Agenda
City of Kalamazoo - Planning Commission
February 4, 2021

Electronic Meeting: Streamed on the City of Kalamazoo YouTube Channel and Facebook 7:00 p.m.

A. Call to Order:
B. Roll Call:
C. Adoption of Formal Agenda:
D. Approval of Meeting Minutes:
   1. January 7, 2021
   2. January 11, 2021 - Special Meeting
E. Communications and Announcements:
F. New Business:
G. Public Hearings:
H. Other Business:
   1. Neighborhood Planner Report
   2. Discussion of PC Interviews Held Last Week (Jan. 20th and 21st)
I. Citizens’ Comments:
J. City Commission Liaison Comments:
K. City Planner’s Report:
L. Miscellaneous Comments by Planning Commissioners:
M. Adjournment:
This meeting will be conducted electronically in order for members, staff, and the public to comply with the *Emergency Order under MCL 333.2253 – Gatherings and Face Mask Order* issued by Robert Gordon, Director of the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services, on December 18, 2020.

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

Members Excused:

City Staff: Christina Anderson, City Planner; Pete Eldridge, Assistant City Planner; Clyde Robinson, City Attorney; Beth Cheeseman, Executive Administrative Assistant; Don Hepler, Senior Systems Analyst; Amanda Cockcroft, Marketing and Communication Specialist

Public Panelists: Ms. Pat Taylor, Kalamazoo Eastside Neighborhood Association Chair; Ms. Kelly Clarke, Kalamazoo Land Bank; Mr. Andrew Schipper, AVB; Mr. Steve Hassevoort, InForm Architecture

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 Phipps, supported by Commissioner Greenman Wright, moved approval of the January 7, 2021 Planning Commission agenda as presented. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Wissner, supported by Commissioner Pitts, moved approval of the December 3, 2020 Planning Commission minutes as presented. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

E. COMMUNICATIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.
F. NEW BUSINESS

None.

G. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Commissioner Milliken reviewed the process for the public to comment on the public hearings.

1. P.C. #2021.01: 1701, 1709 and 1711 Fraternity Village Drive. Request for a special use permit to construct a fraternity house in Residential Multiple Family (RM15).
   [Recommendation: Approve Special Use Permit]

Planner Eldridge presented the staff report and reviewed pictures and maps of the area. The property is vacant and consists of three lots with a combined total of 1.83 acres. Previously, the parcels had three separate structures on them with four apartments in each. They were demolished in 2012. The newly proposed fraternity house will be seven, four-bedroom apartments in one building with a common gathering space and study room. Planner Eldridge stated that this project will require site plan review. There are adequate utilities to the site and the road capacity is sufficient to handle the additional traffic. He reported there is a traffic light at Fraternity Village Drive and W. Michigan Avenue. Planner Eldridge reviewed the current and future zoning and land use for the area. Fraternity Village Drive is comprised of seven fraternity houses, six sorority houses, three apartment complexes and some smaller student rental units. Planner Eldridge shared that the Planning Department sent notices to property owners within 300’. The applicant sent letters to adjacent properties. The Planning Department hasn’t received any correspondence related to this request. Planner Eldridge reported that a fraternity house aligns with the density and vision for this area. He shared staff’s rationale for recommendation: fraternities are allowed in this zone with approval; previously there were three apartment buildings on the site; the area already has high number of apartments, fraternity houses, and sorority houses; the Master Plan 2025 Future Land Use map identifies this area as high density residential which aligns with this use.

Mr. Andrew Schipper from AVB shared that they want to take the three parcels and split them into two parcels with two phases of building. They plan to have one building on each parcel. Mr. Schipper said the owner of this property also owns two fraternity houses to the west. He was approached by a fraternity looking for a home and an agreement was made. Mr. Schipper said the timing for the first phase, pending approvals, is to start in February and have the house ready for students in Fall 2021.

Commissioner Milliken opened the public comment portion of the hearing.

No public comments.

Commissioner Milliken closed the public comment portion of the public hearing.

Commissioner Greenman Wright, supported by Commissioner Wissner, made the motion to approve a special use permit to construct a fraternity house in Residential Multiple Family (RM15).

Commissioner Greenman Wright said the request makes sense given that it fits into the current land use and is in line with future land use goals outlined in the Master Plan.
Commissioner Milliken noted that the motion was worded as fraternity house in the singular. He wondered if they would come back to the Planning Commission for another special use permit for the second phase of building. Mr. Schipper confirmed that since special use permits are only good for a year, their second phase of building wouldn’t happen within that timeframe. They will need to come back to the Planning Commission for the second phase. Commissioner Milliken thanked them for the clarification. He said the request is consistent with the Master Plan, the zoning ordinance, and standards in the ordinance for Special Use permits. Commissioner Milliken noted that he agrees with the staff report.

Roll call vote was taken, and the motion passed unanimously.

2. P.C. #2021.02: Request to rezone parcels in the Eastside Neighborhood from Community Commercial (CC), Manufacturing (M1), Residential Single Family (RS5), Residential Multiple Family (RM15), Residential Duplex (RD19), and Commercial Office (CO) to Live Work 1 (LW1), Live Work 2 (LW2), Residential Duplex (RD19), or Residential Single Family (RS5). [Recommendation: Recommend approval of Rezoning to the City Commission]

Planner Anderson presented the staff report. She said they chose to update the zoning code incrementally with a focus on neighborhoods with plans, key corridors and centers, and areas with known barriers. It was noted that the E. Main and E. Michigan area has zoning barriers. The district as it is mapped doesn’t match existing uses or desired uses. There are lots with more than one district mapped on them. Planner Anderson reviewed the existing zoning for the area (CC, M-1, CO, RM-15, RD-19, RS-5). She said the main guiding document for this request is Imagine Eastside which is the Eastside Neighborhood Plan. The Plan talks about façade improvements, number of stories, and mix of uses. Specific goals are outlined for housing, transportation and commercial. In the Master Plan, most of the area they were looking at was Neighborhood Edge or Urban Edge which allows for a mix of uses. There is an Historic Neighborhood Node that was noted in the neighborhood plan.

Planner Anderson shared that engagement efforts had recently been restarted after pausing for Covid. She explained the following outreach efforts. Fall 2019 – KLB Charrette; Winter 2020 – Community Meeting & Draft Map Presentation; October – Meeting with KENA’s Business Committee; November – Door Hangers/Flyers, Email, Social Media, IK.com project page; December – Planning Commission notice (mailed 12/16), email, social media, IK.com. She said they received a number of questions such as, what does this mean for me or when is the hearing.

Planner Anderson explained the area designated on the Neighborhood Plan as an historic node. This area covers two blocks - Phelps, Southworth, Edwina and Trimble and E. Main. There is variation lot by lot and block by block on this corridor. Only one small area is present that has more than one commercial structure strung together - at Trimble and E. Main. Planner Anderson said they went back to the Master Plan for a definition of node. They felt a node district was too restrictive and didn’t match the pattern for this area. However, they are making sure the streets are supporting the walkable urban area that is seen in a node. E. Main will be repaved in 2021 and they are planning to add better crossings, sidewalks, on-street parking, and have a balance of parking and bike lanes. Planner Anderson shared that the request is consistent with the Master Plan and Strategic Vision. The new level of activity in this area, new solidified vision, Land
Bank involvement and business owners coming together for façade renovations has resulted in a change of condition that requires the proposed amendment. The amendment addresses a demonstrated community need for more housing, street projects, and façade improvements – as documented in the Master Plan and Neighborhood Plan. The proposed zoning is compatible with surrounding zoning and the scale of the area. There are no new roads planned, but the scale and form of the proposed zoning will match what is currently there for a logical and orderly development pattern.

Planner Anderson introduced Ms. Pat Taylor, Kalamazoo Eastside Neighborhood Association Chair; Ms. Kelly Clarke, Kalamazoo Land Bank; and Mr. Steve Hassevoort, InForm Architecture.

Ms. Kelly Clarke spoke about the work the Land Bank has done recently in the Edison Neighborhood. She said they have also been working with KENA in the Eastside Neighborhood for 10 years with a focus on redevelopment the past few years. She said the board made a commitment to engage in that area for the next five years doing transformational efforts. Ms. Clarke outlined engagement efforts that were undertaken by KENA and the Land Bank for under-utilized parcels in Land Bank ownership. They hired OCBA and obtained input from residents in a similar manner of what they had done for the Eastside Gateway Project. The Gateway project resulted in small homes, a pocket park, and an intergenerational oral history project. Ms. Clarke noted that, initially, the community was hesitant to engage. They were concerned they would share ideas, but that the projects wouldn’t happen. She believes that seeing the Eastside Gateway Project completed generated enthusiasm to participate for this more recent project. Ms. Clarke said they had six different meetings and over 200 residents participated. The residents were the driving force of aesthetics and use. The community vision was for a mixed-use commercial project with several phases. Commercial on first floor and affordable condominiums. There was a lot of interest for people to move from large homes or enter into home ownership for the first time. People wanted these units accessible and affordable. There will be a mixture of income opportunities for the project itself. Ms. Clarke emphasized that when the Kalamazoo Land Bank seeks to repurpose properties, they want the community to build the vision.

Mr. Steve Hassevoort, InForm Architecture, confirmed they had over 200 community members participate in their engagement efforts. They had several opportunities for people – day/evening, write in and in-person. Mr. Hassevoort said they asked for potential uses for these parcels, sizes, and configurations of buildings. They heard that community members wanted a mix of residential and small scale commercial in the area. They liked the walkable scale of neighborhood. Allowing residential in the area was critical because of the short supply of housing. Community members didn’t think there was enough demand to fill a commercial corridor. They wanted shopping that was walkable, and they didn’t want to overwhelm the existing residences in this area. Mr. Hassevoort said the proposed zoning modifications relate well to what they heard from the community. It supports the desires of the neighborhood and allows flexibility of uses.

Mr. Hassevoort said they are hoping to build and complete the pocket park plan (Edwin & E. Main) in early summer this year. He shared some information about starting design for two other buildings. One is proposed to be a retail and residential building with a small outdoor plaza. The other one will be a residential building. Those might start this fall or early spring next year.
Ms. Taylor said residents are leaning toward believing that things will happen when people come and want their opinion. The small homes and pocket park facilitated more people expressing interest and questions and moving forward. Ms. Taylor said they are very excited about what can happen and what will happen. She was thankful for her partners that worked together to get to this point. She requested the Planning Commissioners approve the zoning change.

Ms. Clarke spoke about the Land Bank’s fundraising efforts, saying they have enough money to get the pocket plaza done this year. They want to signal to the community that their voices matter.

Commissioner Pitts asked about the proposed construction on the corner of E. Main and Edwin. Mr. Hassevoort said that was currently vacant and was where the plaza will be located. Ms. Clarke added that there is a food and beverage store there is privately owned and functional. Attached to that store is a vacant structure that will be demolished. The privately-owned store will remain.

Ms. Taylor told Planning Commissioners that the privately owned building is participating in the façade improvement program. She thought people may have concerns of a brand new building next to an older building.

Ms. Clarke stated that she and Ms. Taylor launched an affirmative marketing campaign last summer. They have a group of 15-17 folks meeting monthly. The goal of the group is to have a robust marketing campaign and connect people interested in home ownership to resources with the specific focus on people of color and neighborhood residents.

Commissioner Milliken asked Planner Anderson if all of the calls she received were technical in nature. She assured him that they were. She had several people call who didn’t have internet access. Planner Anderson sent out pages of the code and highlighted so they can see and compare items.

**Commissioner Milliken opened the public comment portion of the hearing.**

Mr. Chris Pompey asked how LW-1 and LW-2 compare to CC zoning? He said they are a recovery home and have been permitted to open a house on Engleman. Mr. Pompey asked if they would have to go in front of a hearing because this has been rezoned?

**Commissioner Milliken closed the public comment portion of the hearing.**

Commissioner Milliken said that although that was a specific request, it can be generalized to any property that has an existing special use on it subject to a rezoning. Planner Anderson said they are specifically asking about a transitional residence. That is allowed in CC and is also allowed in LW-1 which is what property is proposed to be rezoned to. She said that variances and special uses run with the land and do not change with a zoning map change.

**Commissioner Phipps, supported by Commissioner Vyas, made the motion to recommend approval to the City Commission to rezone parcels in the Eastside Neighborhood from Community**
Commercial (CC), Manufacturing (M1), Residential Single Family (RS5), Residential Multiple Family (RM15), Residential Duplex (RD19), and Commercial Office (CO) to Live Work 1 (LW1), Live Work 2 (LW2), Residential Duplex (RD19), or Residential Single Family (RS5).

Commissioner Pitts said he talked to a couple residents on Eastside and they seem pretty excited about the new things coming. He was glad to hear that facades on older buildings are being addressed in light of the new construction coming up.

Commissioner Greenman Wright commended City Staff, Mr. Hassevoort, and Ms. Clarke on their engagement. She hoped they can capture what worked so well in this planning project and replicate it in other neighborhoods. The residents are engaged, and excited, for-profit businesses have been engaged, and there were strong partnerships on the small homes project. She felt the level of engagement was the reason they have been so successful. Commissioner Greenman Wright said she would be voting to recommend this.

Commissioner Chambers said she is newly living on the Eastside, so she is excited to see things happening and for the City to be better connected. She loves that the City of Kalamazoo considers what the residents want. Commissioner Chambers indicated that she wants to get involved and help make this happen.

Commissioner Milliken thought this was a perfect example of zoning evolution that fits the vision of the Master Plan and the Neighborhood. He indicated that the process taken for this significant change was ideal. Commissioner Milliken said the zoning in place clearly inhibited development. He said it is consistent with the Master Plan and Neighborhood Plan and the standards of the zoning ordinance.

Roll call vote was taken, and the motion passed unanimously.

H. OTHER BUSINESS

1. 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

Planner Anderson said they needed to get the schedule approved and posted and asked for any feedback or changes. Commissioner Milliken thought they should use the presented schedule and adjust as they go.

Commissioner Greenman Wright asked if they could participate in virtual meetings in a non-Kalamazoo location. Attorney Robinson said they would have to disclose their location. He said because of amendments to the OMA, they are permitted to meet virtually through March 30, 2021. After that, a new set of rules will come into play. Attorney Robinson thought it would depend on where they stand in the Covid-19 pandemic. Because of the requirements of hybrid meetings (social distancing, masks, disinfectant protocol), the City may determine to meet virtually as long as they can.
Commissioner Vyas, supported by Commissioner Phipps, moved to approve the 2021 meeting schedule of the Planning Commission.

A voice vote was taken, and the motion passed unanimously.

2. **January 11th – Special Meeting – (4:00pm)**

Planner Anderson announced that they will have 75 minutes of time for the special meeting. The agenda and notice have been posted. They should have received a meeting link from IT. The focus of the meeting will be on how staff bring large cases before the Planning Commission and a discussion on notice, pre-presentation prior to hearings and those type of details.

Commissioner Milliken reminded Planning Commissioners that it will be a public meeting with opportunity for public comment. He encouraged them to bring forward specific talking points or discussion items before the meeting on Monday.

Attorney Robinson cautioned Planning Commissioners that if they send discussion items to all members, they should not respond to that email. If they did, that would be engaging in deliberations.

**I. CITIZENS’ COMMENTS (Regarding non-agenda items)**

A public comment came in late regarding the second public hearing.

Mr. Andre Williams called to ask how façade program works. He said he will also email Planner Anderson. Planner Anderson confirmed she received the email from Mr. Williams, so staff will be able to respond.

**J. CITY COMMISSION LIAISON COMMENTS**

None.

**K. CITY PLANNER’S REPORT**

Planner Anderson let them know the rezoning of North Street and Woodward properties was approved at the City Commission meeting.

**L. MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS BY PLANNING COMMISSIONERS**

None.

**M. ADJOURNMENT**

Commissioner Milliken adjourned the meeting at 8:24 pm.
This meeting will be conducted electronically in order for members, staff, and the public to comply with the *Emergency Order under MCL 333.2253 – Gatherings and Face Mask Order* issued by Robert Gordon, Director of the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services, on December 18, 2020.

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

Members Excused: James Pitts

City Staff: Christina Anderson, City Planner; Pete Eldridge, Assistant City Planner; Clyde Robinson, City Attorney; Beth Cheeseman, Executive Administrative Assistant; Andie Miller, Senior Systems Analyst; Amanda Cockcroft, Marketing and Communication Specialist; Jack Urban, City Commission Liaison

A. CALL TO ORDER

Commissioner Milliken called the meeting to order at 4:03 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 Vyas, supported by Commissioner Greenman Wright, moved approval of the January 11, 2021 Planning Commission agenda as presented. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.*

D. COMMUNICATIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Planner Anderson announced that they will need to complete their meeting by 5:15 pm at the latest.

Commissioner Milliken announced that this is a public meeting and they will be taking public comments. He said they would wrap up discussion at 5:00pm to leave time for citizen comments and the remainder of the agenda.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Discussion on procedures for Planning Commission review of large cases, such as large or scattered site zoning requests and public engagement and notice practices of these cases.
Planner Anderson reviewed the usual notification and engagement efforts for larger cases. For notification purposes, she proposed sending letters earlier (but not too early) and include information on meetings, office hours, and how to get more information.

The Planning Department follows the Public Participation Plan (PPP) for engagement efforts. Planner Anderson thought staff could work in more opportunities for comments and concerns and a more defined space between notices. She said that when they craft their PPP for a project, they will really think about the elements they are using to reach everyone in a timely manner.

To increase communication with the Planning Commission, Planner Anderson would like to use the City Planner Report time on the agenda to bring them into the loop on large projects. She proposed to communicate in detail about the projects at three points: 1) Start of project – Public Participation Plan, how they hope to engage and a basic timeline; 2) Between engagement/input and design – report feedback, what was learned and where they are going with the project; 3) Pre-Hearing/Final Draft – wrapping it up, time to ask any questions. She said they will provide the same information to the City Commission.

Planner Anderson said that the increased touch points are a time to understand the case and ask any questions. Once the Planning Commission receives the information in their packet, they can ask for information to be included in the hearing presentation. She reminded Planning Commissioners that they always have the option to continue a public hearing. If they do that, Planner Anderson requested they give staff clear direction on the information needed and when the case will continue.

Commissioner Vyas thanked her for breaking down the plan. She thought increasing touch points will help them to look into things and generate questions sooner. Commissioner Vyas reviewed some things regarding the NFP Phase II project. She thought the second phase was less consistent than the first phase. What seemed of concern was that they didn’t address questions from the first time. She thinks they can get ahead of that by more touch points. Commissioner Vyas wondered about the most satisfying way to come to a decision when there are still questions lingering.

Commissioner Milliken thought the first way to come to a consensus is through discussion at a meeting. He said he sometimes needs time to absorb new information and questions. If they don’t have answers for questions and feel like they can’t decide without those answers, it is justification to table to a following meeting. He thought the plan laid out would be helpful. It would be good to have additional opportunities to engage and ask questions. Commissioner Milliken shared that he didn’t feel comfortable going or engaging in public participation events. He attended the events virtually and learned things but learning the night you are supposed to decide is hard.

Planner Anderson said staff will do their best to be ready to answer questions. If there is something they can’t answer, and it is intricately tied to the Planning Commission’s ability to recommend or approve a case, then continuing is the best bet. She said, in a technical sense, the Planning Commission can put conditions on a motion or recommend removal of a parcel or an area.

City Commissioner Urban said that continuing or tabling an issue to a subsequent meeting is fine if they are specific about what needs to be clarified or what additional information is needed. He added that it might be good for Planning Commissioners to review midway through a project if all the stakeholders they expected to hear from have responded. They may also want to evaluate areas where they could be blindsided.
Planner Anderson said that at a midpoint presentation, they can be far more detailed with whom and how they engaged to help answer that question. Commissioner Milliken thought that would be very helpful.

Planner Anderson asked if they needed more or different information in the public hearing presentations. Commissioner Vyas thought it may be helpful to be alerted to things to watch for or possible concerns people will have with any particular case. City Commissioner Urban thought that would be especially helpful for the newer members of the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Greenman Wright expressed frustration that they can’t answer questions or ask questions during citizen comment period in a public hearing. Commissioner Greenman Wright thought the multiple touchpoints will offer more opportunities so they’re not just getting information/feedback in the public hearing. City Commissioner Urban urged them to use the Commissioner Comment period at the end of the agenda to let the citizens know their comments were heard and considered or if more information is needed.

Planner Anderson reminded them they can direct staff to respond to the comments. It’s not an opportunity for two-way dialogue, but it is an opportunity to answer questions.

Commissioners Vyas and Greenman Wright asked what the process would look like to exempt parcels from a zoning change? What are their options for making things more manageable for Commissioners and citizens? How do they make decisions that are less than all or nothing?

Attorney Robinson cautioned them about exempting parcels and getting into spot zoning or acting like the Zoning Board of Appeals. He said when they look at rezoning requests, they can think about whether the entire request make sense for all the parcels involved. They can exclude parcels if they feel the rezoning is not appropriate for that parcel. Attorney Robinson told them there is nothing wrong with breaking motions into parts.

Planner Eldridge reminded Planning Commissioners that there will be some situations people will need to apply for variances. That’s what the ZBA is there for and if unique circumstances are involved, it can be warranted to go that route.

Commissioner Pittelko thanked staff for the update. He appreciates the renewed focus on outreach for citizens. Commissioner Pittelko like the idea of having more heads-up on what would be controversial or require more deliberation.

Commissioner Greenman Wright thought the NFP meeting would have gone completely differently if they had the meeting in person and were better able to work as a team. She felt they’ve lost a lot by meeting virtually.

Commissioner Phipps wondered if having the extra touchpoints with large cases would increase the applicant’s timeline. She agreed that the heads-up or homework would better equip them to answer questions. Planner Anderson explained the timeline and said they already tell applicants the process will take about three months. Commissioner Milliken added that in most of the cases they’re talking about, the applicant would be the City. Planner Anderson agreed that they will fit the touchpoints in the normal schedule of preparations and public participation.

Commissioner Milliken asked about projects coming up and their first touchpoint meeting. Planner Anderson said they have three neighborhood focused cases they would like to bring first. She would also like to have a presentation of the Public Participation Plan for NFP Phase II for February or March.
Commissioner Milliken said he will look forward to seeing how that goes and providing feedback on the process as it evolves.

**F. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

None.

**G. OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**H. CITIZENS’ COMMENTS (Regarding non-agenda items)**

Mr. Richard Stuart called to express concern that City staff follow the minimum requirements by law for notification. He believed they have the email addresses for the Southtown Neighborhood. Mr. Stuart said that notices go to the wrong places, and notices aren’t posted on doors. He doesn’t believe there is a good faith effort. Mr. Stuart said they are still trying to file the Southtown Neighborhood Plan to be considered for the 2025 Master Plan. He said their plan seeks to protect the natural features the NFP designated behind Stockbridge and Lake just east of John Street. Mr. Stuart voiced concern regarding a development project for that area. He also shared that the Southtown Neighborhood would like to keep the Portage corridor in the business district CC zoning. Mr. Stuart said there is a need in the market for CC zoning and zero demand for LW-1 and LW-2.

**I. CITY COMMISSION LIAISON COMMENTS**

None.

**J. CITY PLANNER'S REPORT**

None.

**K. MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS BY PLANNING COMMISSIONERS**

Commissioner Vyas thanked Planner Anderson for hosting and organizing this meeting and answering questions. She let her know she is valued, and her work is appreciated.

**L. ADJOURNMENT**

Commissioner Milliken adjourned the meeting at 5:03 pm.
7 Plans Completed!
Northside
Eastside
Vine
Edison
Oakwood
Parkview Hills
Oakland Winchell

5 in the works in ‘21
Westwood
Douglas
Stuart
West Main Hill
Westnedge Hill
NEIGHBORHOOD PLANS IN ACTION
Bike lanes were purchased, with a set created by a local artist, for the Vine neighborhood.

Sidewalk projects including the repair/replace program and new build sidewalk use neighborhood plans to identify projects.

New wayfinding signs were installed on Parkview and Oakland for the Oakwood Neighborhood Center.
KENA partnered with KVCC Culinary School to provide recipe cards with food bank pick-ups.

NACD created a successful CNA training program with partners.

Public Art in Vine and Edison
Public Services supported neighborhood plan goals related to education with recent project.

Major Street Projects incorporate neighborhood plan goals.

Brownfield Project at 501 N Westnedge incorporates the neighborhood plan into the RFP and aims to achieve neighborhood plan goals.
MORE PROJECTS!

NFP Phase 2 Map reflects neighborhood plan goals

Zoning updates to support neighborhood plan goals completed and in progress:
E. Main and Northside CBD complete!

The upcoming Sustainability Strategy has used neighborhood plans to shape goals and actions

Safe Routes to School Grant Program is being pursued to support neighborhood plans.

Pilot projects: bike infrastructure, projecting signs, composting

Memorial Beach design project

Facade Project on E. Main

Public Services used neighborhood plans to support a federal safety grant totaling $629,900 for improvements Citywide.

Historic home workshops