

MINUTES

HARRISBURG PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR/VIRTUAL MEETING May 5, 2021 ZOOM PLATFORM

MEMBERS PRESENT: Joseph Alsberry, Chair
Vern McKissick, Vice Chair (arrived at 6:48 PM)
Shaun E. O'Toole
Jamesetta Reed
Anne Marek
Zac Monnier

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ausha Green

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

CALL TO ORDER: 6:37 PM

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Commissioner O'Toole moved, and Commissioner Marek seconded the motion, to approve the minutes from the April 7th meeting without corrections; the motion was adopted by a unanimous (5-0) vote.

OLD BUSINESS:

NEW BUSINESS:

- 1 Special Exception Applications for 1622 Berryhill Street, zoned Residential Medium-Density (RM), filed Camille Bennett by Bennett Land Development, to establish a three (3) unit Rooming House, which requires relief for the use and for relief from the Off-Street Parking Standards.**

Mr. Knight noted that the current request was a revised version of the proposal that the Planning Commission and Zoning Hearing Board had reviewed in March 2021, and stated that the Applicant had modified the proposal to indicate that they were intending on being an owner occupant of the property and that the property would be ADA accessible. He gave a synopsis of the report, recommending Approval with Conditions; the conditions were that:

1. Per the application, the Planning Bureau would recommend that the Applicant prioritize occupancy for candidates who are veterans, a population for which securing housing is a primary concern.

2. The Applicant will install an ADA ramp or lift in the rear yard, if possible; if not, a lift along the side of the porch between the subject property and the property to the west would be advisable. Depending on the location of this access, and the proximity to the ADA-accessible bedroom and bathroom the Applicant has noted, they will also ensure that there is an ADA-accessible route through the first floor of the building.
3. The Applicant will identify both off-street parking spaces in the rear of the property with signage on the doors of the existing garage; they will also pave the proposed parking space between the garage and Ella Alley formally paved if it is not already, although the Planning Bureau would recommend the use of pervious pavers, if possible.
4. The Codes Bureau will perform a thorough inspection of the interior of the building, to ascertain whether the property complies with all modern Building Code regulations; if not, the Applicant must submit Building Permits to have the structure brought into compliance.

The case was represented by Camille Bennett with Bennett Land Development (the property owner), 1622 Berryhill 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, but stated that they were only requesting relief from one of the off-street parking spaces. Commissioner Alsberry asked the Planning Bureau staff to clarify the off-street parking requirements; Mr. Knight noted that a three-unit “Rooming House” with an additional unit for the Applicant would require four off-street parking spaces, per Section 7-327.6 of the Zoning Code. The Applicant stated that parking spaces would not be required for a single-family dwelling, and thus she did not understand why they needed relief for parking that they already had on-site. She stated that all the other neighbors were permitted to use the spaces in front of their houses, and thus she didn’t understand why she couldn’t use the space in front of her house. Mr. Knight stated that she was not prohibited from using the on-street space in front of the property, but that the Applicant had provided documentation that they were able to provide two of the required four off-street parking spaces; thus, the proposal required relief from two off-street spaces.

The Applicant stated that she didn’t believe that’s how the proposal should be presented, and that she felt she should only have to request relief from one off-street parking space. Mr. Knight reiterated that there were only two off-street spaces, per the Applicant’s documentation and site visits from Planning Bureau staff, and thus that the relief needed to be for two off-street spaces. He stated that while the Applicant was permitted to utilize on-street parking, it was not included in the count of required off-street spaces. The Applicant stated that relief was not required for a single-family use, even if the family members had three cars. Mr. Knight stated that he was simply applying the language in the Zoning Code that regulated the proposed “Rooming House” use; he stated that it did not change the Planning Bureau’s recommendation for the proposal. The Applicant stated that it might change the Zoning Hearing Board’s opinion of the request. Commissioner Alsberry stated that it didn’t sound as though the Applicant agreed with that condition of approval.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether any of the commissioners had comments or concerns about the project. Commissioner Marek stated that she recalled reviewing the previous submission in March, and noted that while the Applicant was intending on making ADA improvements, she

hadn't seen any site or floor plans specifying what those improvements were or where they would occur; she asked whether the Applicant could provide documentation of that work. The Applicant noted that she had provided a contractor's bid for the ADA work on a first-floor bathroom; she clarified that the existing living room would be converted to a bathroom. Commissioner Marek reiterated that she hadn't seen any site plans, floor plans, or structural plans outlining the proposed ADA improvements, and inquired again as to whether the Applicant had that documentation. The Applicant replied that she did not have that information currently, but that she intended on paying her contractor to submit the necessary documentation.

Commissioner Marek stated that the current proposal required both Special Exception and Variance requests, but noted that she did not see any documentation for or review of the Variance criteria. Mr. Knight noted that the Variance requests were included in the previous review because the Applicant was not intending on being an owner-occupant nor ensuring the building would be ADA-compliant, but that the Applicant indicated they would be addressing both of those issues in the current request, obviating the need for a Variance for relief from the Specific Criteria related to "Rooming House" uses.

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 Reed moved, and Commissioner O'Toole seconded the motion, to Approve the request with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (5-0-1; Commissioner McKissick abstained from the vote as he joined the meeting in the middle of the discussion).

2 Variance Application for 414-420 Vaughn Street, zoned Commercial Neighborhood (CN) and Residential Medium-Density (RM), filed by Robert Hershey with WHP Television, to construct a fence eight (8) feet in height to enclose the rear parking lot.

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

1. The Applicant shall include an elevation of the fence with the required Building Permit application, demonstrating there is no barbed wire proposed for the top of the fence and confirming slats will be placed on the inside of the fence.
2. The Planning Bureau notes that the project site is comprised of multiple parcels and, while not required, would recommend that the Applicant consider consolidating the various parcels that comprise the overall property.

The case was represented by Robert Hershey with WHP Television (the property owner), 3300 Hoffman Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110 (aka "the Applicant").

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

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether any of the commissioners had comments or concerns about the project. Commissioner McKissick asked the Applicant to clarify the reasons stated as

justification for the request for a fence higher than permitted in the CN and RM zoning districts. The Applicant stated that approximately six months ago an employee was held up a gunpoint by an individual who had driven on to the property. He stated that a higher fence with a rolling gate was required to provide additional security and prevent unauthorized individuals from accessing the lot. Commissioner McKissick noted that the proposed fencing would also enclose the more secure area which featured satellite dishes and other communications equipment; the Applicant confirmed that was the case.

Commissioner Marek stated that given the nature of the property and the high-value equipment that was stored in the rear of the building, she felt there was a need for greater security of the property. She noted that the Planning Commission did not generally grant fence height requests, but given the value of equipment on the property and the safety concern noted by the Applicant, she felt this request was justified.

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 Marek seconded the motion, to Approve the request with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (6-0).

3 Variance & Special Exception Applications for 1820 North 3rd Street, zoned Residential Medium-Density (RM), filed by Michael Della Porta, to establish a “Retail Store” use, and to request relief from the Off-Street Parking Standards of the Zoning Code.

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

1. The “Retail Store” use will only occupy the 220 square feet of the front portion of the first floor as indicated in the floor plan submitted by the Applicant.
2. Any new signage advertising the business will submit a Certificate of Appropriateness application, and receive approval from HARB, and will submit zoning relief requests and receive approval from the Zoning Hearing Board if not in conformance with the signage regulations.
3. No outdoor or “sidewalk “sales of merchandise shall be permitted without the submittal of a Sidewalk Use Permit and approval from the Planning Bureau.
4. The Applicant will coordinate with the City’s Department of Public Works to ascertain whether additional refuse containers will be needed beyond those already provided for the existing residential units on-site, and to update the billing account for the property.

The case was represented by Michael Della Porta (the property owner), 4447 Augusta Drive, Harrisburg, PA 17112; and Sarah Rose Bryant (the business owner), 3106 North 2nd Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110 (aka “the Applicants”).

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

Commissioner Alsberry noted his general concerns regarding parking in reviewing requests for relief from the off-street parking requirements, and stated that it was often difficult to get parking in the Midtown area of North 3rd Street. He acknowledged that a good amount of the customers would be foot traffic, but asked whether they had thought of a way to deal with customers who drove if their business became more successful. The Applicants noted that they would be providing information on their website asking customers not to double park or occupy Dauphin Street, and that they had contacted the Fire Museum regarding potential use of their parking lot a block away (at 332 Kelker Street); they also noted that there would not be a lot of customers at one time, given the small size of the shop.

Commissioner Alsberry stated that he appreciated that the Applicants had given thought to the parking issue and been proactive about looking for alternative parking arrangements, and also that he appreciated the Applicants' having reached out to neighbors to gain support for the project. He noted that they had submitted a petition of support with signatures from surrounding residents, but also that several of the respondents had written "No," and inquired as to why they had opposed the proposal. The Applicants clarified that those individuals were in support, but had responded that they did not want to be on the business' mailing list; they noted that everyone who signed the petition was in support of the proposed business.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether any of the commissioners had comments or concerns about the project. Commissioner McKissick asked whether the Applicants had built the storefront façade; they confirmed that it had been there when the property was purchased by the current owner. Commissioner McKissick asked whether the Applicants knew what type of business previously operated on-site; they stated that the previous owner's family, which had owned the property for about sixty years, had managed an umbrella shop. Commissioner McKissick stated that he was trying to establish the past history of the property, and noted that the current request was simply looking to re-establish the previous retail use on site. He also stated that the Planning Commission tried to prevent the conversion of first-floor commercial spaces to residential use, and noted that he appreciated the Applicants' were seeking to maintain the mixed-use configuration.

Commissioner McKissick asked whether the current application was an after-the-fact request since work had already begun on the storefront area. The Applicants clarified that floor space footprint of the building had not changed, and stated that there had always been a partition between the first-floor residential unit and the commercial space; they noted that they had done some minor upgrades to the walls, including bringing it into conformance with fire code regulations, in anticipation of the space being used. The Applicants noted that "Florist" was a permitted use in the RM district, and that they anticipated that the proposed plant store might qualify under that designation, but noted that after discussion with Planning Bureau staff, it was determined that the proposed use might not fit that classification.

Commissioner Marek asked whether all of the residential units on-site had existed previously; the Applicants confirmed that they had, and confirmed that they had not changed any aspect of the front commercial space beyond updating the plumbing and electrical work. Commissioner Marek stated that she was glad to see a viable use for such a small commercial space. She noted that the Applicants intended on selling herbal medicines, and asked whether they were intending on selling cannabis-related items in the future; the Applicants responded that they had not plans on selling

medicinal marijuana or related items, although they may sell legal CBD products at some point in the future. They clarified that they intended on selling bulk herbal medicines for things like teas and baths, and noted that they weren't aware of any such store in the future.

Commissioner Monnier said he appreciated the idea and reminded the other commissioners that they expressed an interest in promoting a commercial corridor along North 3rd Street, and noted that many of the customers of commercial uses in this area would walk to the store. He also noted that the Applicants had indicated that most of their sales in the near future would be online.

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. Justin Heinly (205 Harris Street, Harrisburg, PA) stated that he owned the adjacent property at 1818 North 3rd Street. He asked whether Planning Bureau staff considered the current proposal to be a conversion from a three-unit to a four-unit structure. Mr. Knight stated that he did not consider it a conversion, noting that the property already featured a commercial space and three units; he noted that when he first discussed the project with the Applicant several years ago, he confirmed that the property was listed as three residential units in the City's records. Mr. Heinly then inquired as to the parking requirements for a property with that configuration; Mr. Knight noted that the two parking spaces with the property were considered a legal, non-conforming aspect of the three-unit residential use, and thus that the current request required a Special Exception for relief from any parking required for the "Retail Store" use.

Mr. Heinly asked whether upgrading the PP&L electrical meters would be compliant with a proposal to convert the property from three to four "units," and asked how the Planning Bureau could ensure the proposed retail space would not be converted to another residential unit in the future. Mr. Knight stated that the addition of another residential unit would require the approval of two Special Exceptions to expand non-conforming aspects of the property, related to the use and off-street parking, and also noted that the space was likely not large enough to establish a residential unit.

Mr. Heinly stated that he supported efforts to make 3rd Street a commercial corridor and that he felt the proposal was warranted; however, he expressed concern that about the potential to sell smoking-related products in the future and asked how they might be able to ensure that products which might have an adverse impact were not sold in the future. The Applicants reiterated that it was an "urban plant shop" with a focus on plants, extracts, and medicinal herbs; they stated that they didn't want to discount the possibility of CBD in the future, but reiterated that they had no immediate plans to sell that. They noted that it was sold as an extract and was not usually smoked. Mr. Heinly asked whether the Applicants whether they ever intended on selling smoking products; they replied that they did not. Mr. Heinly asked whether they would agree to a condition to not sell smoking products; the Applicants confirmed that they would.

Commissioner Monnier stated that regulating what was sold in the proposed shop was not within the commissioners' purview. Mr. Heinly asked what review was within their purview and how they would zone the property. Ms. Baldock noted that the Applicants were asking for a "Retail Store" designation and that would be classification per the Zoning Code. Mr. Heinly stated that he wanted to understand exactly what the store would be selling. He stated that the biggest issue for

residents along this block of North 3rd Street was the availability of on-street parking, and stated that he appreciated the Applicants had reached out to owners of surrounding parking lots; he noted that there was also a parking lot across the street, as well as one behind the Neighborhood Center. The Applicants stated that they would work hard to ensure they were contributing positively to the neighborhood.

Commissioner McKissick moved, and Commissioner Reed seconded the motion, to Approve the request with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (6-0).

4 Special Exception Applications for 2416 Green Street, zoned Residential Medium-Density (RM), filed by Eli Chattah, to establish a three-unit “Multifamily Dwelling” use and to request relief from the Off-Street Parking Standards of the Zoning Code.

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

1. The Applicant will not install at least one of the proposed front yard parking spaces, as it would encroach into the front yard setback and would result in the loss of yard space.
2. The Applicant will file a Floodplain Development Permit application for any permanent installations on the property, such as a fence, and receive approval from the Floodplain Administrator.

The case was represented by Eli Chattah (the property owner), 6110 Blue Grass Avenue, Harrisburg, PA 17112 (aka “the Applicant”).

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicant whether the conditions in the case report were acceptable; he stated that his English was not quite good enough to understand the Planning Bureau staff. He stated that he was proposing three units, and noted that the three-unit apartment would require less parking than the previous medical office use on-site. The Applicant stated that he could provide three parking spaces on the property, and that he had another three parking spaces in the street. He noted that the property across the street was a large parking lot, set behind a fence, and thus that he was able to accommodate the parking requirements of a three-unit building.

The Applicant asked why he had to provide seven parking spaces for three units. He reiterated that he believed he had three parking spaces on the street and three on the property, and noted that there would be less parking demand for the residential use than for the previous office use on-site. The Applicant stated that any potential families renting the property would have at most two cars. He stated that he had invested a lot of money in the property and that he was going to hire electricians and other contractors to do the work.

The Applicant referenced a potential fence being installed on-site, and stated that he intended to hire a contractor in the future to install a fence on-site and submit all the necessary documentation to the City. He stated that the required reviews and paperwork were difficult for him to complete.

Commissioner Alsberry interjected and stated that he was going to give Planning Bureau staff an opportunity to respond. Mr. Knight noted that he had spoken with the Applicant previously, noting that he had never informed the Applicant that he had to have seven spaces and further noted that

any on-street parking spaces did not belong to the Applicant and could not be counted towards the required off-street parking. He noted that three apartment units would require four total off-street parking spaces, which could likely be accommodated by the existing driveway on-site. Mr. Knight stated that he felt it was reasonable to assume that there may be available on-street parking given the surrounding low-intensity land uses. The Applicant reiterated that he had three off-street parking spaces on the property already and reiterated that the three-unit apartment building would create less parking demand than the previous medical office use on-site.

Commissioner Alsberry noted that the Planning Bureau's case report only included two conditions, and asked the Applicant whether there was someone with him who could read the conditions and understand what they meant. Mr. Knight reread the conditions of approval and sought to clarify the intention of the conditions for the Applicant; he noted that one of the conditions would prohibit the construction of a parking space in the front yard setback area and thus the Applicant could not construct at least one of the two spaces proposed for the front yard. Mr. Knight noted that the Applicant's testimony seemed to indicate that he felt he could meet the parking needs with on-site parking and any available on-street parking. Mr. Knight also noted that the Applicant had stated that he did not intend on installing a fence, but that if he did, he would need to submit a Floodplain Development Permit application to the Planning Bureau. The Applicant reiterated that he would not be installing a fence at the current time, but intended to do so in the future.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether any of the commissioners had comments or concerns about the project. Commissioner Marek stated that she felt a conversion project returning the property to residential use was a good idea.

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 (6-0).

5 Special Exception Applications for 108-112 Walnut Street, zoned Riverfront (RF), filed by Rani Rammouni with LBR Properties, to establish an eight-unit "Multifamily Dwelling" use and to request relief from the Off-Street Parking Standards of the Zoning Code.

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

1. Prior to the issuance of a Zoning Permit, the applicant will file a Lot Consolidation & Land Development Plan for the development of eight units, as required by the Municipalities Planning Code (MPC), and receive approval from the City Council; any conditions required by the Zoning Hearing Board will be shown in this plan set.
2. Any exterior work will be discussed with the City's Historic Preservation Specialist, who will determine whether such work can be administratively approved, or whether approval from HARB will be required.

3. The Applicant will coordinate with the Department of Public Works to ensure appropriate location of a trash enclosure, if that is deemed necessary.
4. Per Section 7-327.3 of the Zoning Code, the Applicant will install at least one bicycle rack on-site; the Planning Bureau would recommend that a rack be installed in the rear parking area.

The case was represented by Sean Flanagan with ThYNK design, LLC (the project architect), 1332 East Chocolate Avenue, Hershey, PA 17033 (aka “the Applicant”).

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicant whether the conditions in the case report were acceptable; he stated that his connection to the meeting was a little spotty and asked whether the conditions could be reread. Mr. Knight reread the conditions of approval; the Applicant confirmed that the conditions were acceptable.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether any of the commissioners had comments or concerns about the project. Commissioner O’Toole expressed some concern about the amount of off-street parking required by the proposed use.

Commissioner Marek stated that she didn’t have any concerns about the conversion of the space back to residential use, but concurred with Commissioner O’Toole that parking might be an issue, and recommended that the Applicant be proactive about addressing parking for the tenants.

Commissioner Monnier stated that he did not agree that resident parking should be an issue, noting that there were plenty of parking options in downtown Harrisburg and that he didn’t think development should be hindered by the availability of nearby on-street parking.

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 also expressed his concerns about the impact of available of the project on on-street parking, and stated that he felt an effort made by the Applicant to address the parking concerns would be a good idea. He stated that he did not agree with Commissioner Monnier that parking concerns were not applicable to downtown projects. Commissioner Monnier stated that the longer the city maintained a strict adherence to the parking requirements, the longer it would take to reach a multimodal future. Commissioner Alsberry stated that he did not want to get into a debate on the issue and that he was just expressing his thoughts on the project.

Commissioner Marek moved, and Commissioner Reed seconded the motion, to Approve the request with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted by a majority vote (5-1).

6 Variance Application for 238-248 Hummel Street and 1216 Kittatinny Street, zoned Residential Medium Density (RM), filed by Gary Lenker with Tri-County Housing Development, LLC, to establish lots with a width of sixteen (16) feet.

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

1. The Applicant will receive approval from City Council for the accompanying Lot Consolidation, Subdivision & Land Development Plan application.
2. The Applicant will install landscape screening along the northern and southern boundaries of the rowhomes along Hummel Street and on the eastern boundary of the townhome on Kittatinny Street, as required by Section 7-307.11(c) of the Zoning Code.
3. The Applicant will provide an easement application for administrative review for the proposed stoops providing access to the front entrances of the proposed units.

The case was represented by Gary Lenker with Tri-County Housing Development Corporation, Ltd. (the property owner and developer), 1514 Derry Street, Harrisburg, PA 17104; and Brent Sapan with Skelly & Loy (the project engineer), 449 Eisenhower Boulevard, Harrisburg, PA 17111 (aka “the Applicants”).

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicants whether the conditions in the case report were acceptable; they stated that they generally supported the conditions, but wanted to discuss them further. The Applicants stated that they wanted to provide some background to the project before addressing the Planning Bureau’s conditions of approval.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether they had anything additional to add to the case report; the Applicants noted that the project had been in the works for several years and that they were looking forward to completing the development. They confirmed that they intended on demolishing the structure at 248 Hummel Street, which they had recently purchased at a sheriff’s sale. The Applicants noted that the Harrisburg Housing Authority and the Brethren Housing Association had been rehabilitating the area over the previous years through development of new housing projects. They noted that they had funding pending from the State, and thus needed to move forward expeditiously.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether any of the commissioners had comments or concerns about the project. Commissioner McKissick stated that appreciated the work that Tri-County HDC did in throughout the city, but especially in the South Allison Hill neighborhood.

Commissioner Monnier asked whether the Applicants intended on salvaging any of the architectural materials from the property at 248 Hummel Street, which was slated for demolition; they responded that they did not plan to salvage any materials.

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 felt the project was excellent and expressed his appreciation for the work that Tri-County HDC performed throughout the neighborhood. He stated that he was excited to see the project completed.

Commissioner Monnier moved, and Commissioner McKissick seconded the motion, to Approve the request with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (6-0).

7 Preliminary/Final Lot Consolidation, Subdivision & Land Development Plan for 238-248 Hummel Street and 1216 Kittatinny Street, zoned Residential Medium Density (RM), filed by Gary Lenker with Tri-County Housing Development, LLC, to construct six single-family dwellings on the subdivided parcels, along with associated site and access improvements.

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

1. The Applicant will receive approval from the Zoning Hearing Board for the accompanying Variance & Special Exception application.
2. The Applicant will install landscape screening along the northern and southern boundaries of the rowhomes along Hummel Street and on the eastern boundary of the townhome on Kittatinny Street, as required by Section 7-307.11(c) of the Zoning Code.
3. In accordance with the issues brought up by the Fire Chief, the Applicant should install fire prevention sprinkling systems in the proposed single-family dwellings.
4. The Applicant will coordinate with the City Engineer to ensure that all new sidewalks will be in conformance with ADA requirements.
5. The Planning Bureau would recommend that the Applicant consider including sloping access paths/ramps into the rear of the units to allow for ADA accessibility to the buildings.
6. The Applicant will provide an easement application for administrative review for the proposed stoops providing access to the front entrances of the proposed units.

The case was represented by Gary Lenker with Tri-County Housing Development Corporation, Ltd. (the property owner and developer), 1514 Derry Street, Harrisburg, PA 17104; and Brent Sapen with Skelly & Loy (the project engineer), 449 Eisenhower Boulevard, Harrisburg, PA 17111 (aka “the Applicants”).

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicants whether the conditions in the case report were acceptable; they stated that they were acceptable, but also noted that they had a discussion with Fire Bureau Chief Enterline in which they determined that the standalone building might be sprinklered but confirmed that the attached rowhomes would be sprinklered. The Applicants stated that they would consider sprinklering the detached unit if the Fire Bureau was able to identify funding sources. They stated that they did not have the \$8,000 on hand to install sprinklering that was not required, and noted the addition costs of construction caused by an increase in material prices due to issues with the COVID pandemic.

Ms. Baldock stated that she understood the Fire Chief’s comments to be a recommendation, based that there was not a nearby fire hydrant; the Applicant stated that there were two fire hydrants along Kittatinny Street near the intersections of Hummel Street and Nectarine Street. Commissioner Marek noted that some of the City’s fire hydrants were not operational and that may have been the reason for the sprinklering recommendation. The Applicants stated that their conversation with the Fire Chief had not included a review of the proximity of fire hydrants, but reiterated that they were willing to consider the installation of sprinklers in the standalone unit.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether any of the commissioners had comments or concerns about the project. Commissioner McKissick said he understood why the Fire Chief wanted sprinklering,

but that if the building was able to meet building code requirements without it, then it might be an overreach on the part of the commissioners, and that he didn't think including a sprinklering condition was appropriate.

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. Joshua Juffe (3405 North 6th Street, Harrisburg, PA) stated that he was in favor of the project, noting that he served with Mr. Lenker on the Harrisburg Builders' Association board, and that he was aware of the Applicants' commitment to providing affordable housing. He said it was great to see projects getting reviewed and hopefully approved quickly. Mr. Juffe agreed with Commissioner McKissick in that if the project could meet the building code requirements, he didn't think sprinklering was necessary.

The Applicants asked City staff to confirm that sprinklering the standalone unit was not a condition of approval for the project. Mr. Knight confirmed that it was not to be included as a requirement and was only a recommendation based on the Fire Chief's review of the project.

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 additional comments.

Commissioner McKissick moved, and Commissioner O'Toole seconded the motion, to Approve the request with Staff Conditions and Additional Conditions; the additional condition was that sprinklers would not be required for the detached unit on Kittatinny Street. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (6-0).

8 Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan for 1122 Green Street, zoned Residential Medium Density (RM), filed by Jonathan Bowser with Integrated Development Partners, to convert the existing building into a sixteen-unit "Multifamily Dwelling" with associated off-street parking.

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

1. All of the conditions from the Zoning Hearing Board decision from the January 25, 2021 meeting shall be included in the project and incorporated into the Final Plan Sets before submission to the City.
2. The Final Plan Sets shall include a note that the parking areas depicted on this plan shall be only for the tenants of the apartment complex.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.

6. 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 with Integrated Development Partners (the developer), 430 North Front Street, Wormleysburg, PA 17043 (aka "the Applicant").

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicant whether the conditions in the case report were acceptable; he stated that they were acceptable. Commissioner Alsberry asked whether he had anything to add to the case report; the Applicant responded that he did not.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether any of the commissioners had comments or concerns about the project. Commissioner McKissick noted that it was going to be difficult to find a successful reuse of the property given the configuration of the building and that he felt the current project was a good proposal.

Commissioner O'Toole stated that it was a good project and he was in favor of it.

Commissioner Marek stated that she felt most of the issues associated with the project were addressed in the zoning relief review that the Planning Commission had previously undertaken. She stated that she was pleased to see how the project had turned out.

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 with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (6-0).

9 Street Vacation Application for portions of Mercer Street, Goodyear Street, and Filson Street, in the block bounded by Berryhill Street, South 23rd Street, Brookwood Street, and South 22nd Street, filed by Josh Juffe with Brookwood Commons, LP, to effectuate the consolidation and development of the adjacent parcels.

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

1. If required by Capital Region Water or other utility providers, the Applicant will execute easement agreements with those providers to allow access to and maintenance of existing infrastructure running through or along the right-of-way, or will have such infrastructure formally abandoned.
2. There is a 20-foot water main easement located across a portion of Mercer Street to be vacated. Existing utility easements must be maintained and no structures should be located on this area.

The case was represented by Josh Juffe & John Juffe with Brookwood Commons, LP (the property owner and developer), 3405 North 6th Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110; and John Baranski, Esq. with Blakey, Yost, Bupp & Rausch, LLP (the legal counsel), 17 East Market Street, York, PA 17401 (aka “the Applicants”).

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicants whether the conditions in the case report were acceptable; they stated that they were.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether any of the commissioners had comments or concerns about the project. Commissioner O’Toole noted that the project had previously been presented to, and approved by, the Planning Commission; the Applicants confirmed that was correct. Commissioner Marek inquired as to which project Commissioner O’Toole was referring and asked when it had previously been approved by the Planning Commission. Ms. Baldock stated that she believed the project had initially been reviewed in 2013. She noted that the five-year extension authorized by State legislation had run out, but that the Applicants had gotten a two-year extension from City Council in 2020.

Commissioner Marek asked whether the Applicants had spoken with the neighbors in properties adjacent to the Mercer Street right-of-way; the Applicants stated that they had not spoken with them recently, but had previously spoken with them previously. They stated that they would be willing to speak with the neighbors again.

Ms. Baldock confirmed that the Applicants had secured the signatures of a majority of the property owners abutting the right-of-way, as well as the owners representing a majority of the frontage, as required by law.

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.

Ms. Baldock reminded the Applicants of previous they had had regarding the provision of an updated survey to the Planning Bureau, and asked for confirmation that that would be provided. They stated that they were hoping to hear back from their project engineer in the near future. Ms. Baldock stated that the documentation would need to be provided before the application could move to City Council.

Commissioner McKissick moved, and Commissioner Marek seconded the motion, to Approve the request with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (6-0).

OTHER BUSINESS:

1 Report on Harrisburg Just Climate Action Stakeholders’ Group

Commissioner Reed noted that she had attended the last two committee meetings, and stated that the group was moving forward with individual sectors of the plan. She noted that the group was currently reviewing the residential component of the climate action plan.

2 Comprehensive Plan Update

Mr. Knight noted that Councilman Madsen had revised the Comprehensive Plan in-person public engagement timeline so that the in-person meetings would occur on June 9th and June 16th, with the latter being held at Italian Lake and the former being held at Reservoir Park. He noted that the format would largely be question and answer, with the thought that attendees could mainly ask questions and provide additional thoughts on ideas, language, or concepts that should be included in the document. Mr. Knight stated that he was not sure what format the meetings would take, but that Councilman Madsen had been working with the Communications Bureau to ensure that notices were multi-lingual.

Mr. Knight stated that he believed the intention was to take a vote on the document before the City Council went on hiatus in July.

Commissioner Alsberry stated that he was happy to hear the timeline was being moved up, noting that he had attended some City Council meetings and workshops and had heard references to the document and process, but that it was unclear on how it when the meetings would take place. Commissioner Marek agreed that she was pleased to hear about the revised schedule. Commissioner McKissick asked whether she had sent a letter to Councilman Madsen requesting a change to the previously-proposed schedule; Commissioner Marek stated that she had not sent that letter but thought that Councilman Madsen may have had conversations with other individuals that prompted the change. Commissioner O'Toole confirmed that he had spoken with Councilman Madsen and asked that the process be expedited.

Commissioner O'Toole stated that he believed there was a group asking for more time and opportunities to make changes to the document, but that he did not believe it was indicative of a push from the larger community of residents. He stated that he felt there had been a substantial amount of public engagement and that there should be a focus on educating the public about the opportunities that have been presented throughout the process.

Commissioner McKissick asked whether any of the commissioners had attended meetings of the Comprehensive Plan Working Group on Facebook. Commissioner Marek stated that she had attended some of the sessions, and believed that they were aware of the email address through which they could submit their ideas and comments on the current version of the document; she asked Planning Bureau staff whether any such submissions had been made by the Working Group. Mr. Knight stated that he hadn't received direct communication regarding comments from the Working Group, but also noted that once the Planning Commission had advanced the document to City Council, the process was in their hands and thus that comments may have been submitted directly to the City Clerk's Office or Councilman Madsen. He also noted that Councilman Madsen had attended some of the Working Group meetings.

Commissioner Marek asked whether the "complancomments" email address was still valid and active; Mr. Knight confirmed that it was. Commissioner Monnier stated that everyone in the Working Group was aware of the email and had submitted their comments; he stated that the group's members were more concerned that many other people were not aware of the current options that existed for submitting comments, or were not able to access those options. He stated

that they were pushing for more opportunities for those individuals to provide comments and ask questions.

Mr. Knight noted that it would likely have been easier to conduct the type of engagement requested by the Working Group prior to COVID, recounting the substantial efforts made during the initial public engagement portion of the process in 2015. He noted that those meetings involved face-to-face interaction which was generally more helpful to the public than the online, Zoom-based engagement that was necessary during the COVID pandemic. Mr. Knight noted that in-person meetings might better accommodate the schedules and resources of people for whom Zoom-based engagement was not sufficient. He stated that Councilman Madsen's suggestions were an attempt to address constituencies with limited internet access, and to close the gap between that population and the process.

Commissioner Alsberry stated that he would be interested to see how many individuals attended the in-person meetings, but that he anticipated turnout might be lower than expected. Commissioner Monnier noted that the in-person meetings would allow City Council to prove they addressed the concerns before moving forward with the process; Commissioner Alsberry agreed.

Commissioner McKissick stated that he was concerned whether the Working Group knew what the purpose of a Comprehensive Plan was, its relationship to other plans and zoning, and what its breadth and limits were. Commissioner Monnier noted that there were knowledgeable individuals operating within the Working Group, and that they were familiar with the purpose of the document; he stated that he felt the group knew how to review and consider the aspects of the document. He stated that he felt their perspective on the process and the document should be given substantive consideration; Commissioner Marek stated that she disagreed, noting that the Working Group had approached City Council and requested compensation to act as liaison for the Comprehensive Plan process between the public and City Council. She stated that she felt that was not appropriate. Commissioner Monnier acknowledged that that occurred, but noted that City Council did not engage the group in that manner.

Ms. Baldock stated that the Working Group members should not have been paid for that work, as it was not their role, and Commissioner Marek noted that the commissioners had contributed far more time, with no compensation, on the document and process, and reiterated that she felt the group had overreached with their request for payment.

Commissioner McKissick stated that he appreciated the Working Group's thoughts and ideas, but felt that the City needed to adopt the current document, and then the group could begin working on improvements for a future update of the Comprehensive Plan. Commissioner Monnier stated that he had recommended to the group members that they could begin working on amendments to the document to present to the City in the future. Commissioner McKissick noted that they could begin working on amendments now, and review and discuss them over the next couple of years so that they were ready for the regular, five-year update of the document.

Commissioner McKissick noted that he, Commissioner Alsberry, and Commissioner O'Toole had, in the past, waded into larger planning discussions in previous years when they opposed

incompatible projects that were being proposed by a previous Administration. He stated that he appreciated the interest from the community in the larger picture of planning in Harrisburg.

3 Subdivision & Land Development Ordinance regulations

Mr. Knight noted that he had sent out a Word version of the SALDO regulations to the Planning Commissioners so that they could begin reviewing the document and recommending edits. He stated that he wasn't sure whether the commissioners had recommendations they wanted to discuss at the meeting, or whether they wanted to collaborate as a group prior to discussing proposed changes.

Commissioner McKissick stated that he wasn't prepared to discuss the potential edits at the current meeting, and that he wanted to discuss his thoughts with the other commissioners. Commissioners Monnier and Marek concurred. Commissioner Marek inquired as to the extent of the June HPC agenda; Mr. Knight stated that there was only one application currently on the agenda for the following months' meeting, but that he was expecting a few more to be submitted by the deadline.

ADJOURNMENT: 8:41 PM

Commissioner McKissick moved, and Commissioner O'Toole seconded the motion, to adjourn. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (6-0). The meeting adjourned at 8:41 PM.