

## MINUTES

### **HARRISBURG PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR/VIRTUAL MEETING January 6, 2021 ZOOM PLATFORM**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Joseph Alsberry, Chair  
Vern McKissick, Vice Chair  
Shaun E. O'Toole  
Jamesetta Reed  
Ausha Green  
Anne Marek  
Zac Monnier

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

**STAFF PRESENT:** Geoffrey Knight, Planning Director  
Tiffanie Baldock, Senior Deputy City Solicitor

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

**CALL TO ORDER:** 6:35 PM

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Commissioner Marek moved, and Commissioner Reed seconded the motion, to approve the minutes from the November 4<sup>th</sup> meeting without corrections; the motion was adopted by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

**1 Variance & Special Exception Applications for 1103 South Front Street, zoned Riverfront (RF), filed by Thomas Zimmerman with Veterans Outreach of Pennsylvania, to establish a "Use Not Specifically Prohibited" in the Zoning Code and to construct buildings below the Minimum Building Height regulation.**

Mr. Knight noted that the Planning Commission initially reviewed the application at their previous meeting on November 4, 2020 meeting. He noted that, due to disagreements between the Planning Bureau and the Applicants regarding the conditions in the case report, the Planning Commission had Tabled the review to allow the parties to coordinate on potential compromises between the positions. Mr. Knight noted that he had a teleconference with the Applicants on December 1, 2020 from the site, and had discussions with the City Engineer. He noted that the Applicants had subsequently provided supplemental documentation and that the Planning Bureau had drafted a response to that documentation, which had been emailed to the commissioners that day.

Mr. Knight noted that the Applicants had provided documentation demonstrating why they did not want to change the configuration of the site, why the development footprint could not be relocated, and why public access could not be retained along the full length of the waterfront. Mr. Knight stated that, after consideration and internal discussions, the Planning Bureau felt the Applicants' justifications for why the conditions could not be were reasonable, noting that the future residents required space not just from the public, but from each other as well, and that there were topographical and geological issues that prevented the development footprint from being relocated to the east. He stated that the site visit made it evident that a significant investment would be required to meet some of the Planning Bureau's conditions of approval, and that this may prove cost-prohibitive to the proposed project. Mr. Knight noted that one of the goals of the conditions of approval was to allow eventual expansion of the project if it was successful, but that the Applicants had stated they didn't intend to expand in the future, as a crowded site would be detrimental to the growth and healing of the residents.

Mr. Knight noted that the Applicants had removed some of the on-site parking, as recommended in the case report, which would reduce the impervious surface footprint and the number of vehicular trips to the site; he noted that the access road would cross the Capital Area Greenbelt at a somewhat precarious location. Mr. Knight also noted that the revised site plan reduced the area of the truck turnaround area, and that some of the proposed development footprint was currently covered in gravel, which would reduce the increase in impervious surface coverage. Finally, he noted that the Applicants were willing to establish a small, publicly-accessible area in the northwestern corner of the property which would provide some accommodation along the riverfront for the public. Mr. Knight stated that these compromises were an acceptable response to the Planning Bureau's initial case report, and that he was willing to withdraw the conditions of approval in the case report in light of the proposed revisions.

The case was represented by Bruce Grossman, Esquire with Caldwell & Kearns (the legal counsel), 3631 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110; Tom Zimmerman with Veterans Outreach of Pennsylvania (the prospective property owner), 6526 Plowman Ridge, Harrisburg, PA 17112; and Christine Hunter with H. Edward Black & Associates, Ltd., 2403 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110 (aka "the Applicants").

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether the Applicants had anything to add to the Planning Bureau's statements. They thanked Mr. Knight, the City Engineer, and the Mayor for their coordination on finding an acceptable compromise to the site layout. The Applicants stated that they accepted the revised recommendations as noted in the Planning Bureau's memo addressing their response to the conditions of approval, with the addition that any zoning relief approvals would only be applicable to the parcel which would eventually be subdivided from the existing property. He noted that had not been included in the Planning Bureau's memo.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether any of the commissioners had comments or concerns about the project. Commissioner McKissick stated that he appreciated they had addressed some of the original comments from the Planning Bureau.

Commissioner Marek also stated that she was happy to see that a compromise had been reached between the Applicants and the Planning Bureau. She stated that she didn't see the relocated

Greenbelt access and asked whether that had been relocated in the revised plan. The Applicants noted that the Greenbelt would traverse the property north of the project area, and that the owner of the property had reached an agreement with the Capital Area Greenbelt Association regarding continued public access to the portion of the trail on the property. Mr. Knight noted that a portion of the Greenbelt would be improved as it would function as the emergency access route proposed as part of the project. Mr. Knight noted that the long-term legal standing of the Greenbelt across the property would need to be addressed with the owner of the existing parcel, who would still own the portion to the north after the proposed subdivision; he stated that they had initiated conversations with that owner on the eventual, formal status of the Greenbelt on the property.

Commissioner Monnier stated that he was happy to see the revisions to the project and was excited to have the eventual development in the city.

Commissioner Alsberry concurred with the other commissioners and stated that he felt the Applicants had done a good job with the final proposal

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether there was anyone from the public that was for or against the project; Ms. Baldock gave instruction to the public in attendance on how to request to be unmuted so they could provide comment. There were no comments.

Commissioner Alsberry asked for the commissioners to make a motion. Commissioner O'Toole asked whether there were any conditions on the approval. Mr. Knight stated that the Planning Bureau was withdrawing the conditions of approval in the original case report based on the compromises discussed with the Applicants. He noted that he hoped to have an updated on the eventual status of the portion of the Greenbelt that ran across the property when the requisite Land Development Plan was filed for the project. Mr. Knight stated that the Planning Bureau was supporting the proposal with the revisions agreed to by the Applicant.

Commissioner O'Toole moved, and Commissioner Marek seconded the motion, to Approve the request with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (7-0).

## **NEW BUSINESS:**

- 1 Special Exception Applications for 1928 Zarker Street, zoned Residential Medium-Density (RM), filed by Vicky Dominguez with VIP Hair Club, LLC, to establish a "Personal Services" use on-site and to request relief from the off-street parking requirements outlined in Section 7-327.6 of the Zoning Code.**

**[Note: this application was intended to be the first "New Business" case heard, but the Applicant was not in attendance at the start of the meeting, and the case was moved to the end of the agenda. The Applicant entered the meeting at approximately 8:22 PM and the application was heard as the last case.]**

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the report, recommending Approval with Conditions; the conditions were that:

1. The business will be limited to a single chair and one employee, and will not install any signage advertising the business, to ensure it is operated as closely to a “Home Occupation” use as possible.
2. The Applicant will inform all clientele that there is no off-street parking associated with the business and that customers may not park on the sidewalk along the street, which is a prevalent practice for residents, to reduce potential impacts of the business on the neighborhood.
3. The Applicant should contact DPW and LCSWMA to ascertain if there are any chemicals or products that should not be disposed of in the general refuse and take appropriate steps to dispose of such materials properly.

The case was represented by Vicky Dominguez with VIP Hair Club, LLC (the business owner and property owner), 1928 Zarker Street, Harrisburg, PA 17104 (aka “the Applicant”).

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicant whether the conditions in the case report were acceptable; she confirmed that they were.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether any of the commissioners had comments or concerns about the project. There were no comments.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether there was anyone from the public that was for or against the project; Ms. Baldock gave instruction to the public in attendance on how to request to be unmuted so they could provide comment. There were no comments.

Commissioner O’Toole moved, and Commissioner Reed seconded the motion, to Approve the request with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (7-0).

**2 Special Exception Application for 308 North 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, zoned Commercial Neighborhood (CN), filed by Garrett Rothman with Peleton Investments, LLC, to convert the existing first-floor commercial space into two units, which requires a Special Exception to increase an existing non-conforming aspect (the residential density).**

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the report, recommending Approval with Conditions; the conditions were that:

1. The Planning Bureau would recommend that the Applicant consider establishing one two-bedroom unit on-site, given that such units are in relatively short supply in the downtown area, particularly compared to studio and one-bedroom units.
2. The Applicant will submit a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) application, and receive approval from HARB, for any exterior alterations visible from a public right-of-way associated with this project.

The case was represented by Garrett Rothman with Peleton Investments, LLC (the property owner), 3 Lemoyne Drive, Suite 100, Lemoyne, PA 17043 (aka “the Applicant”).

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicant whether the conditions in the case were acceptable. The Applicant noted that the first floor was approximately 1,600 square feet and was configured in a “shotgun” layout, which supported the creation of two units. He stated that the front portion

would be most appropriate for a commercial use and that he was considering retaining that space for commercial use and establishing a one- or two-bedroom residential unit in the rear. The Applicant noted that the property could generate more revenue with a two-bedroom unit and that they would attempt to identify commercial tenants for the front unit.

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Planning Bureau staff whether they had a response to the Applicant's statement. Mr. Knight noted that the revised proposal for one residential unit and one commercial unit would not change the request aside from minimizing the intensity of the zoning relief being sought; he noted that most commercial uses for the front unit would likely be by right. Mr. Knight noted that the Planning Bureau's recommendation for a single unit was based not only on a desire to see a less prevalent unit layout (i.e., two bedrooms), but also because the rear entrance to a second unit would require tenants to walk through a relatively dark and unsecured access, and because the entrance may be adjacent to a dumpster for a food service business in the adjacent building.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether any of the commissioners had comments or concerns about the project. Commissioner McKissick noted that he was struggling with the proposal to replace an existing commercial storefront with residential units, noting that it may adversely impact street activity. He asked if the Planning Bureau knew whether the property had been constructed as a solely residential property, and stated that it would assuage his concerns about establishing a precedent of converting commercial storefronts to residential units. Mr. Knight noted that the Historic Preservation Specialist usually provided background on the architecture and history of a property, but that he did not have information regarding the original use of the building. He noted that the storefront windows were not historic and that the original window pattern likely mirrored that of the residential units on the upper floors, but that he did not have specific information on the historical use of the building. Commissioner McKissick noted that if the property had originally been used as a residence, then approval would not create a precedent for the conversion of other storefronts. The Applicant stated that he didn't have information as to the original use of the property, but reiterated that they were willing to retain the commercial space in the front unit.

Commissioner O'Toole asked whether Commissioner McKissick would feel more comfortable requiring a commercial use in the front unit, noting that he did not feel strongly one way or the other; Commissioner McKissick stated that he would like to see that.

Commissioner Marek stated that she agreed with Commissioner O'Toole's recommendation that the front unit be retained as commercial space. She stated that she understood the intent to have as much of the building leased as possible. Commissioner Marek stated that if there was not going to be a two-bedroom unit on-site, she would prefer that the front unit remain as commercial space, which she felt should be made a condition of approval.

Commissioner Monnier stated that he frequented the former barbershop on-site and appreciated the atmosphere that the commercial space lent to the street; however, he noted that it was difficult to market the property for commercial space. He also noted that the Applicant had submitted a letter of support from Harristown, which confirmed the difficulty in leasing commercial space, and that he observed empty storefronts during his own walks along 2<sup>nd</sup> & 3<sup>rd</sup> Streets. Commissioner

Monnier stated that he would approve the request without the requirement to maintain commercial space in the front unit, but that he hoped such a use could be identified.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether there was anyone from the public that was for or against the project; Ms. Baldock gave instruction to the public in attendance on how to request to be unmuted so they could provide comment. There were no comments.

Commissioner Alsberry stated that he was willing to approve the proposal either with or without a requirement for commercial space.

Commissioner McKissick stated that he was willing to support the project on the basis that he believed the property was constructed solely for residential use, and that the proposal would be converting the property to its original use. Commissioner Alsberry asked whether he was including the conditions of approval in the case report in that motion, and Commissioner McKissick clarified that he was.

Commissioner McKissick moved, and Commissioner Reed seconded the motion, to Approve the request with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (7-0). The Applicant requested clarification on the conditions of approval, and asked whether a one-bedroom unit was acceptable. Mr. Knight stated that the recommendation was to consider a two-bedroom unit on the first floor, and noted that the Applicant seemed to be considering that configuration. He stated that the Zoning Hearing Board would ultimately be responsible for determining what conditions would apply to any approval granted.

**3 Special Exception Applications for 1724 Market Street, zoned Residential Medium-Density (RM), filed by Ashish Desai with Harrisburg Home Adult Daycare, to establish an “Adult Day Care” use on-site and to request relief from the off-street parking requirements outlined in Section 7-327.6 of the Zoning Code.**

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the report, recommending Approval with Conditions; the conditions were that:

1. The Planning Bureau recommends that at least two of the on-site parking spaces be reserved for use by staff, with the remaining space used for transportation van loading/unloading. The Applicant will clearly delineate any proposed parking on-site and ensure that such spaces do not encroach on the pedestrian right-of-way along Market Street. The Bureau would also recommend the Applicant coordinate with the City Engineer’s Office on the establishment of a loading/unloading area in front of the property.
2. The Planning Bureau would recommend that the Applicant utilize the existing legal, non-conforming wall and free-standing signage to advertise the new use.
3. The Applicant will coordinate with the Department of Public Works in the type and location of refuse containers, and to ensure that the account billing is updated to reflect the proposed change in use.
4. The Planning Bureau recommends that the Applicant coordinate with a neighborhood group on the installation of a mural on the recessed front façade of the building as part of their site improvement work.

The case was represented by Brian Linsenbach with Stone, Wiley & Linsenbach (the legal counsel), 3 North Baltimore Street, Dillsburg, PA 17019; and Ratilal Patel, P.E. (the project engineer), 4815 Sheffield Court, Harrisburg, PA 171102(aka “the Applicants”).

The Applicants stated that Conditions #1, #2, and #3 were acceptable, but stated that they weren’t sure they wanted to be locked in to Condition #4 regarding the installation of a mural on the front façade, although they confirmed their intention to improve the appearance of the property from the inside and the outside. They noted that they could install brick façade in place of the existing boarded-up windows. Mr. Knight stated that the condition was included after a review of the proposed site plans did not indicate that the windows would be reopened, and that a mural would be a good way to improve the curb appeal of the property; he noted that it would be a good way to engage the community and future patrons of the business. Mr. Knight outlined some community organizations that might be able to assist in installing a mural on-site. He stated that he was not insisting on such improvements and that the Planning Bureau would be happy to support other improvements to the property. The Applicants stated that they were willing to consider all options.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether the property was near a day care center on Market Street; Mr. Knight noted that there was a day care center further to the east on the 1900 block of Market Street. Commissioner Alsberry confirmed that was the business he was referencing, and the Applicants stated that they weren’t aware of a day care center near their property.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether any of the commissioners had comments or concerns about the project. Commissioner McKissick noted that, in passing the property over the years, he had wondered whether there was a better use for the building. He stated that adult day care was desperately needed in the Harrisburg community, and that he felt the three conditions aside from the one referencing the mural would be acceptable.

Commissioner O’Toole stated that he was in favor of the proposal and asked whether the business revenues came from charitable donations or patrons’ fees. The Applicants stated that they did not accept charitable donations, but that the facility would accept federal payments to operate the business. They noted that they operated similar businesses in two other states, which both accommodated approximately 50-60 people, and that these businesses were not funded by charities. Commissioner O’Toole reiterated his support for the proposal.

Commissioner Green stated that she supported the proposal, noted it would bring needed services to the community, and felt it would be a great reuse of the proposed building.

Commissioner Marek also indicated support for the proposal and concurred with the other commissioners in that it was She asked whether the Applicants had engaged with the immediate neighbors or any community groups; the Applicants stated that they had not engaged with the community beyond the required notification letters mailed to property owners within 100 feet of the subject property. They noted that the sale was contingent upon receiving zoning approval, and that once they received approval, they would invest resources in hiring architects and consultants for community engagement. Commissioner Marek noted that applicants usually engaged with the community during the zoning relief application process. The Applicants noted that they had directly engaged with the owner of the property on the one side of the site, but not the other side.

Commissioner Monnier noted that he had researched the proposed use, which identified the many benefits for residents of the community. He stated that he felt the proposal would be a great program for the Market Street corridor in Allison Hill.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether there was anyone from the public that was for or against the project; Ms. Baldock gave instruction to the public in attendance on how to request to be unmuted so they could provide comment. There were no comments.

Commissioner Alsberry stated that he was happy to see vacant buildings being adaptively reused, but noted that communication with neighborhood groups was a primary point of consideration for the Planning Commission; he recommended that the Applicants contact some of the neighbors to get ideas on how best to improve the aesthetics of the property.

Commissioner O'Toole moved, and Commissioner Marek seconded the motion, to Approve the request with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (7-0).

**4 Special Exception Applications for 327 Lewis Street, zoned Residential Medium-Density (RM), filed by Ryan Rudy with Rudy Property Group, LLC, to establish a “Multifamily Dwelling” on-site by converting the existing first-floor commercial space into a residential unit and to request relief from the off-street parking requirements outlined in Section 7-327.6 of the Zoning Code.**

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the report, recommending Approval.

The case was represented by Conrad Rudy with Rudy Property Group LLC (the property owner), 360 Beverly Road, Camp Hill, PA 17011 (aka “the Applicant”).

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicant whether they had anything to add to the Planning Bureau’s case report. The Applicant expressed support to the Planning Bureau staff in getting prepared for the current meeting, noting that this was the first project they had done in the city. They noted that the proposal ultimately proposed a conversion of the first-floor commercial unit into a residential unit.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether any of the commissioners had comments or concerns about the project. Commissioner McKissick asked whether the property was originally constructed as a corner store, or whether it had been converted to commercial use at some point. Mr. Knight stated that it was likely a residential structure, based on the Historic Preservation Specialist’s research, which noted the differentiation from the attached buildings that were constructed as residences. He also noted that in researching the property, a former property owner appeared to have managed the previous business on the first floor, and it was possible that they converted the first-floor unit into commercial space. Commissioner McKissick noted that the proposal appeared to convert the property to its original use, and Mr. Knight confirmed that was the case.



Commissioner Alsberry asked whether there was anyone from the public that was for or against the project; Ms. Baldock gave instruction to the public in attendance on how to request to be unmuted so they could provide comment. There were no comments.

Commissioner McKissick moved, and Commissioner Green seconded the motion, to Approve the request. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (7-0).

**5 Variance & Special Exception Applications for 123 South 14<sup>th</sup> Street, zoned Residential Medium-Density (RM), filed by Esayas Seyoum and Tigist Dessalegn as an after-the-fact application, to convert an existing single-family home into two units, which necessitates Variances for relief from the Specific Criteria regulations in Section 7-309.2(v)(1) and from the density regulations in Section 7-307.3, and Special Exceptions to establish a “Multifamily Dwelling” and to request relief from the off-street parking requirements.**

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the report, recommending Approval with Conditions; the conditions were that:

1. The Codes Bureau will perform a thorough inspection of the interior of the building, to ascertain whether the conditions for a second unit currently exist (i.e., a separate bathroom, kitchen/kitchenette, and sleeping area); if they do not, the Applicant must submit Building Permits to have the entire structure brought into compliance with current Building Code regulations.
2. The Applicant will landscape the entirety of the rear yard and maintain it in good condition to avoid having to seek relief for other aspects of the Development Standards.

The case was represented by Esayas Seyoum & Tigist Dessalegn (the property owners), 404 Montrose Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110 (aka “the Applicant”).

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicants whether the conditions in the case were acceptable; the Applicants requested clarification on Condition #1. Mr. Knight stated that a full inspection of the property would be necessary to understand what the existing configuration of the property was and whether it was fully in compliance with the applicable Building Code regulations such as fire separation between units. He noted that since the Applicants had purchased the property, there was little work submitted for building permit reviews except for the installation of a second electrical box on the building, after which an inspection had not been conducted. He noted the Applicants had indicated that the property was two units when they purchased it, although all City records indicated that it was a single unit prior to their purchase of the property. Mr. Knight stated that a Codes Bureau inspector should conduct a thorough interior inspection to confirm how the property is configured and whether it is code-compliant. The Applicants stated that that would be acceptable and that the property featured separate bathrooms and kitchens on the first and second floors at the time of their purchase.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether any of the commissioners had comments or concerns about the project. Commissioner O’Toole asked whether the Applicants had used a realtor when purchasing the property; they responded that they had. Commissioner O’Toole noted that realtors not providing the correct and necessary information to potential purchasers was a common issue

in the city. He stated that he thought this particular request would be approved, although recent similar proposals were less acceptable.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether there was anyone from the public that was for or against the project; Ms. Baldock gave instruction to the public in attendance on how to request to be unmuted so they could provide comment. There were no comments.

Commissioner O'Toole moved, and Commissioner McKissick seconded the motion, to Approve the request with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (7-0).

**6 Variance Applications for 2246 Susquehanna Street, zoned Residential Medium-Density (RM), filed by Richard Lawson with Harrisburg Mini Storage, to construct a chain-link fence higher than permitted in the RM district per Section 7-307.9(c) of the Zoning Code.**

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the report, recommending Approval.

The case was represented by Richard Lawson with Harrisburg Mini Storage, 2 Lumber Street, Highspire, PA 17034 (aka "the Applicant").

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicant whether they had anything to add to the Planning Bureau's case report. The Applicant stated that he did not.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether any of the commissioners had comments or concerns about the project. There were no comments.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether there was anyone from the public that was for or against the project; Ms. Baldock gave instruction to the public in attendance on how to request to be unmuted so they could provide comment. There were no comments.

Commissioner Marek moved, and Commissioner Reed seconded the motion, to Approve the request. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (7-0).

**7 Variance Applications for 256 Herr Street, zoned Residential Medium-Density (RM), filed by Don Delp with Restore-N-More, to construct a metal fence higher than permitted in the front yard and higher than permitted in any yard, and to construct a wall higher than permitted, per Section 7-307.9 of the Zoning Code.**

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the report, recommending Denial.

The case was represented by Don Delp with Restore-N-More (the contractor), 251 West Stiegel Street, P.O. Box 128, Manheim, PA 17545; and Nathaniel Hench & Ronald Wetzel (the property owners), 256 Herr Street, Harrisburg, PA 17102 (aka "the Applicants").

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicants whether they wanted to outline reasons why the Planning Commission should not deny the application. The Applicants clarified that they were not requesting approval for any portion of the fence to exceed six feet in height. They also stated that

they were approaching the project as though Herr Street was the front entrance of the property and Green Street was the side entrance, although they acknowledged that there was some ambiguity on that aspect. The Applicants stated that while the contractor was working on the subject property, there was a report of a breaking & entering incident at the property owners' previous residence, which was across Herr Street from the subject property.

The Applicants stated that two years prior, they had undertaken a complete interior and exterior renovation of the building, and that they were now beginning site work in an attempt to give the property a more residential appearance as opposed to its current commercial appearance. They stated that as part of that work, they wanted to install a fence to prohibit mischief on the property or unauthorized access. The Applicants stated that the proposed fence would replicate the design of the existing fence on-site with good visibility though the fence, with the exception of the proposed brick wall, which they stated would not be wide.

Commissioner Alsberry asked Planning Bureau staff whether they had a response to the Applicants' statements. Mr. Knight stated that the Planning Bureau supported the previous and proposed work on the property, including the removal of parking, construction of a driveway, and installation of landscaping, which would bring the property more into conformance with the Zoning Code and improve the aesthetic appearance. He stated that he was not aware of any police reports related to the break-in referenced by the Applicants, or of any criminal activity at all, and being that the property was completely accessible to the public, it did not appear that prevention of criminal activity was a good justification for the requested Variance. Mr. Knight stated that a four-foot-high fence using the same design was proposed would be sufficient to deter any potential criminal activity.

In addressing the determination of "front yard" versus "side yard" with respect to the proposed fence, Mr. Knight noted that while the property was addressed as 256 Herr Street, the widest portion of the building and the larger building entrance faced Green Street, and that this was also where vehicles accessed the site. He stated that due to these reasons, the Planning Bureau felt that Green Street was the "front yard."

The Applicants stated that they used the Herr Street as the main entrance to the building and noted that they would be putting out patio furniture around their wraparound porch. They also stated that they intended on installing gas lanterns atop the brick pillars of the fence, and that they wanted those to be located high enough to avoid being damaged by passersby.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether the Applicants would accept the Planning Bureau's recommendation of a four-foot-high fence; the Applicants stated that they were hoping to have a six-foot-high fence approved and reiterated that they considered Herr Street to be the front yard of the property. They stated that they understood a six-foot-high fence was permitted by right on the side yard property line and felt that such a height should be permitted to extend to the front yard property line to establish an aesthetic continuity to the fence. Mr. Knight stated that a four-foot-high fence would accommodate the Applicants' stated interest in fence height continuity in a manner consistent with the Zoning Code. He also noted that regardless of whether Green Street or Herr Street was considered the front yard; there would be a front yard portion that wrapped around

the corner and thus the fencing regulations would apply in the same way regardless of which side of the property was the “front yard.”

Mr. Knight stated that the case report’s reference to a “fence higher than permitted in any yard” was included in error; he noted that an original elevation plan showed aspects of the fence and brick pillars higher than six feet, but that subsequent conversations with the Applicants confirmed that no part of the fence would be higher than six feet. He stated that that aspect of the case report was being withdrawn. The Applicants stated that they had support from neighbors and the Historic Harrisburg Association, and noted that they had been granted HARB approval. Commissioner Alsberry noted that he was going to inquire as to whether HARB had reviewed the proposal, and they reiterated that they had received approval.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether any of the commissioners had comments or concerns about the project. Commissioner McKissick stated that he thought the proposal was attractive from an aesthetic perspective, noted that he was concerned about establishing a precedent. He noted that other applicants with a proposal for a fence higher than permitted by the Zoning Code might not consider such a substantial design.

Commissioner Green stated that while she appreciated the appearance of the proposed fence, she was also concerned about establishing a precedent for front yard fencing in the RM district.

Commissioner Reed inquired as to the height of the current fence; the Applicants stated that the existing fence was approximately three feet in height, and noted that some of the fencing on the property had been removed.

Commissioner Marek stated that she felt the site was relatively unique, particularly within the surrounding neighborhood. She stated that she understood the concerns about precedent but felt this situation presented a rare case and that she didn’t foresee the Planning Commission receiving many applications for similar situations in the future. Commissioner Marek stated that she appreciated the Applicants’ proposal and that it seemed like they were trying to bring the property back towards a more original appearance. She asked whether the Applicants had documentation that showed what the property had previously looked like prior to the parking being installed on-site; they noted that they had included an historic photo of the property with the existing fencing on-site running around the perimeter of the property, and that they were attempting to duplicate that appearance in design and style to recreate what was on-site originally. Commissioner Marek noted that the previous fence was much shorter than six feet. The Applicants reiterated that they were attempting to match the style of the original fence with one that was six feet high. They stated that they had identified a vendor who could replicate the existing stylistic finishes of the original fence on-site. The Applicants stated that they had purchased the house in 2014 and that they had been restoring the structure since that time, although they had only moved into the house approximately two years ago. Commissioner Marek stated that given the context of the site, she was less concerned about establishing a negative precedent.

Commissioner O’Toole stated that he agreed with Commissioner Marek about the uniqueness of the site, and also noted that the Applicants had made a substantial amount of investment into the property.

Commissioner McKissick noted that in the submitted plan sets, the top of proposed brick pillars and some of the gate fencing exceeded six feet in height, but that previous testimony indicated that the fence would not be that high; he asked whether there had been a design change relative to the submitted documentation. The Applicants stated that the submitted documentation was developed by a contractor who was not familiar with the zoning regulations, but that after conversations with the Planning Bureau staff, they had revised the fence height down to six feet in height.

Commissioner McKissick noted the unique nature of the property in that it had two front yards, and asked whether the zoning regulations penalized such a configuration. Mr. Knight concurred that there was a front yard height consideration regardless of which side of the property was the “front yard,” but that the primary concern of the Applicants seemed to be access control as opposed to aesthetic issues, and noted that a by-right, four-foot-high fence would provide the same aesthetic consistency. He noted that the property was been open to the street by way of the on-site parking for many years, yet he was not aware of any criminal activity on-site; thus, he stated that he felt that did not establish a justification for a fence higher than permitted by right.

Commissioner McKissick if a six-foot-high fence would be permitted by-right if one of the street frontages would be considered the side yard. Mr. Knight noted that the Zoning Code specifically noted that any fence to the front of a building was in the “front yard” and thus that the four-foot height limit would apply to some point along both frontages regardless of which was considered the front yard.

Commissioner McKissick noted that he had dealt with a similar issue in his professional capacity, in which had ultimately recommended a five-foot-high fence as opposed to a six-foot-high fence, due to the higher fence creating the appearance of a prison. He asked whether a five-foot-high fence would be more acceptable to the Applicants, noting that such a compromise might be more palatable to the Zoning Hearing Board. The Applicants stated that during their years living across the street and considering how they would improve the property, they had envisioned gas lanterns on top of the pillars and that they were concerned about having a live glass flame within reach of the general public.

Commissioner McKissick asked how the Applicants intended to mount the gas lanterns on the pillars; they stated that they would be mounted to the top. Commissioner McKissick noted that the proposed lanterns would elevate the overall height of the pillars to approximately 12 to 18 inches above the proposed height of the fence. Commissioner Marek noted that the submitted elevation plans did not include the lanterns on top of the pillars; the Applicants confirmed that the landscaper who designed the fence had not included the lanterns as he only addressed the components of the project for which he was responsible.

Commissioner Monnier stated that he could see the years of planning that the Applicants had put into the design, and that the proposed landscaping would be a substantial improvement to the property; however, he stated that he felt the height and the design of the proposed fence might make the property a target for mischief instead of providing security. He also stated that the proposed fence height might project an unwelcoming quality to the public. Commissioner Monnier stated that he felt the proposed fence might cause the proposed improvements to be vandalized

rather than loved, although he noted that it would likely not occur from immediate neighbors, some of whom signed the letters of support. He recommended that the Applicants consider a lower height fence. Commissioner Monnier stated that he didn't have a problem with either a six-foot-high or four-foot-high fence, and would support either proposal, but reiterated his concern about the fence being a target for vandalism.

Commissioner McKissick noted that the property reminded him of the Civic Club, which was similarly exposed to public access, and noted that those walls were approximately four to five feet high. He noted that the six-foot height was not entirely necessary to provide the deterrent effect. The Applicants stated that they had traveled around the neighborhood observed different fence configurations, and noted that a nearby property at 919 Green Street had a fence that was higher than six feet. They stated that they wanted to have visibility in and out of the property.

Commissioner Alsberry stated that he was still concerned about the precedent that might be set by a six-foot-high fence; he stated that he was worried future applicants would reference this project in applying for similar requests. He noted that although the Applicants might be submitting a good proposal, another applicant could reference this case in requesting a less attractive proposal. The Applicants reiterated their belief that the setting of the property created unique conditions that supported approval.

Ms. Baldock asked the public whether anyone else was interested in providing comments; there were no additional comments.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether there were any other comments from the commissioners. Commissioner McKissick stated that he would move to deny the proposal on the basis that it would set a negative precedent for the future. He stated that he thought HARB's review and response of the proposal from an aesthetics standpoint was correct, but that he couldn't find a justification for relief from the zoning regulations.

Commissioner McKissick moved, and Commissioner Green seconded the motion, to Deny the request. The motion was adopted by a majority vote (4-3). Commissioner McKissick stated that if the Applicants were willing to accept a lower fence, he might be willing to support the proposal, and Commissioner Monnier noted that the primary concern of the Applicants was ensuring the proposed gas lanterns were elevated above the reach of the general public. Commissioner McKissick noted that he had dealt with a similar issue in installing gas lanterns on the rear wall of his property, and had ultimately decided on installing them on the inside of the wall because they might otherwise be an attractive nuisance and be targeted.

The Applicants asked whether the Planning Commission would consider a request for a five-foot-high fence; Commissioner Monnier noted that the fence would still be over four feet and might thus still set a precedent. Commissioner Marek stated that she considered recommending a compromise before the vote but thought it still might be denied due to the concerns about setting a precedent. Mr. Knight noted that the Planning Commission's resolution was recommendatory to the Zoning Hearing Board, which made the final decision; he stated that the Applicants would have the opportunity to present their case and justifications. Commissioner Marek recommended the Applicants consider modifications to the location of the gas lanterns or the overall height of

the fence. The Applicants asked whether changing the height of the proposed fence would necessitate another zoning relief application; Mr. Knight stated that modifications to the proposal could be discussed at the Zoning Hearing Board meeting.

**8 Variance & Special Exception Applications for 1122 Green Street, zoned Residential Medium-Density (RM), filed by Jonathan Bowser with High Pointe Apartments, LLC, to convert the existing institutional building into a “Multifamily Dwelling” and to construct 16 condo units, exceeding the density regulations outlined in the Development Standards in Section 7-307.3 of the Zoning Code.**

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the report, recommending Approval with Conditions; the conditions were that:

1. If granted approval for the requested zoning relief, the Applicant will subsequently file a Land Development Plan and receive approval from the Planning Commission and City Council.
2. The Applicant will submit a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) application and receive approval from HARB for all proposed exterior alterations to the building and site.
3. The Applicant will coordinate with the Department of Public Works to confirm the appropriate size and location of refuse collection on-site and update the billing accounts to reflect the new use.
4. The Planning Bureau recommends improvements to the surface parking lot at 1122 Green Street, including the removal of impervious surface and installation of new plantings in the corners of the parking lot which vehicles cannot access, and the removal of the barbed wire atop the parking lot fence.
5. The Planning Bureau supports the Applicant’s proposal to utilize the small garage on the property at 1210 Green Street for active transportation storage for residents of the building; the Planning Bureau would further recommend the installation of publicly-accessible bike racks underneath either of or both the two building awnings on either side of Cumberland Street.

The case was represented by Jonathan Bowser, 430 North Front Street, Wormleysburg, PA 17043 (aka “the Applicant”).

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicant whether the conditions in the case were acceptable; the Applicant confirmed that they were. Commissioner Alsberry asked whether the Applicant had anything to add to the Planning Bureau’s case report; the Applicant noted that the project involved the establishment of sixteen, one- and two-bedroom units, some of which would be in a loft configuration, and that the property also had thirty-seven parking spaces spread across two adjacent parking lots. He stated that the project would maintain the general appearance of the building with a few modifications to modernize the exterior.

Commissioner Alsberry notified the commissioners that he served with the Applicant on the HACC foundation board.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether any of the commissioners had comments or concerns about the project. Commissioner McKissick stated that he felt the scale and design of the project were appropriate for the neighborhood and that he especially appreciated that he had satisfactorily addressed the parking concerns. He noted that the parking lots associated with the primary property

were on separate deeds, and recommended that the Applicant legally tie the parking on those lots to the primary property; he noted that in the past, accessory parking lots were sometimes converted to commercial lots for surrounding residents. The Applicant stated that the condition was acceptable, noting that the accompanying parking was a critical component to the value and success of the primary parcel.

Commissioner O'Toole asked the Applicant whether they had coordinated with residents in the surrounding neighborhood. The Applicant confirmed that they had sent the required notification letters to owners of the surrounding properties. He noted that several neighbors had contacted him by phone and email, and that the most pressing concern was the provision of adequate parking; he stated that most of the individuals' concerns were allayed by the amount of parking that accompanied the project. The Applicant referenced the previous project proposal and noted that addressing the parking concerns were a primary point of emphasis in their design. Commissioner O'Toole confirmed that the previous project resulted in a large turnout from the neighborhood, and reiterated that he wanted to ensure the surrounding residents were aware of the current project.

Commissioner Green stated that she was happy to see a lower-density proposal that would be more appropriate for the community and that it would be great to see a vacant building brought into productive reuse.

Commissioner Marek reiterated the comments of the other commissioners and noted that previous proposals had not been appropriate for the neighborhood or building space. She stated that the current project was a more viable response to those issues. Commissioner Marek stated that the distribution of one- and two-bedroom unit seemed appropriate, and that she appreciated the project addressed the parking concerns. She inquired about the Applicant's proposed reuse for the small garage structure that accompanied the larger accessory parking lot. The Applicant stated that the building was intended as an amenity for the residents of the project, and might be used as storage space for things like bicycles or as a small fitness center.

Commissioner Marek noted that some nearby residents might have had concerns based on the previous proposal for the space, which included a small commercial unit that would have adversely impacted local traffic and parking. She stated that she supported Commissioner McKissick's recommendation to legally tie the accessory parking lots to the primary property.

Commissioner Monnier stated that other commissioners had addressed his comments and questions and that he was excited to see a viable project for the property. He noted that there were few condominium units in the city and thus that he was eager to see the establishment of more such units.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether there was anyone from the public that was for or against the project; Ms. Baldock gave instruction to the public in attendance on how to request to be unmuted so they could provide comment. Mr. Arnold Kagan (1224 Green Street, Harrisburg, PA) stated that he felt it was a great project and asked for clarification on the parking situation; he noted that the neighborhood was in a residential parking permit area, and asked how parking spaces would be allocated for visitors. The Applicant noted that the larger accessory parking lot had thirty-two spaces, and thus each unit would effectively have two associated parking spaces, although he



noted that there would be lower demand from the one-bedroom unit. The Applicant noted that the smaller accessory parking lot would not be gated and could potentially be utilized for visitor parking. He stated that he anticipated that use of that lot would be largely self-policed by residents to ensure that they did not have many visitors on extended stays. Mr. Kagan stated that he felt the current proposal addressed most of the concerns about parking; he noted that he supported the project, but stated that the Planning Commission should be mindful of the overall parking situation as the density was increased in the Midtown neighborhood. Mr. Kagan noted that the Applicant would likely need to use the smaller accessory parking lot for contractors doing construction or maintenance work on the property.

Mr. Jonathan Hendrickson (1108 Penn Street, Harrisburg, PA) noted discussions he had with the Applicant via email, and that he had also communicated with the Applicant for the previous project; he thanked the Applicant for a good proposal which decreased the density and better addressed parking compared to the previous project. He noted that while the project density was greater than permitted by the Zoning Code, he understood that some variance must be granted to enable the financially-viable redevelopment of the building. He asked the Applicant whether he anticipated that a condo association would collect fees to ensure requisite property maintenance. Mr. Hendrickson also noted that the Applicant was considering various community uses for the smaller parking lot and asked whether they could speak to specific ideas they were considering.

The Applicant confirmed that they would be establishing a condo association to address ongoing maintenance of the exterior and interior aspects of the building; he noted that associations usually established a deferred maintenance fund for such work. The Applicant stated that an initial thought for the use of the smaller parking lot was as publicly-accessible open space for the surrounding community, but that subsequent conversations with neighborhood residents indicated that the most beneficial near-term use would be for parking for tenants' visitors.

Ms. Baldock asked the public whether anyone else was interested in providing comments; there were no additional comments.

Commissioner Marek moved, and Commissioner McKissick seconded the motion, to Approve the request with Staff & Additional Conditions; the Additional Condition was that the parcels accommodating the accessory parking for the use, at 1114 Penn Street and 1210 Green Street, would be deed with the primary property. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (7-0).

**9 Variance & Special Exception Applications for scattered sites in the UPMC Campus, filed by Paul Toburen with UPMC, to replace existing wall and free-standing signage, and to install new signage, at various locations throughout blocks that comprise the institutional campus; the proposals require a variety of zoning relief – both Variances and Special Exceptions – for aspects such as number, size, and height.**

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the report, recommending Approval with Conditions; the conditions were that:

1. The Applicant will submit a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) application and receive approval from HARB, if such documentation is deemed necessary by the City's Historic Preservation Specialist.

2. The Applicant will submit a Floodplain Development Permit application, if such documentation is deemed necessary by the City's Floodplain Administrator.
3. If any of the signage is determined by the City's Law Bureau to require new or revised Easement applications, the Applicant will submit such documentation for administrative review by the City.

The case was represented by Paul Toburen with UPMC Pinnacle (the property owner), 409 South 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, Harrisburg, PA 17104; and Alex Cohn with Exit Design (the consultant), 725 North 4<sup>th</sup> Street, Philadelphia, PA 19123 (aka "the Applicants").

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicants whether the conditions in the case were acceptable; the Applicants confirmed that they were. They stated that the Planning Bureau case report appropriately outlined the issues to be addressed in the current application. They noted that the surrounding network of one-way streets, and the visual obstructions from the existing railroad bridges that crossed 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, created confusion for patients and visitors; they also noted that the main entrance to the hospital was not visible from the street, and thus additional signage was needed to guide people to that location. The Applicants stated that visitors and patients arrived from various directions and that many were not familiar with the layout of the campus; they stated that the new signage would positively impact the visitor and patient experience, and the overall public health of the community. They noted in that experiences from other health campuses showed that, in some cases, elderly patients would skip appointments because they did not know where to park or where to locate the main entrance; thus, improved wayfinding would have a tangible benefit on public health.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether any of the commissioners had comments or concerns about the project. Commissioner O'Toole noted that most of the signage would only be visible to individuals who were navigating within the campus and that the proposal made sense.

Commissioner Marek stated that it was a logical proposal that was very necessary.

Commissioner Monnier noted that he often traveled past the campus on his way to and from work, and that visitors had often stopped him and asked for directions to various parts of the facility. He noted that he had interacted with staff members from other facilities in the UPMC network who were not familiar with the campus, and that they were often confused and lost when trying to find different offices and departments. He noted that wayfinding signage was important and necessary.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether there was anyone from the public that was for or against the project; Ms. Baldock gave instruction to the public in attendance on how to request to be unmuted so they could provide comment. There were no comments.

Commissioner O'Toole moved, and Commissioner Monnier seconded the motion, to Approve the request with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (7-0).

**10 Special Exception Application for 1315 North 6<sup>th</sup> Street, zoned Commercial Neighborhood (CN), filed by Sheila Gray with Harrisburg Housing Authority, to subdivide the existing property, which requires Special Exceptions for Lots #2 & #3 to**

**allow an increase to an existing, non-conforming aspect (residential unit density in the CN district) per Section 7-321.4(b) of the Zoning Code.**

Mr. Knight noted that the current request was related to the Subdivision application which was filed concurrently with, and necessitated, the zoning relief request. He gave a synopsis of the report, recommending Approval with Conditions; the conditions were that:

1. The Applicant will receive approval from the Harrisburg City Council for the associated Subdivision application required to enable the project to move forward.

The case was represented by Sheila Gray & Senghor Manns with the Harrisburg Housing Authority (the property owner), 351 Chestnut Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101; and Marc Kurowski with K&W Engineers (the project engineer), 2201 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110 (aka “the Applicants”).

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicants whether the condition in the case was acceptable; the Applicants confirmed that it was. Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicants whether they wanted to add anything to the Planning Bureau’s case report. The Applicants reiterated that the current zoning relief request was related to the accompanying Subdivision application. They noted that they would subsequently submit a Land Development Plan in the near future for the proposed apartment building on-site.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether any of the commissioners had comments or concerns about the project; there were no comments or questions.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether there was anyone from the public that was for or against the project; Ms. Baldock gave instruction to the public in attendance on how to request to be unmuted so they could provide comment. There were no comments.

Commissioner Green moved, and Commissioner O’Toole seconded the motion, to Approve the request with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (7-0).

**11 Subdivision Application for 1315 North 6<sup>th</sup> Street, zoned Commercial Neighborhood (CN), filed by Sheila Gray with Harrisburg Housing Authority, to subdivide the current lot into three separate parcels, which each will accommodate a “Multifamily Dwelling:” one each for the Jackson and Lick Towers, and one for a to-be-constructed, 50-unit building.**

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the report, recommending Approval with Conditions; the conditions were that:

1. The Applicant will receive approval from the Zoning Hearing Board for the associated Special Exception application required to enable the project to move forward.
2. The Applicant will provide cross-easement access agreements for the three lots, as noted in the Dauphin County Planning Commission’s review.
3. The Applicant will address the City Engineer’s comments prior to the submission of a Land Development Plan for the proposed development of the 50-unit apartment building on-site.

The case was represented by Sheila Gray & Senghor Manns with the Harrisburg Housing Authority (the property owner), 351 Chestnut Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101; and Marc Kurowski with K&W Engineers (the project engineer), 2201 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110 (aka “the Applicants”).

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicants whether the conditions in the case were acceptable; the Applicants confirmed that they were. The Applicants noted that they would incorporate the City Engineer’s comments into the requisite Land Development Plan application that would eventually be submitted for the proposed building on-site.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether any of the commissioners had comments or concerns about the project; there were no comments or questions.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether there was anyone from the public that was for or against the project; Ms. Baldock gave instruction to the public in attendance on how to request to be unmuted so they could provide comment. There were no comments.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether the proposed 50-unit apartment building was going to be limited to senior citizens or would be open to the general public. The Applicants confirmed that it would be a general occupancy apartment complex and would not be age-restricted housing.

Commissioner Marek moved, and Commissioner McKissick seconded the motion, to Approve the request with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (7-0).

## **OTHER BUSINESS:**

### 1 Comprehensive Plan Update

Commissioner Alsberry noted that he had circulated an email to the commissioners prior to the meeting, per an email forwarded from the City Clerk’s Office, soliciting the attendance of Planning Commissioners at upcoming, online meetings being led by the City Council, with tentative dates on the Wednesdays in the month of February. He stated that he had informed the City Clerk that all of the commissioners would be attending at least some of the meetings.

Commissioner Marek inquired about the nature of the pending meetings, and asked whether they were internal meetings or open to the public. Ms. Baldock stated that they would be public meetings and treated like workshop sessions; she stated that the City Council’s intention was to provide ample time for the public to review and comment on the draft Comp Plan in a public format. She noted that after those sessions, the City Council would hold at least one public hearing, per the MPC requirements.

Mr. Knight stated that he and Ms. Baldock had spoken with Councilmembers Madsen and Green, and noted that the format would be a slightly expanded version of the webinar sessions the Planning Commission had hosted in September 2020, in that they would be reviewing three chapters at each session instead of five as had been done previously. He noted that they would be taking input from the public, with the expectation that they would be overarching, generalized comments, with a time limit on individuals. Mr. Knight noted that longer, more detailed comments

could be submitted to the Comp Plan email address. He noted that the final decisions on the length and format of the meetings would be up to City Council.

Commissioner Alsberry stated that while he didn't expect every commissioner to be at each meeting, and asked that Commissioners McKissick and Marek try to attend as many as possible as the commissioners most directly involved in coordination on the document and process.

Commissioner Marek inquired about the rest of the Comp Plan schedule and timeline after the upcoming public sessions. Ms. Baldock stated that City Council had not yet set a date for any action on the draft Comprehensive Plan document, and that they were waiting to see how many and what type of comments were received at the public sessions. She stated that if the comments received during the public sessions were relatively straightforward, that it was likely a public hearing would be scheduled for early March with an eventual vote shortly thereafter.

Commissioner Marek asked whether the commissioners had received an email from a member of the community, a Mr. Basir Vincent, who had sent out invitations to the Planning Commission and Planning Bureau staff to attend weekly Facebook discussions on the draft Comp Plan document. She stated that she had tuned into one of the sessions, which were live-streamed video sessions on Sundays, during which individuals from the public were engaging with one another in discussions on individual chapters; she stated that she was not aware of whether they were compiling comments from the group, and that she did not know whether they had submitted any or were intending on submitting any comments. Mr. Knight asked whether the sessions were recorded and Commissioner Marek confirmed that they were recorded and posted to their Facebook page.

Mr. Knight noted that one of the points of discussion with Councilman Madsen was how the City Council intended on soliciting and reviewing the public comments they received. He noted that written comments were easier to compile and organize, as opposed to audio comments, and that he anticipated that the City Clerk's Office would have guidance on that before the meetings. He noted that if the Facebook discussion group was able to summarize their weekly discussions and recommendations in a document, that would help the City Clerk's Office to collect and organize comments. Commissioner Marek asked if the group were aware of that, and Mr. Knight noted that they had just discussed City Council's process the previous day.

Commissioner Marek asked whether any of the Planning Commissioners had responded to the invitation from Mr. Vincent; the other commissioners noted that they were waiting until they had discussed the issue with each other. Commissioner Monnier stated that he thought it would be a good idea for the commissioners to begin engaging as soon as possible. Commissioner Marek stated that she wanted to ensure the comments from the Facebook discussions were provided to City Council.

#### **ADJOURNMENT: 9:37 PM**

Commissioner O'Toole moved, and Commissioner Marek seconded the motion, to adjourn. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (7-0). The meeting adjourned at 9:37 PM.