

Exhibit G

January 21, 2026 Commission Meeting.

Katia Zhestkova

Testimony:

I want to speak tonight not just about *what* is in this final draft, but **how we got here**, because under Florida's planning process, **how matters just as much as what**.

On **April 26**, this room was packed for the public workshop conducted by Kimley-Horn. Residents spoke clearly: they want a **historic, small-scale downtown**, not high-rise buildings.

On **June 2**, Kimley-Horn presented a draft that reflected that input.
That draft:

- focused on **six stories**,
- used **48 dwelling units per acre**,
- and warned that **waivers — especially height and parking waivers — were a risk and should be removed**.

That is the **only draft residents ever saw**.

On June 2, the **only direction from the Commission** was a request to look at **one additional 10-story option**.

There was **no vote**, no authorization to increase density, no approval to add sub-districts, and no instruction to expand waivers.

Nearly **five months later**, the Commission is presented with final recommendations that include **major changes**:

- density increased from **60 units per acre** in certain areas.
- new or reworked **sub-districts**,
- and waivers that were once called a risk are now built into the system.

All traffic and infrastructure analysis in this study was done at **48 units per acre**, and even that showed problems.

There is **no updated analysis** supporting 60.

These changes were **never brought back to residents**.

Florida's planning process requires **meaningful public participation**.

When material changes are made after public workshops and presentations, residents must be informed, shown what changed, and given a chance to respond.

That did **not** happen here.

Just yesterday, we met with the Town Manager and Development Director. They told us the Town did **not** direct these changes and cannot explain how they occurred.

So tonight, the Commission is being asked to consider recommendations that are:

- materially different from what residents saw,
- not supported by updated data,
- and lacking clear authorization.

That is not a policy disagreement.

It is a **process breakdown**.

Until this is addressed, the **only version that reflects resident input, tested assumptions, and a transparent public process is the June 2 draft**.

Advancing these recommendations without resolving these process defects exposes the Town to serious legal vulnerability because they are not supported by the public record or the analysis presented to residents