

Exhibit H

Testimony Before Lake Park, FL Commission 1/21/2026:

Public Comment on the PADD 10th and Park Project:

Scrutiny of the Kimley-Horn Nov. 5, 2025 Report

Michael Steinhauer, 435 Greenbriar Dr. pipestone1992@gmail.com 608-332-5547 Private Resident /
Lake Park Society for the Advancement of Civic Engagement

Members of the Commission,

Tonight, we will hear from KH about their November 5th report, a planning document. It had been 5 months since their first report was submitted in June 2025, and I wondered why it took 5 drafts to reach November 5th. Who was giving the consultants directions during these drafts on what to specifically include in the final November report?

What concerns many residents is not just the report's outcome, but **how** that outcome was reached. What motivated KH to materially change their recommendations WITHOUT COMMISSION OR P&Z DIRECTION between June 2 and November 5, so as to WRITE A REPORT WITH SPECIFIC LANGUAGE SUPPORTING BOTH 60 DWUs AND ASSOCIATED OPTIONAL WAIVERS? For instance, where did the notion of multiple downtown districts come from? Why did KH choose to create a detailed road map for only one possible future? It seems so striking that their recommendation appears to have been formed **before** it was formally considered by the Commission and then bypassing the Planning and Zoning Board altogether. Equally worse, draft after draft went by **before residents could review the information, ask questions, and provide input**. Who directed KH to promulgate such an exhaustively detailed path of higher density that inevitably leads to the need for multiple optional waivers and high stories?

It feels like a Planning and Zoning review is more of a formality than a meaningful part of the process.

How is it that no other densities were as fully language out that reflects the will of residents? Residents must by law be engaged during the process, when our feedback can still influence the outcome. When that doesn't happen, confidence in the process erodes.

KH should remove the November report as unauthorized in scope and resubmit with clear direction from P&Z, residents, and the Commission. Tonight, the Commission should ratify this path. Conduct additional public hearings on any final recommendation to be made by the consultants.

Please note with my testimony an email attachment to the KH Team requesting answers to these questions.

Good development can coexist with good governance. But only if transparency and accountability are treated as obligations, not inconveniences. Thank you for your time.



Fw: Request for Clarification on Unauthorised Revisions to PADD Final Draft

1 message

Katia Zhestkova <ekaterinaz@hotmail.com>

Wed, Jan 21, 2026 at 9:24 AM

To: Michael Steinhauer <pipestone1992@gmail.com>

Mike, because time is of essence and KH needs to see this before the meeting I sent it yesterday to both partners. I think it is more than strange about that both Nadia and Richard denied the responsibility for changing the report. It actually made the final draft invalid.

From: Katia Zhestkova <ekaterinaz@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, January 21, 2026 4:08 AM

To: Palmer, Alessandria <ali.palmer@kimley-horn.com>; Cruz, Ruben <ruben.cruz@kimley-horn.com>

Cc: Nadia DiTommaso <nditommaso@lakeparkflorida.gov>; Richard Reade <rreade@lakeparkflorida.gov>; Roger Michaud <rmichaud@lakeparkflorida.gov>; Baird, Thomas J. <tbaird@jonesfoster.com>

Subject: Request for Clarification on Unauthorised Revisions to PADD Final Draft

Request for Clarification on Unauthorised Revisions to PADD Final Draft
January 20, 2026

Dear Kimley-Horn Team,

I am writing on behalf of the Lake Park Society for the Advancement of Civic Engagement (SACE) regarding the Park Avenue Downtown District (PADD) Study and the substantial, unexplained revisions contained in the December 2025 draft.

On **January 20, 2026**, we met with the Town's Development Director and Town Manager to discuss the differences between the publicly presented **June 2, 2025 draft** and the **Final draft** recently posted on the Town's website.

During this meeting, both officials clearly stated that:

- The Town **did not direct or authorize** Kimley-Horn to change the density framework from 48 to 60 dwelling units per acre;
- The Town **did not request** the retention or expansion of waiver mechanisms, including structured parking height exclusions;
- The Town **did not instruct** Kimley-Horn to alter or create new sub-district boundaries or increase intensity;
- The Town has **no explanation** for how these substantial changes occurred;
- The Town Manager expressly stated that he instructed the Development Director and planning staff to “**stay away**” meaning staff did not make any specific requests to change the report after June 2; and
- Both officials advised us to contact Kimley-Horn directly for an explanation.

It is also important to note that at both the **April 26 public workshop** and the **June 2 public presentation**, Kimley-Horn witnessed **hundreds of residents** expressing strong, consistent opposition to high-rise development and a clear preference for preserving a small-scale, historic downtown with buildings **not exceeding approximately six stories**. This public input was reflected in the June 2 draft.

However, the December draft departs sharply from this consensus. In addition to higher intensity, expanded waivers, and increased density, the final draft introduces **an entirely new or reconfigured Core Sub-District** with materially different development entitlements. This sub-district was **never discussed publicly, never shown to residents, never evaluated in the June 2 presentation, and was not the subject of any infrastructure, traffic, wastewater, or compatibility analysis**. Its creation is a substantial policy change that contradicts both the June 2 draft and the documented public record.

Given Town has denied providing direction for these revisions—we are requesting clarification directly from Kimley-Horn.

To ensure transparency and accountability, we respectfully request answers to the following:

A. Direction and Authorization

- 1. What instructions, if any, were provided to Kimley-Horn after June 2, 2025?**
- 2. Who requested or authorized the introduction of 60 dwelling units per acre in the Core Sub-District?**
- 3. On what basis were waiver mechanisms preserved or expanded, despite the June 2 draft identifying them as a risk?**
- 4. Who directed or authorized the creation or reconfiguration of the sub-districts—particularly the Core Sub-District that now carries a higher density entitlement—and what was the rationale for these boundary changes?**
- 5. Why were these significant policy revisions not presented publicly prior to the release of the December draft?**
- 6. If no direction was provided by Town staff or the Commission, what was the rationale for producing a final draft that contradicts the June 2 draft and the public input documented to date?**

B. Draft Review Process and Communications

- 7. Who reviewed the drafts and how many revisions were made prior to their release?**
- 8. Who provided comments, edits, or requested changes to those drafts?**
- 9. Were any of the following individuals or groups consulted regarding revisions after June 2?**
 - Mayor Michaud
 - Individual commissioners
 - The CRA or CRA Director
 - Economic development personnel

- Business owners within the PADD
- Developers or their representatives
- Chamber of Commerce or business organizations

10. Did Kimley-Horn meet with, correspond with, or receive feedback from any private individuals, businesses, or developers regarding revisions to the PADD recommendations and the timing of these communications?

11. What was the purpose of the November 2025 outreach to business owners for a private meeting?

Who initiated it, who was invited, and what materials or draft concepts were to be discussed?

12. Were any draft versions, redlines, annotated comments, or markups circulated that are not part of the public record?

As you know, the June 2 draft was the only version presented at a public meeting, and the Commission acknowledged that the only follow-up request was to evaluate a single optional **10-story scenario**. No other changes were voted on or authorized.

Because the Town has stated that staff were instructed "stay away" and that no direction was given for the significant changes contained in the December draft, we respectfully request a clear and timely explanation from Kimley-Horn regarding how these revisions—including the creation of a new sub-district—entered the document and under what authority.

Finally, the fact that the Town has confirmed that it did not request, authorize, or participate in these substantial and material revisions raises serious questions about the integrity of the process through which the final draft was produced. Major changes of this magnitude—introducing new sub-districts, increasing density, expanding waivers, and altering the development framework—should not appear in a planning document without clear direction, transparent communication, and public review. The absence of such direction makes it essential to understand how these revisions were developed, by whom, and under what authority.

· Thank you for your prompt response. Both residents and the Town Commission deserve full transparency regarding the origin of these changes.

Sincerely,

Katia Zhestkova

President, Lake Park Society for the Advancement of Civic Engagement (SACE)