

City of Kalamazoo
PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes
November 5, 2020
FINAL

Second Floor, City Hall
Commission Chambers
241W. South Street, Kalamazoo, MI 49007

Members Present: Gregory Milliken, Chair; Emily Greenman Wright, Vice Chair; Derek Wissner; Coreen Phipps; James Pitts; Brian Pittelko; Sakhi Vyas; Shardae Chambers

Members Excused: James Pitts

City Staff: Christina Anderson, City Planner; Clyde Robinson, City Attorney; Beth Cheeseman, Executive Administrative Assistant; Pete Eldridge, Assistant City Planner; Joe Ulery, Deputy Chief Information Officer; Jamie McCarthy, Redevelopment Project Manager; Amanda Cockroft, Marketing and Communication Specialist

A. CALL TO ORDER

Commissioner Milliken called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

B. ROLL CALL

Planner Anderson proceeded with roll call and determined that the aforementioned members were present.

C. ADOPTION OF FORMAL AGENDA

Commissioner Greenman Wright, seconded by Commissioner Phipps, moved approval of the November 5, 2020 Planning Commission agenda as presented. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Phipps, seconded by Commissioner Chambers, moved approval of the October 1, 2020 Planning Commission minutes. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

E. COMMUNICATIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

F. NEW BUSINESS

Commissioner Milliken asked for clarification if P.C.#2020.16 was New Business as listed on the agenda or a Public Hearing. Planner Anderson stated that it was noticed as a Public Hearing. It was agreed to move that to section G. Public Hearings.

G. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Commissioner Milliken announced the phone number and process for people to call and leave public comment.

1. P.C. #2020.16: Natural Features Protection Overlay Text and Map Amendments to Chapter 50 of the Zoning Code, Article 6. The Planning Division is proposing text amendments to clarify the zoning code to improved interpretation and application of the NFP standards. The zoning map revisions are an expansion of the existing areas within the NFP Overlay District and are located throughout the City. Parcels included in the expansion were identified by spatial analysis to have natural features important for protection. **[Recommendation: The Planning Division supports a recommendation to the City Commission to approve the NFP text and map amendments.]**

Ms. McCarthy explained that this work was done by the NFP Review Board along with staff. She gave a short history of the NFP Overlay. In 2017, the City adopted the 2025 Master Plan. Staff were charged with looking at some sort of policy to protect natural features throughout the City. Rules, requirements and standards of the overlay district were created. In June 2019, the City Commission adopted the new NFP Overlay district. Public comment made it clear that the map needed to be evaluated and NFP Phase II was started. Ms. McCarthy reported that the NFP Overlay doesn't stop development, but it does require thoughtful design to incorporate natural features into projects during development. Ms. McCarthy said they worked to make sure standards were in alignment with all zoning districts and parcel types and sizes. She explained the different NFP standards for wetland and water resources, trees, woodlands, slopes, and the Natural Heritage area.

Ms. McCarthy explained the work that single-family/duplex homeowners can do on their property without a permit and with a permit. She said that commercial projects often need full site plan review. Ms. McCarthy talked about site plan review and how NFP projects would go to the NFP board during that process. The NFP board consists of seven individuals with expertise in natural features: native plants, forest ecology, geologists, wetlands professionals and site development/construction. Ms. McCarthy shared the process of site plan in the NFP. She said applicants fill out an extra sheet in the site plan application. If natural features are identified on the property, then the NFP board goes through that with the applicant. If natural features are on the property, then the setbacks have to be shown on the site plan. The NFP board may ask for changes to the site plan.

Ms. McCarthy shared examples. Owners of a residential lake front property were allowed to take down a tree that was very close to the house because it could cause damage to the foundation. They wanted to build a new garage. The NFP required them to plant trees to replace the one taken down. Ms. McCarthy's next example was more complex. It involved a commercial property with a slope and woodland. The client was building a 4,000 square foot retail space. The property was extremely sloped - there was a 30-foot drop to the back of property which ended at another multifamily housing property. There was also a water main running along the property which required a pretty substantial set back. The

initial design would have required a regrading of the slope and taking out nearly all the trees. Per NFP standards, the owner had to preserve 25% of woodlands instead of the 10% proposed. They would have to seek a challenging variance because they were proposing to level out the whole site and put in a massive retaining wall. Working with staff, they moved the retail space to the property line, reduced the retaining wall because of the water main, and reduced parking per the zoning requirement. The client was fine with changes to the driveway which still met the new business' needs. The real success of making natural features a part of the design is that they were able to preserve 50% of the woodlands. The client tried to stay out of the slope and set back as much as possible, but there was some encroachment. Seeking the least relief needed, encroaching in a minimum way, preserving more woodlands than required by code went a long way to show they were protecting the integrity and keeping maximum screening from neighbors.

Ms. McCarthy reviewed the map as it looks with the NFP Overlay. She indicated their goals of mapping for NFP Phase II was to look at the districts as a whole and think about it in a connected way to support habitat, the ecosystem and green space for people. She said they had to look at this on a parcel basis because that is how zoning is done.

Ms. McCarthy said they used data to define and identify features on a City-wide basis. They filled in gaps to create a more connected overlay district. She said their first action was to identify parcels immediately adjacent to the three important preserves and create buffers for them. A second action was to look at water ways and wetlands and create a buffer around those. A third action was to identify steep slopes which are part of the natural watershed. She said they looked at that with data for slopes with a 20% grade or greater and that picked up most natural watershed slopes. Ms. McCarthy explained their process of identifying slopes and woodlands.

Ms. McCarthy reviewed the map and the new overlay district – explaining differences between the Phase I map and the Phase II map. She said the amendment is made up of public and private parcels. Some parcels are owned by the City and WMU and some are privately owned. She said there are a lot of large parcels and some small properties. Ms. McCarthy reported that the Phase I Overlay District had 364 parcels. After review, they are proposing that 26 parcels be removed from the Overlay. They also propose to add in over 800 parcels bringing the total to around 1100 parcels. She pointed out the connections by water and sloped woodlands. Ms. McCarthy said they paid special attention to engineered channelized streams downtown. She said the code works best on natural streams or rivers, so they didn't add that in, even though Arcadia Creek runs through the City.

Ms. McCarthy shared that the NFP review board acted as the working group for this process. From June – Sept. they looked at maps down to the site level, ground trooping and making sure the overlay district was following the criteria. The online survey and mapping exercise ran from August 24 – Sept. 21. Hard copies of the map and survey were available at City Hall. She said they connected to people through email, the City's social media and website, and the neighborhood associations. Ms. McCarthy said they were able to put the mapping exercise and opportunity on the cover of the View from the Curb which is sent to every house in the City of Kalamazoo. They also published a notice in the Kalamazoo Gazette and mailed letters to parcel owners and residents.

Ms. McCarthy said they had a total of 230 people who engaged with the map. She had over 45 phone discussions, emails, letters and online comments. There were requests for several additions into the overlay district. Because those were not noticed for the Planning Commission meeting, they will have to be considered for addition at a later time. Ms. McCarthy said they are proposing that three areas be added to the map: Glen Park in Winchell neighborhood, a condo development on Hazel Avenue in the Oakridge plat (there is a site plan approved there) and parcels on Stockbridge and Lake Street (there is a site plan approved for a portion of those parcels). She reported there were specific requests to remove parcels from the overlay. Staff took time to look at each of those requests. Overall, the parcels meet criteria for the

overlay district. They fit into the district with natural features or are very close to and influence those natural features. Ms. McCarthy said some people asked why their property was included and nearby properties were not. She said that's where thinking of the district as a whole and knowing parcels on the map have been identified as having natural features helped draw that boundary line. Ms. McCarthy felt that most residents were supportive of NFP, but they seemed concerned about having the flexibility to maintain their homes and yards. She noted that one resident asked for public education and to address wildlife issues. The resident wanted opportunities for neighbors to be stewards of their own property or to adopt practices to deter or change the wildlife issues. Ms. McCarthy stated that education and looking at voluntary best practices would be a part of NFP Phase III. They would talk to neighborhoods about partnerships with the groups like the Kalamazoo Nature Center. Ms. McCarthy asked Planning Commissioners to recommend the map as it has been proposed by the NFP Review Board. She asked that they look at the map in a district-wide perspective and think about how that meets the goals of preserving natural features important to the community, defining neighborhood character and providing protection to the natural environment.

Ms. McCarthy said about nine cases came forward that required site plan review in the NFP district. Some went to NFP board, some were minor and could be handled administratively. The Board reviewed three variance requests. After working with staff, all three variances were recommended to the ZBA for approval.

Ms. McCarthy talked about the three minor text amendments the Board wanted to put forward. The text amendments were in the following: Section K. Site Development Standards – clarification around native plant requirements and adding landscaping above the requirements, giving the Board flexibility to approve non-native species; Section L. NFP Review Bodies and Processes – deleted the natural feature of wetland or water resource triggering noticing; Section M. Bonding of Projects - adding the bonding requirement to the NFP checklist.

Commissioner Milliken asked if the variance was granted in the commercial example Ms. McCarthy mentioned. Ms. McCarthy said they were granted the variance and are almost through the site plan process.

Commissioner Greenman Wright asked if there was a fee schedule put together for associated permits. Ms. McCarthy responded that the NFP Overlay review was added to the fee schedule as an addition to the site plan review fee. Commissioner Greenman Wright asked if there are fees associated with permission to remove trees. If they have to have a City arborist come or something like that. Ms. McCarthy said there was not a permit fee. There has to be proof of a professional review/justification for the removal and that could incur a cost.

Commissioner Pittelko asked if those who requested parcels be added in NFP Overlay would be considered by the NFP Board in the next year. Ms. McCarthy replied that she is tracking those along with other text amendment ideas to be considered in the future.

Ms. McCarthy clarified for Commissioner Greenman Wright that the NFP Overlay review fee is tied to when a site plan review is needed. If it is a single-family home project, it is tied to the permit fee. Commissioner Greenman Wright asked if it was similar to the way the historic district works - this doesn't add additional permit fees or expenses to their inspection or site plan review. Ms. McCarthy responded that it wouldn't for single-family or duplex.

Commissioner Milliken confirmed that the three areas that people talked about adding and are added on the proposed map is Glen Park, Stockbridge and Lake, and the end of Hazel Avenue. Ms. McCarthy agreed.

Commissioner Chambers asked how long approval would take for those who had requested to be included in the overlay. Ms. McCarthy said to add parcels would be a similar process as the current map. It would take a couple of months at a minimum to get through that process.

Commissioner Milliken opened the public comment portion of the hearing.

Mr. Craig Martin stated that he has no objection to the fundamental objectives associated with the district itself. He requested that his parcel be excluded from the overlay. He said there are no natural features on the parcel aside from three trees.

Mr. Michael Baer asked for his property to be removed from the overlay. He expressed concerns about how being included in the overlay would impact his property values. Mr. Baer was concerned that the use and application of the overlay map could undermine equal rights to property owners in Kalamazoo. He said he felt persecuted or ostracized because the overlay was being applied to his property and not others.

Mr. Michael Vasicek requested his property be removed from the overlay. He said they didn't receive notification of this change. They have started building a single-family home on the property. None of their adjacent neighbors are included in the district.

Ms. Meghan Van Lente expressed an objection to being in the overlay. She said they were informed less than two weeks ago that their property would be included. She feels the NFP overlay requirements are burdensome for their 1.5-acre lot. Ms. Van Lente wondered why they were included in the overlay while neighboring and adjacent properties which meet the same criteria were not included. She said they are in contract with the City to build a single-family home on the lot. They plan to take a small part to build and leave the rest natural. Ms. Van Lente said they've invested money and being a part of overlay would make keeping the contract with the City difficult to do. She asked Planning Commissioners to take individual properties and concerns into consideration.

City Commissioner Jack Urban stated he hoped there would be a discussion of how properties privately owned were placed on the NFP map and what the procedure would be to remove them if the owner doesn't want them in the overlay.

Ms. Hattie Brombery thanked staff for the work they're doing. She said she has seen progress and people coming together to protect the environment. As a property owner, she was surprised to see the letter. Ms. Brombery wished that homeowners would have been a part of the conversation early in the process. She feels the policy is punitive and an unfair burden on some residents and not others. She said only her property is affected in her neighborhood and that puts them at a disadvantage.

Ms. Dorothy Appleyard wanted to know the procedure for holding public hearings and the rules for public notice. She felt it was a waste of time to have a public hearing if no one knows it is happening.

Mr. Richard Stewart called to ask for protection of the properties located between Stockbridge and Lake. He said it is the last remaining natural green space, habitat, and watershed. Mr. Stewart reported that the neighborhood is unanimously against developing the area. He noted that recent developments like KVCC have created a much worse flooding area. Mr. Stewart believes that City staff have refused their request to file a neighborhood plan because it doesn't meet the City's agenda. He said that it was mentioned that the properties have been included in the overlay, but there is a site plan approved there. Mr. Stewart said they were not aware that the site plan had been approved. He believes it went on in secret and was approved during the Covid crisis. He asked the Planning Commissioners to protect their feature.

Ms. Tina McClinton called about the property on Lake and Stockbridge and east of John. She said they have been trying to protect that property. It is a habitat for wildlife and a natural water shed. Ms. McClinton said the Southtown neighborhood plan seeks to protect this natural place as their last green

space. She said no one wants to take the plan from the Southtown neighborhood. Ms. McClinton asked for the Planning Commissioners to help protect this area.

Ms. McCarthy responded to some of the concerns. She reported that 6200 letters went out and they were sent within the 14-day notice period under the Zoning Enabling Act. Ms. McCarthy said the NFP Board did consider public input and made some small modifications based on the input. They approved the map on October 13 and then the notice was mailed. She talked to people who called and said they didn't get a notice, but their neighbors did. Ms. McCarthy found they were on the mailing lists. The notice also was put in the Kalamazoo Gazette. She said they started getting a lot of phone calls two days after the notice was mailed.

Planner Eldridge clarified that notices were mailed at least 15 days prior to the Planning Commission meeting date in accordance with the Zoning Enabling Act. He confirmed they did meet and exceed the 15-day requirement.

Commissioner Milliken closed public comment portion of the public hearing.

Commissioner Chambers asked about the callers commenting on Lake Street and Stockbridge. She wondered about the confusion – if the parcels are in the overlay or just being considered.

Planner Anderson stated that a number of the properties in reference are included in the map. This site does have an approved site plan on it. It was approved around February, March or April 2020. Planner Anderson explained they honor a site plan for a certain amount of time understanding it is a snapshot of the zoning at the time. If the project were not to be built, someone else was to build the project or the project changed significantly, they would need to go through site plan review again and follow the current rules. She said that as it is today, an approved site plan does exist. Planner Anderson stated that all site plans are posted online for public review and the public can sign up for alerts.

Commissioner Milliken asked Ms. McCarthy for feedback from the conversations she had with those requesting to be removed from the map. Ms. McCarthy said she heard from most of the people by email and had some exchanges. She let the people at Lancaster Drive know that since they already have their building permit, they will be able to go ahead with their plans. For those who called, Ms. McCarthy said they talked through what characteristics and features their property had and how it got included in the overlay district. She said in many cases the question was why my property and not a neighboring property. The NFP Board spent hours looking at all the neighborhoods and trying to make sure there was a connection or cluster of properties. Most are large parcels for the City, and many had no structures. Some blocks may have had parcels where the green space or cluster for the area was in a neighborhood. Those neighborhood areas had a lot of open space. If a property is fully built out and doesn't have many natural features, then it didn't make sense to add them. She said they looked at properties with more potential for change over time or redevelopment or those that have lots of natural features and little impervious surfaces. Ms. McCarthy said some calls were about zoning code and the implications or rules they might have to follow on their property.

Commissioner Chambers asked if notices are sent to property owners or renters. Ms. McCarthy responded that letters were sent to the address' physical location and also to the taxpayer.

Commissioner Phipps, seconded by Commissioner Greenman Wright, moved to recommend to the City Commission to approve the NFP overlay text and map amendments to chapter 50 of the zoning code.

Commissioner Phipps thanked the staff for their explanations. She commented that there are people for and against this. She said the definitions, zoning and map were all laid out. Commissioner Phipps believes it considers the 2025 Master Plan, that the change of conditions was met, and it showed a

demonstrated need for the community. Commissioner Phipps thought people were confused about the word, "protection." She didn't think people understood what is protected, what is not protected and what it means for their building projects. She thought there were a lot of questions and concerns from the public. Commissioner Phipps said that, overall, she approves and is ready to go ahead with a recommendation to the City Commission.

Commissioner Pittelko asked about questions regarding removing parcels. He noted that City Commissioner Urban seemed concerned about that as well. He said he agrees with the NFP, and he found the Townhall helpful. Commissioner Pittelko said he understands the need for public and private parcels to be included in order to protect natural features. He wanted to know if there was concern about how private homeowners are affected.

Commissioner Vyas said she had the same concerns as Commissioner Pittelko. She wondered if there was a mechanism for those who want their parcels included or excluded from the overlay.

Planner Anderson reminded Planning Commissioners that Phase I included many residential lots. The same type of lots were included in Phase II that were included in Phase I. She said the dominant use in the City is residential. The overlay is set up to be managed on small and large properties and properties with one, some, or multiple natural features. In the rare case the overlay did not work, there is always the relief valve of a variance. That exists for all the districts for all the cases.

Ms. McCarthy gave an example of how the overlay works with parcel sizes. She said the set back from water is on a sliding scale based on the size of your property. With a smaller parcel, the setbacks went down because they knew people would need space. She said there are built in allowances or exceptions. There is a slope setback for no new buildings. If something already exists in the slope, there are allowances for changes. Ms. McCarthy said flexibility and allowances were built into the code for things that would come up often. The variance is the relief valve. She reminded Planning Commissioners that the rules do allow people to build or propose new development. They just make sure the design incorporates those natural features.

Commissioner Pittelko said it helps to understand how the process is intended to work and there are options for homeowners who want to make normal changes to their property. Commissioner Vyas wanted confirmation that a variance can be requested.

Commissioner Milliken said he can understand property owners' comments and feedback. He appreciated the presentation and all the work the NFP committee and staff went through to put this together. Commissioner Milliken said he supports the reason why parcels are included and found the examples Ms. McCarthy gave about site plan and variances helpful. He requested the Planning Commission receive information in the annual report about NFP cases. He would like to know how many came up for site plan, how many went for variances, how many variances were granted, and the type of features. He would like to see the NFP Committee revisit the map yearly or every other year as they gain experience and understand what parcels should or shouldn't be in the overlay.

Planner Anderson said that information can be included in the site plan report they get regularly. She said in December they will get the Master Plan and Neighborhood Plan presentation. They can include information on NFP so Commissioners can track it.

Commissioner Chambers spoke in support of the update and the properties being added. She felt discouraged that in the first overlay, some places were not protected. Commissioner Chambers thought this would make it clear for those who want to develop properties.

Commissioner Greenman Wright noted that they consistently have problems with noticing. She said the NFP overlay was a perfect example where people didn't think there was enough time given.

Commissioner Greenman Wright didn't think there was enough time to take the idea from theoretical to thinking about the implications of individual projects and property. She wished they could have a workgroup or a more generous period of time with property owners. Commissioner Greenman Wright stated that she was uncomfortable with the overlay. She thought it was being applied inconsistently over the neighborhoods. She saw the intent of making things contiguous but felt there were random chunks not congruent. Commissioner Greenman Wright said she was almost advocating to put it on more parcels, so it was equitable. She felt it was almost legislative overreach. The prospect of having additional things to comply with as a homeowner seems scary, undoable and out of reach. She expressed concern that the NFP might turn into something where people's visions are not possible because they happen to have a tree that is slightly larger than their neighbor's tree. Commissioner Greenman Wright agrees with the spirit of the NFP and its goals, but thought it was inconsistently applied. Adding 860 parcels is a major change. She felt it was reasonable for people to be concerned, interested and passionate about it.

Ms. McCarthy shared that the NFP tool works best on those types of parcels where there is a lot of open space or half the property is wooded and sloped and hasn't been built on. It works better in shaping new development and there has to be a space for that new development to happen. She believed staff have been really thoughtful on the creation of the rules and how they are applied. Ms. McCarthy said they can talk to the NFP Committee to make sure they look at it from the homeowners' point of view. The code really focuses on commercial development. All of the zoning districts have different requirements to a degree. She thought there was value in that as long as it is not overly burdensome and the code meets the intent.

Commissioner Milliken asked Commissioner Greenman Wright if there were changes, she would like to see or propose to the amendment. Commissioner Greenman Wright said the Planning Commission has made great strides regarding public engagement, but she feels they are not doing the best job they can. She is concerned that people felt they didn't have enough time and she agree that 14 days is not a long period of time. She wanted it noted that people are saying it is not good enough and that she agrees that it is not good enough.

Planner Anderson said they can add the topic of how to do different types of engagement – during Covid and regular times – to the December meeting. She thought using the View from the Curb to engage was a great way to get information out because it's mailed to everyone. Zoning notice is done a minimum of 15 days in advance. The Townhall meeting and Planning Commission were noticed together. The public hearing and what happens in front of the City Commission is part of the engagement process.

Commissioner Greenman Wright thought that by the time it comes to Planning Commission, there is an expectation from City staff that they go along with it. They can't engage with citizens from phone messages or in person during a public hearing. She wondered how they are to have meaningful interactions on major projects. If people had time for information and she could hear from her neighbors, that would help her make a better choice. She expressed that she feels pressure to meet the needs of the City Commission, developers, and City staff. Commissioner Greenman Wright believed they need working groups - opportunities to work through these issues so everyone can hear the discussion and they can learn from each other.

Commissioner Milliken requested the discussion about public engagement be put on the December meeting agenda.

A roll call vote was taken. Commissioners Wissner, Vyas, Pittelko, Greenman Wright voted no. Commissioners Milliken, Phipps, Chambers voted yes. The motion failed.

Planner Anderson said that if it was going to the City Commission with the negative recommendation or coming back to the Planning Commission, she would like a summary of what is deficient.

Commissioner Wissner said that Commissioner Greenman Wright made a compelling case - public input is important.

Commissioner Vyas asked about setting up a working group to get questions answered. Having this discussion before it's time to make a decision. Planner Anderson cautioned that the work groups would have to be a public meeting. Planner Anderson said working groups were being considered post-downtown zoning, but this meeting was already in the works to be noticed. They were trying to use the Townhall as that discussion to get questions answered. Planner Anderson said they can absolutely give previews of large cases during New Business at the end of a meeting or set up a second meeting to review, ask questions, and take public comment.

Commissioner Milliken said he has felt a timing pressure to get everything done. He suggested building in a couple extra meetings for zoning ordinances in the upcoming year. Perhaps anticipate that public hearings can be tabled to the next meeting in order to ask questions and glean information. Commissioner Milliken said he watched the NFP meetings and the Townhall and still got new information that night during the Staff report.

Commissioner Greenman Wright said she was not comfortable that this wasn't legislative overreach. She needs to see that it is not an undue burden on homeowners.

Attorney Clyde Robinson reviewed the next steps. The NFP Overlay can go to the City Commission with a lack of recommendation from the Planning Commission, or the Planning Commissioners can request staff to come back with something modified they feel can be recommended to the City Commission. He encouraged Planning Commissioners to share their objections. Attorney Robinson thought the City Commission would be reluctant to approve it without the approval of the Planning Commission. They had already heard from the one City Commissioner who called in and raised a concern.

Commissioner Vyas suggested having an edge or buffer – like Neighborhood Edge. She thought it would be helpful to establish a 'light version' where people can be included or have minimal regulations. Generally something that gives a contiguous look at the natural features. Commissioner Vyas indicated there could be changes in both the map and the regulations.

Commissioner Greenman Wright thought the overlay should cover more parcels. She didn't feel it was reasonable to set this expectation for a specific number of people and not others.

Commissioner Chambers mentioned that Phase II was adding areas that should have always been in the overlay. She was concerned that there are now approved site plans for these areas that they can't stop. She felt they need to do something as soon as possible to get the areas covered.

Commissioner Greenman Wright asked for more clarification on how parcels are included or excluded. She didn't feel they could answer the questions for the homeowners of why they were included. It seems inconsistent. Commissioner Greenman Wright shared that there is a natural ravine behind her house. It is contiguous to the properties included, and she doesn't understand why it was not included. She felt it may be a burden in CDBG dense areas to have more regulations on your property. She said she understands the code book, and this is something that is outside of her understanding.

Planner Anderson suggested having a representative of the NFP board come and speak since they are the technical body. Commissioner Greenman Wright agreed that would help.

Commissioner Milliken asked if they should bring the NFP Overlay back rather than send it to City Commission. Planning Commissioners agreed.

Planner Anderson cautioned that it probably wouldn't come forward again until February or March.

Attorney Robinson suggested a motion based on Commissioner's Comments.

Commissioner Greenman Wright moved, seconded by Commissioner Pittelko, to request City staff to re-present P.C. 2020.16 and return an amendment within six months' time.

Commissioner Greenman Wright apologized for not asking for this to be tabled. She did not feel that was an option. She would love to hear more about this with more information and clarification.

A voice vote was taken and passed unanimously.

H. OTHER BUSINESS

None

I. CITIZENS' COMMENTS (Regarding non-agenda items)

None.

J. CITY COMMISSION LIAISON COMMENTS

None.

K. CITY PLANNER'S REPORT

Planner Anderson noted that a tentative 2021 calendar of meeting dates was included in the packet. She asked them to review the calendar and give feedback at the next meeting.

Planner Anderson reviewed what was coming up at the next meeting – one public hearing, CIP, Imagine Kalamazoo discussion, and a discussion on engagement.

Planner Anderson shared that they are in the process of advertising for new members. Some Planning Commissioners are terming out in March, and they are short one Commissioner since Mr. Espinosa resigned. Planner Eldridge made a flier. They need people on the Planning Commission, ZBA and Historic District Commission. She said they have sent emails to a wide group from neighborhoods and organizations in town.

Commissioner Milliken asked for Commissioner's terms to be shared with them. Planner Anderson said that will be part of the information for December.

Planner Eldridge reported that the NFP is on the site plan review spreadsheet under the design review column.

L. MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS BY PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Milliken thanked Planning Commissioners for their discussion. He thought having diversity of thought is critical for these boards.

M. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Milliken adjourned the meeting at 9:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "C. Anderson". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above a solid blue horizontal line.

Christina Anderson,
City Planner
Community Planning & Economic Development