurement to help staff understand density and parking requirements. Planner Durkee referred to a zoom in of the parking summary. He noticed there was a miscalculation under the number of beds (1 per 5 beds). The original calculation was 142 parking spaces needed for the beds. However, they only need 28 for the beds. That changes their parking over calculation. Planner Durkee stated that the Staff report referred to the corrected number because they got the updated plan very quickly.

Planner Durkee explained that the PUD approved in 1997 was approved per that ordinance and that plan. Moving forward, if this plan was approved, it would be based off the current zoning code and PUD standards.

Phase I of the development is expected to start in October 2025.

- Demolition of the existing maintenance building, guard shack, and free standing garages.

- New construction of a single-story skilled nursing addition – including 40 units and 48 beds. Those are existing relocated skilled nursing beds.
- New construction of a single-story free standing maintenance building.
- New construction of a single-story multiple stall parking garage.
- New three-story 80 unit independent living building.
- Remodel existing spaces such as the rehab building, and town center commons area.
- Revisions to the campus loop and additional parking.
- New construction site improvements – sidewalks, landscaping, outdoor amenities, and surface parking areas.

Phase II will be focused on the main building and duplexes. Start date for this phase is unknown at this time.

- Demolition of existing three-story independent living wing (loss of 60 units).
- Demolition of single-story skilled nursing wing (loss of 28 units and 41 beds).
- New construction of two three-story independent living additions. That would lead to 110 units for residents.
- Remodel main kitchen, main common center.
- New construction of two additional single-story multi stall parking garages.
- Any site improvements not already done.

This work represents 76 additional dwelling units and 19 more beds than the PUD in addition to modernization and internal work.

Planner Durkee stated that the role of the Planning Commission was to ensure that the PUD is consistent with zoning ordinance standards and consistent with the Master Plan. He reviewed the criteria as outlined in the Staff Report. He shared that staff recommends approval of the PUD with the condition that the City Commission amend the agreement to permit the stormwater basin as shown on the PUD plan.

Commissioner Curtiss asked about the phasing for the two proposed stormwater basins. Planner Durkee thought they would be put in as needed but wanted the applicant to give more information.

Commissioner Dascenzo said there was already a PUD in place where Phase II was not completed. She noted that most of the unit loss for this PUD was listed in Phase II. She wondered if there would be any problem if Phase II didn't occur. Planner Durkee responded that if the number of units didn't exceed the number in the PUD plan, that would be permitted.

Commissioner Milliken clarified that the specific development proposed would need to go through formal site plan review. He also stated that they were being asked to review the proposed plan as an amendment to the previously approved plan, ensure its consistency with standards, and make a recommendation to the City Commission.

Commissioner Curtiss asked if their approval would be specific to the layout provided or if it was for a certain number of buildings of a certain size in any permutation. Planner Durkee said it would be approval of the layout proposed. He shared that there could be an administrative approval done if things were slightly different. Planner Durkee clarified that the Planning Commission was not doing a site plan review level of approval of the PUD. The PUD plan gives the guardrails for the development.

Commissioner Milliken asked if it was the goal to shift PUD 1 and PUD 2 boundaries, so the western part of PUD 2 becomes part of PUD 1 and the southwestern part of the parcel that PUD 1 sits on becomes part of PUD 2. Planner Durkee clarified that the overlap has always been part of PUD 1. When they built PUD 2, they put in Persianwood Drive (PUD 1), but there was an easement there for a road. To achieve PUD 2, they built a compliant road from PUD 1, but they missed the buffer strip. Commissioner Milliken asked if the boundaries remain the same. Planner Durkee said that PUD boundary lines have been respected and used. To be consistent, staff advised the applicant to use the PUD boundary.

Commissioner Curtiss thought that a lot would come down to the 132' buffer zone. He asked where it came from and what it had to look like. Planner Durkee explained that in 1997 there was a PUD with a condition to move the buffer to the east side. The original approval was imposed by the City Commission. It was a deed restriction. The language in the deed restriction calls it a buffer, but it is not too specific. It didn't say it should be trees. He stated that if the northern part isn't cut off from the buffer, then the pond would have to be removed from the PUD plan. Commissioner Milliken asked if the deed restriction just applied to 1402 Drake Road parcel. Planner Durkee said there is a legal description, and it does cross parcel boundaries.

Commissioner Tolber referenced the NFP requirements. He wondered if the natural features had been identified, if that would be a part of this process or a separate process with the NFP. Planner Durkee said that process would be separate. Friendship village was aware of the NFP impacts, and they had done some groundwork to start to understand the site. When any phase of the PUD goes to site plan review (and all of their future improvements require site plan review), the NFP Committee will review the site plan and give their approval before the site plan is approved and construction starts. Planner Durkee spoke with the Natural Features Protection staff liaison – he said they are doing everything needed to understand the criteria.

Mr. Randy Kuser, Lifecare Services, came forward as a representative of the development side of the project. He said they manage the accounting side and do things for the facility they can't afford. For this project, he said they assisted Friendship Village with hiring an architect, civil engineer, interior design firm, and landscape architect. Mr. Kuser said they recently put out an RFP and hired a local contractor to help with pre-construction so they can decide the most non-disruptive way to complete the project.

Mr. David Riser, Associate Executive Director - Friendship Village of Kalamazoo, introduced himself and went over the mission statement, vision statement, and values of the organization. He shared the following Friendship Village of Kalamazoo campus goals.

- Addressing continued demand for senior living housing needs over the next 15+ years.
- Update interior and exterior finishes.

- Create a more cohesive feel across the continuum of care options on campus.
- Enhance existing site circulation and wayfinding.
- Increase outdoor and indoor amenities for additional choices.

Mr. Sam Michael, Pope Architects Inc., reiterated the need for additional housing for seniors. He stated that this campus is aging, and they are trying to bring state of the art amenities and technologies to make the campus grow and last the next 15-25 years. Mr. Michael said they planned to address wayfinding across the site, the loop road's vehicular circulation, parking, and sidewalks around the campus. He said they anticipate keeping the campus up and running throughout construction.

Commissioner Milliken asked for clarification as to why the stormwater basin needed to be in the proposed location resulting in a shift of the buffer. Ms. Annie Gigowski, Driesenga & Associates, stated that location is ideal for the independent living building to the east. With a full build out of the campus, that area isn't going to provide enough stormwater retention for that development. They will need to utilize the area at the northwest. She shared that both basins sizes are shown as a full buildout. Ms. Gigowski said they had been working with the City Engineer on calculations. During Phase I they would not be utilizing the full build out of at least the northwest basin. Commissioner Milliken commented that the existing stormwater basin for the club house looks like a landscaped feature that happens to be low and is fairly dry. He wondered if that was the proposed design for the basins. Ms. Gigowski agreed that based on their calculations right now, the basins would be designed to be dry.

Commissioner Milliken asked for a description of the proposed underground parking. Mr. Michael said they are proposing underground parking under the reverse c-shaped building. There would be two different drive lanes entering each end of that building. As a vehicle approaches the building, they will be going down a level. He said there would be retaining walls on either side of that drive entry. The majority of the building will be at grade. People won't be able to see the parking garage except from the access points. They plan on parking on both sides, intermixed between columns. The garage will have adequate lighting, safety control measures, bike parking, and storage. There won't be windows, and it will have a mechanical means of ventilation. The overall intent is for residents to bring their cars in and keep them out of the cold elements.

Commissioner Curtiss asked why it was an ideal location for the new building to the east; what makes other locations not ideal, and what hardships would be imposed by relocating that basin. Mr. Michael said that one big thing they've recognized with underground parking is that the piping is lower in the ground. They would ideally like to gravity feed drainage from that area. The area to the northwest would provide significant challenges pumping water up and piping it long distances. Mr. Michael said they identified the northeast location close to the c-shaped building because of the proximity and the elevations are more conducive to sending some storm water in that location. He said there are very limited open areas on this site. Mr. Michael mentioned a dedicated memorial tree area on the southwest portion of site that they cannot touch. It is sacred to the campus.

Commissioner Dascenzo asked if there had been any discussion about connecting trails to the park to the south. Mr. Michael said that was not discussed, but they would be willing to explore that.

Commissioner Tolber asked what the general theme of feedback was received from the public. He wondered if they made any changes based on that feedback. Mr. Michael said that much of the feedback was about the buffer zone on right hand side. There was a misconception that woodland areas in the buffer zone would be completely removed. He said they were able to clarify their intent. Overall, the feedback was fairly positive, although there were still some concerns about change happening in neighbors' back yards. Mr. Michael said they want to do their best to make sure those people are heard and mitigate any issues. Commissioner Tolber asked about the purpose and type of screening they would provide. Mr. Michael said the screening purpose would be to maintain a visual buffer and he believed it would be natural vegetation.

Commissioner Milliken opened the public hearing.

Ms. Beth van den Hombergh came forward as a follow up to letters and photos she sent. She brought photo collages as a visual. Ms. van den Hombergh stated that neighbors along the property line have significant concerns about their quality of life. She feels they are living in a hostile home environment. Ms. van den Hombergh reviewed the picture collages she brought while voicing concerns about a drainage pond, natural features, and retaliation from Friendship Village. Ms. van den Hombergh requested amendments to the plan to protect property lines.

Ms. Janet Hay came forward to comment on her experience at the Friendship Village public meeting. She didn't feel staff was forthcoming about details about the expansion project. Ms. Hay felt there were conflicting messages between posters and the spoken word - particularly with reference to the buffer zone.

Mr. Lenzy Bell said he was not aware of Friendship Village's public meeting regarding the expansion. However, he did receive a letter about the Planning Commission hearing. He said he was glad to hear that there was a plan to deal with drainage. Since the Garden Homes area was developed, he has experienced repeated flooding in his back yard. Mr. Bell held up pictures of the flooding. He talked with residents that live at the back of the property. They also had concerns when they first moved in about flooding in their basements. Mr. Bell said he followed the line of water that comes from the property and then goes back to the drainage area that cuts into his back yard. He is not against progress, but not at his expense. Mr. Bell said he is not concerned about Friendship Village's expansion or their drainage ponds, but he wants to know what they will do about his current drainage problems.

Mr. Tony van den Hombergh asked them to consider an amendment to protect the woodlands along the east property line. He doesn't want to see a three-story building from the back of his house – he would rather see trees. Mr. van den Hombergh also expressed displeasure at the idea of a walking trail on the other side of his fence. There is a mowed path there currently and he has been told there will be a trail back there.

There were no call-in comments.

Commissioner Milliken closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Curtiss noted applicant statements about variances from existing ordinances pertaining to maximum building height, required minimum bicycle parking, and setbacks. He asked if those variances would be granted by the approval of the proposed PUD. Commissioner Curtiss wondered what consideration staff made while talking to the applicant about those variances. Planner Durkee said that a PUD, by design, permits you to propose what you think you need. A PUD can permit beyond what underlying zone requires if it is spelled out through the plan. He indicated that staff evaluated their parking, building heights, and setbacks and they didn't seem out of context with their plan. If the developer decided to seek something outside of the PUD plan, they would probably need to seek a variance. The standards in the PUD plan should be considered the maximum allowed.

Commissioner Dascenzo clarified that the 132' buffer zone on the east would remain all the way north and south, but the 225' buffer to the north would be eliminated in this recommended motion. Planner Durkee confirmed that the Planning Commission would be recommending to the City Commission to make that alteration. The deed restriction can't be modified without City Commission approval.

Commissioner Milliken commented that it was clarified earlier that the Planning Commission was not doing a site plan level review for this project. During public comments, they heard about screening and drainage issues, which are good things to consider. Commissioner Milliken indicated that some of the issues may fall under enforcement which is not under the Planning Commission's purview. He questioned where they draw that line. Planner Durkee shared that code enforcement staff have responded to some of these issues previously. The buffer creates a unique situation. He shared that the deed is, in a way, serving as the ordinance without having to go into the code. Planner Durkee thought the proposed PUD had more screening than if this was a typical new development. They would still evaluate the screening requirement for this development. If additional screening is required outside of the buffer, then it would be required in addition to the buffer.

Commissioner Tolber asked if there were plans for ongoing community outreach so residents could voice concerns and have them addressed rather than go through enforcement. Mr. Michael said there were no plans in place for that currently, but they are open to hearing community members in any capacity. Mr. Riser agreed that Friendship Village is not only a partnership with future residents, but also a partnership with the greater Kalamazoo community. They are open and willing to have those conversations. Planner Durkee also mentioned that the public will be notified when the matter goes to the City Commission.

Commissioner Curtiss expressed the need for clarity of what Friendship Village could do in the future (remove trees, change type of screening, remove screening along the buffer zone) that would not require further oversight of the Planning Commission. Planner Durkee said that the simple answer is that the guard rails are in the recorded document. If the PUD and/or deed restriction doesn't give specifications, then staff would work between the NFP and screening ordinance to support what's in the deed restriction.

Commissioner Curtiss asked about a stop gap where no further trees were to be removed without approval from the NFP. He wanted to avoid a situation where there is Planning Commission and City Commission approval, then all the trees are removed except for the buffer. Planner Durkee assured that anything in violation of the deed restriction could be an enforcement issue. Commissioner Curtiss asked if it was in

the capacity of the Planning Commission to modify or add language to guarantee some sort of a true buffer. Planner Durkee asked Attorney Bear if he could address the limits of the Planning Commission's authority to put conditions on the deed restriction. Attorney Bear said he would need to review the deed restriction in more detail before he could address that question.

Commissioner Milliken thought if they were able to suggest an amendment to remove the northern 225', they could probably suggest an amendment to add a sentence or two. Planner Durkee said he would work with Attorney Bear to get this question nailed down more before it goes to City Commission.

Commissioner Curtiss asked if there was input from City stormwater management staff on the necessity of a retention basin in the northeast in the buffer zone vs. other locations. Planner Durkee said that the engineer seemed to think the plan looked reasonable. This is a non-conforming site for stormwater that would probably need more capacity. From a technical feasibility and maintenance standpoint, with that building, they thought it made a lot of sense.

Planner Durkee confirmed for Commissioner Dascenzo that there are not any open enforcement cases on this property.

Planner Durkee stated that the City Commission made the previous deed restriction, so in theory they could make new ones. He felt he was hearing they wanted language saying there is a vegetative cover to achieve the intent of the screening. Planner Durkee said if they didn't make a hard condition now, they could request the City Commission to evaluate that when it reaches them.

Commissioner Milliken read the definition, *There shall be a 132' wide natural buffer area along the easterly property line.*

Commissioner Pittelko, seconded by Commissioner Tolber, made a motion to recommend approval to the City Commission to approve the amendment to the Friendship Village PUD with the recommendation of removal of the northerly 225' of the buffer easement to permit the future stormwater basin as shown on the PUD plan.

Commissioner Pittelko said they heard a compelling case that Friendship Village needed to update and expand. There is a need for housing and senior housing in this community. He said they heard concerns from neighbors, but those are not under the purview of this Commission. At the end of the day, they have a proposal of a large vegetative barrier that already exists. Commissioner Pittelko thought they should consider a motion to recommend that remain intact. He thought it was important for the development to have the capacity to handle additional stormwater. Resident comments of already existing stormwater drainage problems show that Friendship Village needs to expand their stormwater handling capacity.

Commissioner Curtiss said he was in general agreement with the motion and points laid out. Staff's recommended condition of approval is to remove the northern 225' of buffer zone. He suggested they could still have some sort of screening in that 225' of eastern border and include a stormwater basin area. Commissioner Curtiss asked if they needed to remove the definition of the buffer from that 225'.

Commissioner Milliken clarified that he was saying that instead of removing 225', refining the definition to include a stormwater basin. Commissioner Curtiss said the buffer could include the stormwater basin and require screening which would allow the buffer to extend up the 225'. This would guarantee protection for the southern area while not requiring elimination of the buffer as a recommendation to the City Commission. Planner Durkee commented that was a good thought. He said the feasibility issue right now is what type of basin retention is necessary. The size and volume of the basin is unknown.

Commissioner Dascenzo offered potential language for a friendly amendment to the motion, *The property owner amend existing buffer easement to allow a future stormwater basin*, striking the phrase to remove the northern 225'. Commissioner Milliken worried about opening the entire buffer area to stormwater basins. He wanted to retain the 225' reference. Commissioner Curtiss said that is why he wanted to include the language of a visual screen. Neighbors want a visual screen, and the applicant wants a stormwater basin somewhere in buffer area - as long as there is a visual screen, there is no harm done.

Commissioner Audette-Bauman thought there was a pretty big difference between 5' of screening vs. 132' of screening. She felt the concerns about opening the entire buffer zone to the potential for a retention area was something they should be intentional about. She asked, with the current recommended language, if there would still be a requirement for screening - even if they remove the northern 225'. Planner Durkee agreed that zoning requires it, and the approved site plan for the Garden Homes probably has a detailed planting plan. Between zoning, site plan, and the PUD plan, there would still have to be screening. Commissioners Dascenzo and Curtiss agreed that if screening was already required, then they wouldn't have to add language about it. Commissioner Curtiss stated that the proposed amendment would be refining the definition of buffer to include stormwater retention basins only in the northern 225' as laid out in the previous PUD plan.

Commissioner Curtiss made a motion to amend the condition of the approval to read, the property owner shall amend the existing buffer easement to allow for stormwater retention basins within the northern 225' to permit the future basin as show in the PUD plan.

Commissioner Milliken thought Commissioner Pittelko had to second that. After some thought, **Commissioner Pittelko seconded the motion.**

Attorney Bear clarified that while the motion to amend the amendment does require a second, it didn't have to be Commissioner Pittelko.

Commissioner Milliken stated that the proposed amendment maintains the buffer but adds the language of the storm basin. Not supporting the amendment reduces the buffer, but the PUD plan shows the storm basin. Commissioner Curtiss clarified the reason for the changed wording. Before, it said removing the buffer. It feels like a larger than necessary change to the original PUD agreement and the buffer as was laid out when an amendment would serve the same purpose without having to remove it.

Commissioner Audette-Bauman agreed. The current language in the easement defines the buffer as a natural buffer. She asked if they should recommend a more precise definition of the buffer to the City

Commission. Commissioner Milliken asked her to hold that question until they wrap up the question of the storm basin. He restated that they wanted to amend the motion to state that instead of amending the buffer to reduce it by 225', they were going to allow a stormwater basin to exist within the northern 225' of the buffer strip.

A roll call vote was taken to amend the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Audette-Bauman stated that the definition in the easement doesn't put guardrails around the contents of the buffer. She wondered if they should recommend a definition of the buffer to the City Commission.

Attorney Bear reminded them that they have a vote to amend a motion, but they need to go back and vote on the original motion. Commissioner Milliken agreed they were discussing the amended motion. Attorney Bear said they could proceed.

Commissioners Curtiss and Tolber agreed that the language of a natural buffer in combination with existing zoning requirements of screening felt like enough. Commissioner Tolber mentioned that the development would also be reviewed by the NFP Board.

Commissioner Dascenzo thought that it was great to be adding housing of any kind and specifically this population. She also said the integrated trail system was lovely. Commissioner Dascenzo thought they did a good job of reflecting the Master Plan and the criteria in the PUD review.

Commissioner Milliken noted that the changes presented wouldn't fundamentally change the nature of the use. He heard concerns about the interactions of Friendship Village and their neighbors. He hopes they will continue to engage with them and work to improve those relationships. The PUD meets the Master Plan and standards of the zoning ordinance. Commissioner Milliken indicated he looked forward to seeing how this project progresses through the site plan process.

Commissioner Milliken shared that they have a recommendation to the City Commission to approve the amended Friendship Village PUD with the amended condition to allow the stormwater basin within the northerly 225' of the existing 132' buffer on the eastern property line.

A roll call vote was taken, and the motion passed unanimously.

F. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

None.

G. REPORTS:

1. City Planner's Report

Planner Anderson informed Commissioners they will get a communication from the Planning Department about Imagine Kalamazoo 2035. They plan to kick off the Master Plan process later this summer. She said they are putting together a working group (Master Plan Partner list), and they would like a representative from the Planning Commission and other boards to serve on it. They will meet every other month, agree to read a book and have discussion, review community feedback, and host a small meeting of their own. It will be a 12-18 month commitment.

2. Site Plan List

No questions.

H. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

No in-person or call-in comments.

I. CITY COMMISSION LIAISON COMMENTS

Commissioner Praedel shared that at the June 17 City Commission meeting, they accepted a community based crises grant. This will allow KDPS to partner with ISK Mental Health professionals on behavioral health related calls. The grant will enable funding for two full-time people to work as a co-response model and provide crisis intervention training. At the July 1 City Commission meeting, they had the first reading of an ordinance amendment for traffic code. He said it involves overnight parking, meter rates, and operation hours of meters for downtown parking. They also want to put meters on the Kalamazoo Mall. Business owners have been positive about the changes. Commissioner Praedel thanked them for their patience in construction season. He said they are building a community for the future.

J. MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS BY PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Milliken thought they had a great discussion on a complicated issue. He encouraged that level of dialog going forward.

K. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Milliken adjourned the meeting at 9:21pm.

Planning Commission

July 8, 2024

Page **12** of **12**

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "CK Anderson", is positioned above a solid blue horizontal line.

Christina Anderson,

City Planner

Community Planning & Economic Development