

## MINUTES

### **HARRISBURG PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING May 6, 2020 ZOOM PROGRAM PLATFORM**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Joseph Alsberry, Chair  
Vern McKissick, Vice Chair  
Shaun E. O'Toole (arrived at 6:42 PM)  
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:** 6:34 PM

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Commissioner Marek moved, and Commissioner Reed seconded the motion, to approve the minutes from the March 4<sup>th</sup> meeting without corrections; the motion was adopted by a unanimous (6-0) vote. Commissioner Marek moved, and Commissioner Reed seconded the motion, to approve the minutes from the March 10<sup>th</sup> meeting without corrections; the motion was adopted by a unanimous (5-0-1; Commissioner Alsberry abstained) vote.

Commissioner Alsberry noted the new nature of the meeting

**OLD BUSINESS:**

**1 Variance Applications for 50 South Cameron Street, zoned Downtown Center (DC), filed by U-Haul Company of PA, to install more wall signs than are permitted by right and to install signage larger than permitted.**

Commissioner Alsberry noted that the Applicant had submitted a request for a Continuance to be heard at the June Planning Commission and Zoning Hearing Board meetings. He asked Planning Bureau staff whether the Applicant was intending on moving forward with the case; Mr. Knight stated that he believed the Applicant would be moving forward with the project at the following month's meeting. He noted that he had scheduled a meeting with the Applicants to discuss aspects of the current request as well as related issues regarding the floodplains that were not particularly relevant to the Planning Commission's review of the case.

The Commissioners decided to accept the Continuance the request, although no formal vote was taken.

**2 Variance & Special Exception for 1122 Green Street, zoned Residential Medium-Density (RM), filed by Michael Lam with 1122 Green Holdings, to convert the existing institutional use into a “Multifamily Dwelling” and to construct 25 units, exceeding the density regulations in the Development Standards of the Zoning Code.**

Mr. Knight stated that the Planning Bureau was pulling the application from the agenda, noting that he had solicited updated documentation on the project in response to comments from commissioners and the public at the March 4<sup>th</sup> HPC meeting. He recalled that the Applicant had stated at that meeting that they had additional electronic files that better described the project which they intended to submit for Planning Commission review. Mr. Knight stated that he had solicited a Continuance request from the Applicant but that they had not yet received a formal request, so the City had determined that the application would be pulled from the current meeting agenda.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether the commissioners had to take a formal vote to Continue the review of the application until the next meeting. Ms. Baldock stated that they did not and noted that the Planning Bureau had pulled the application from the agenda on the advice of the Law Bureau because legislation (Act 15-2020) recently passed by the State had suspended MPC timelines.

**3 Special Exception Application for 2025 Derry Street, zoned Commercial Neighborhood (CN), filed by Amer Almabruk with A&I Auto, LLC, to convert the property from one non-conforming use (“Auto Body Shop and/or Repair Garage”) to another non-conforming use (“Auto, RV, Boat, or Manufactured Home Sales”).**

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

1. Any new signage on-site will conform to the regulations in Chapter 7-325 of the Zoning Code; as such, the Applicant will only be permitted one of the two proposed business signs and must file zoning relief for additional signage.
2. No vehicles, equipment, or products will be displayed in the front yard of the property along Derry Street.
3. The Applicant will provide a site plan indicating the exact locations of the required off-street parking spaces and spaces for display of vehicles for sale. Applicant will not store vehicles on adjacent properties.
4. The Applicant will complete sections of the fence in the rear yard, in conformance with the Zoning Code, to prohibit unauthorized access to the site and to prevent the storage of inventory on adjacent properties.
5. The Applicant will ensure that the property is maintained to the standards of the Property Maintenance Code, and will be operated in a manner that is not detrimental to the lives or property value of neighbors, to ensure the proposed use is a benefit to the community.

The case was represented by Amer Amalbruk w/ A&I Auto, LLC (the property owner), 2025 Derry Street, Harrisburg, PA 17104; and Mark Wendaur w/ Wendaur Law, LLC (the legal counsel), 104 Walnut Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101 (aka “the Applicants”).

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicants whether the conditions in the case report were acceptable; they confirmed that they were. They noted that there would be some vehicle repair occurring on-site to make repairs to vehicles in preparation for sale, but that it would not be a standalone aspect of the business.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether any of the commissioners had comments or concerns about the project. Commissioner Marek stated that the questions she had were addressed in the conditions included in the case report; she concurred that a site plan would be helpful in understanding the layout of the property.

Commissioner Green asked whether auto repairs would occur on-site; the Applicants confirmed that there would be some repair work occurring on-site to vehicles purchased by the business for resale. Mr. Knight confirmed that the Zoning Code permitted accessory auto repair operations on the site of an auto sales business.

Commissioner Green noted that there were instances around the city in which unauthorized auto repairs were occurring on a property and the owner would place vehicles for sale on the lot, and that she was concerned the business might be similarly-run. The Applicants confirmed that the business would be primarily devoted to auto sales and that they may offer auto repair and servicing for their customers.

Commissioner Green noted that the building sat on a small hill elevated above Derry Street and inquired as to how the Applicants would be displaying vehicles, whether they would be doing site work to create space in the front yard to display vehicles or simply keeping the vehicles in the rear yard area near the garage. The Applicants stated that they intended on paving the rear yard area and installing a fence, and that all vehicles would be stored there.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether there was anyone from the public that was for or against the project; 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).

**4 Subdivision Application for 651 Alricks Street, zoned Industrial (IND), filed by Max Cohen with Consolidated Holdings International, LLC, to subdivide the current lot into two separate parcels along the same lot line which existed prior to the land development plan in 2016 which consolidated all the former lots into a single parcel.**

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

1. The Applicant will provide the Planning Bureau with Easement agreements for vehicular access across 651 Alricks Street and for shared stormwater management infrastructure between 61 Alricks Street and 3243 Pennwood Street.

The case was represented by Max Cohen w/ Consolidated Holdings International, LLC (the property owner), 651 Alricks Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110; and Marc Kurowski w/ K&W Engineers, 2201 North Front Street, Suite 200, Harrisburg, PA 17110 (the project engineer)(aka “the Applicants”).

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicants whether the conditions in the case report were acceptable; they confirmed that they were. Commissioner Alsberry asked if the Applicants had any additional comments; they reiterated that the proposal would re-establish the lot lines that existed prior to the Land Development Plan in 2016.

Commissioner Marek asked for clarification on how the current request related to the previous zoning relief requests submitted by the Applicant [note: requests were heard in February 2020], and whether a decision would change any of those decisions. Mr. Knight confirmed that it would not, noting that the current request would implement the proposal and that the previous five zoning relief requests were submitted in anticipation that the property would be subdivided as presented in the current request.

Commissioner Alsberry asked for a motion on the application. Commissioner Monnier reminded him to solicit public comment. Commissioner Alsberry asked whether there was anyone from the public that was for or against the project; there were no comments.

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

Ms. Baldock reminded the Applicants that the Subdivision application submitted for the request had not been signed and that a signed copy would be required before City Council reviewed the request. The Applicants confirmed that would be done and asked whether the easements noted in the conditions of approval should be submitted prior to the City Council review. Ms. Baldock confirmed that the documentation should be provided prior to City Council review.

**5 Land Development Plan Approval Extension for 2216 Brookwood Street, zoned Residential Medium-Density (RM), filed by Jonathan Juffe with Brookwood Commons, LP, to consolidate two lots and to-be-vacated rights-of-way into a single parcel on which four buildings, of approximately 24,000 square feet each, with 144 total units, will be constructed with associated parking, access, and site improvements. This LDP was originally approved in December 2013.**

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

1. The Applicant will submit updated applications to vacate the public rights-of-way running through and along the project site, and will receive approval for such applications from the Harrisburg Planning Commission and City Council.

2. The Applicant will ensure that conditions in the original City Council approval of the project will be met.
3. The Applicant will coordinate with the City Engineer and Capital Region Water (CRW) to ascertain whether there are any improvements to the proposed traffic circulation or on-site stormwater management that can be implemented in the revised proposal. In the years since the initial approval, the City has adopted a Vision Zero policy to reduce traffic fatalities and serious injuries and to promote a more balanced, equitable approach to transportation infrastructure, and CRW has adopted new stormwater management regulations to meet a partial consent decree with the EPA.
4. The Planning Bureau would recommend that the Applicant coordinate with the City Arborist on the installation of trees on the subject property and/or in the surrounding rights-of-way. Because this is an extension of a project approved under a previous Zoning Code, the current regulations would not apply to this development.

The case was represented by Jonathan Juffe w/ Brookwood Commons, LP (the property owner and developer), 3405 North 6<sup>th</sup> Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110 (aka “the Applicant”).

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicant whether the conditions in the case report were acceptable; the Applicant requested clarity on Condition #3, noting that the previously-approved LDP was a recorded plan with a valid stormwater management permit. He stated that they were precluded from changes to the design since they had an active NPDES permit, which was renewed in 2019 for four years. The Applicant stated that the permit was in compliance with the City’s Partial Consent Decree with the EPA. The Applicant further stated that they were open to traffic circulation changes that would not affect the recorded plan. Mr. Knight noted that the Applicant had mentioned the same issues during the City Council review of legislation authorizing the approval extension, and that he recognized there would be limitations to the type and intensity of changes, but felt that it would be helpful to have discussions on what changes may be possible to the existing proposal to make it better for the community. Mr. Knight stated that in light of the new regulations and policies regarding traffic and stormwater management, he felt it was important to promote coordination on those issues. The Applicant stated that he understood that approach.

Commissioner Alsberry asked if the Applicant had any additional comments; he confirmed that he did not.

Commissioner McKissick noted that most of the current commissioners were not on the Planning Commission when the development proposal was first reviewed in 2013, and asked whether a traffic study had been completed for the project. Mr. Knight noted that a Trip Generation Letter produced by a local traffic management consultant, had been submitted and approved for the original project. He noted that the then-City Engineer, Paul Francis, had accepted the conclusions of the letter.

Commissioner McKissick stated that he was fairly sure there wasn’t much change to the traffic generation in the neighborhood since that time, and noted that the proposed design was going to be less dense, and thus have less impact, than the previous design. The Applicant noted that they were currently building a similar project in York, with fewer units than originally approved for the Harrisburg project, and that they would be copying that design and reducing the overall project

density by approximately 27 units. They noted that would have a positive impact on the traffic generation as well.

Commissioner Monnier stated that he was happy to see an infill development proposal and that the proposed project would be an improvement on the existing parking lot use. He stated that he would also recommend the Applicant coordinate with the City Arborist on the installation of trees on-site, but concurred that the Applicant was not required to do so since the current request was the extension of a previous approval and not a new review. The Applicant stated that they worked with arborists and landscapers on other projects and noted that they often found easy ways to incorporate beneficial vegetation into projects with minimal financial investment.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether there was anyone from the public that was for or against the project; there were no comments.

Commissioner Green 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 Zoning Code Amendment for the Development Standards outlined in Section 7-307.3 of the Zoning Code, filed by the Harrisburg Planning Bureau, to rescind the Density range regulations for the Residential Low-Density and Residential Medium-Density districts, and revise the Minimum Lot Area regulation for the Commercial Neighborhood district.**

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

The case was represented by Geoffrey Knight w/ the City's Planning Bureau, 10 North 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101.

Mr. Knight noted that the current request was a revision to a previous application which had been submitted twice before; he noted that previous submissions had proposed to fully remove the density requirements in the CN district, whereas the current submission only proposed to revise the density requirements downwards. Mr. Knight stated that during previous reviews, the Planning Commission and City Council seemed to appreciate the spirit of the proposal, which could lower the bar to creating new housing units, but felt that there might be unexpected challenges or unwanted consequences. He noted that the new proposal was a step in the right direction and would address those concerns by minimizing any adverse impacts.

Mr. Knight noted that the current proposal to revised the density regulations downwards could function as a test period to determine whether the concerns from the public might not be realized. He stated that the Planning Bureau would follow new development proposals in the CN district that might be submitted over the next couple of years to ascertain the impacts from the proposed Zoning Code Amendment.

Mr. Knight recited the reasons that the Planning Bureau was recommending approval, as outlined in the case report.

Ms. Baldock stated that the Administration saw the current proposal as short-term solution to a recent issue that had arisen in the review of projects, namely that the Zoning Hearing Board had been denying zoning relief requests for residential development projects that the Planning Commission had routinely approved. She noted that the current application would enable further regulatory action supported by the Administration and City Council to provide density bonuses for projects that provide affordable housing units.

Commissioner McKissick stated that he felt the current application began addressing some of the concerns he raised during the previous review in November 2019. He noted that if the current application was approved, he believed it would be a first step towards more changes being brought through the amendment process. Commissioner McKissick stated that he agreed with the concept of offering additional zoning relief such as density bonuses for affordable housing through a “stick and carrot” approach. He stated that he felt he could support the application.

Commissioner Marek concurred that it was a step in the right direction, noting that the Planning Commission had dealt with the issue many times in the past and that a resolution on addressing the inconsistencies in the document was helpful. She stated that the new regulations would thus be an improvement on the current regulatory structure, and that the proposal was a reasonable step in the right direction. Commissioner Marek stated that she hoped the application would spur more residential development and more types of residential development.

Commissioner Green stated that she liked the spirit of the application and the potential it had for providing more housing units, and that she hoped more affordable housing aspects could be tied into future changes.

Commissioner Monnier stated that he was happy with the format of the current application and that the Dauphin County Planning Commission’s review was also helpful in understanding the issues associated with the proposal.

Commissioner Alsberry stated that he agreed with the commissioners and that he was happy to see positive changes in the city’s development regulations.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether there was anyone from the public that was for or against the project. Mr. Robert Shoaff stated that he thought the proposal was a good step towards the provision of affordable housing in the city. He recommended that the commissioners continue to review the relationship of affordable housing to zoning regulations. Mr. Shoaff stated that he wanted to see more accountability going forward and noted that Mr. Knight had indicated that the proposed Zoning Code Amendment would not change the Land Development Plan submission process or affect other zoning regulations.

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

Ms. Baldock referenced Commissioner Alsberry’s comment regarding the Planning Commission wanting to see more changes with respect to zoning and land use regulations. She noted that the

commissioners had the authority to recommend or request any changes to the Zoning Code or Subdivision & Land Development Ordinance (SALDO).

Commissioner McKissick noted that Commissioner Alsberry may have been referring to the three attempts at updating the Zoning Code document that preceded the adoption of the current Zoning Code and that they were happy to see a necessary upgrade to the document, even though they felt it had some issues.

Ms. Baldock noted that the adoption of the current Comprehensive Plan document would likely precipitate changes to the City's current zoning regulations.

## **OTHER BUSINESS:**

### **1 Comprehensive Plan Update**

Commissioner Alsberry thanked the commissioners for dedicating their time and effort towards the development of the current draft document. He noted that they had provided many volunteer hours towards reaching the point where they finally had a hard copy draft document. He gave special attention to Commissioner Marek, who was the Planning Commission's lead person on the process, and to Commissioner McKissick, who provided leadership and expertise in helping lead the review by the group.

Mr. Knight introduced Lauren Good with Wallace Montgomery and noted that the commissioners had received digital versions of the document the previous version of the Comprehensive Plan draft document and that hard copy versions were delivered more recently. He noted that the City's reproduction department had some issues with printing and binding in the current format and that it might make sense to consider a different formatting concept such as legal-size paper. He invited the commissioners to review the document for comments on issues such as formatting, layout, information, and readability.

Mr. Knight noted that the next phase after the Planning Commissioners review would be a public comment period, and that they might be able to vote to advance it to City Council as early as the June 3<sup>rd</sup> Planning Commission meeting. He noted that the review period would formally start upon presentation of the document to City Council, at which point there would need to be a review period of at least 45 days, per the Municipality Planning Code. Mr. Knight noted that he had forwarded a rough timeline for the process via email and that based on that, the public review period could run through the City Council's hiatus period during the summer. He stated that any comments submitted during the public review period would be submitted to City Council, noting that once the Planning Commission voted to present the document to City Council, it would be under their purview for the remainder of the process, although the Planning Commission may still have a role to play in the review process.

Mr. Knight asked the commissioners how they wanted to move forward with the upcoming public review period given the current constraints surrounding the coronavirus response. He noted that during previous public engagement, there was more in-person and face-to-face engagement, but that such practices may not be possible going forward. Mr. Knight stated that the goal was to engage as much of the public as possible, noting various reasons why a significant portion may



not want to or be able to engage online. He noted that a significant portion of the upcoming public engagement phase will likely occur online.

Commissioner McKissick concurred and noted that the normal ways of engaging the public such as festivals, events, and in-person meetings would not be available. He stated that they would likely have to move forward with a schedule of online Zoom presentations. He noted that some stakeholders such as developers and property owners may have internet access, but that a significant portion would not. Commissioner McKissick noted that the MPC likely did not have guidance for public engagement under the current conditions.

Ms. Baldock agreed and noted that the State legislature had revised some aspects of the MPC, but that she was not sure any action was taken towards comprehensive plans. She noted that the Planning Commission was required to hold at least one public meeting, but that they could host more than that. She recommended that any public comment be solicited prior to their voting to present the document to City Council. She noted that City Council may decide to have the commissioners review any comments that were received, but that it would only come at the invitation of City Council. Ms. Baldock recommended the Planning Commission hold as much public engagement as they felt was necessary before taking a final vote. She acknowledged that the commissioners were volunteers and that it might be difficult to coordinate for everyone to attend Zoom meetings.

Commissioner McKissick stated that the City's Communications team had a robust online and social media presence that they could use to promote public engagement sessions.

Ms. Baldock stated that Mr. Knight was developing a master list of neighborhood groups and contacts by consolidating documentation across multiple City bureaus and that this list could be used to bolster the public outreach. She stated that written comments should be promoted as opposed to voicemail comments, which could be difficult and time-consuming to transcribe.

Mr. Knight suggested that the Planning Commission could hold multiple Zoom sessions of about one hour covering one or two chapters, versus longer meetings covering more chapters, to keep the meetings manageable and also to keep the public engaged. He noted that there was likely a greater percentage of the public that had access to smart phones as opposed to computers and internet access, and suggested that they could look into means of soliciting feedback through survey apps.

Commissioner McKissick noted that Zoom had built-in polling programs. Ms. Baldock stated that the City had disabled the polling option for City-sponsored meetings, but that they could look into enabling that feature for potential Comprehensive Plan Zoom meetings. Commissioner McKissick stated that it might be helpful to use such surveys to provide feedback at the end of the meetings. He stated that he agreed with Mr. Knight that there was a fatigue factor with Zoom meetings and that limiting the time of such sessions would be helpful in keeping the public's attention. He suggested that there should be at least three or four meetings to review all the chapters.

Mr. Knight stated that a packaged, one-hour discussion with a follow-up poll might present the best method for introducing and discussing the general information in the Comprehensive Plan

chapters. He noted that everyone was still trying to identify the best way to take advantage of digital meeting platforms and that their approach might evolve as they went through the process. Commissioner McKissick suggested holding the sessions at the same night and time each week for four weeks in a row.

Ms. Baldock noted that some of the chapters were longer than others and that the commissioners should consider pairing chapters in a way that made the overall review time approximately equal. She stated that they may want to structure the meetings in such a way as to decide on the final review and City Council presentation timeline at the June 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting. Commissioner McKissick stated that he wasn't sure there was time to plan and host such sessions before the June 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting. Ms. Baldock noted that the commissioners had the option of taking a vote at the July 1<sup>st</sup> meeting or holding a special meeting.

Commissioner McKissick asked whether there were public notice requirements in the MPC for any Comprehensive Plan meetings; Ms. Baldock confirmed that it was a relatively short notice period for special meetings. Mr. Knight noted that the advance advertising time for special meetings was 24 hours. He noted that if the commissioners waited until the July 1<sup>st</sup> meeting to vote to present the document to City Council, that such a presentation may not be able to occur before their summer hiatus. He also noted that he could simply present the document to City Council on July 2<sup>nd</sup>, but noted that the commissioners might want there to be a formal presentation.

Ms. Baldock noted that City Council was required to hold a meeting in July and thus that any hiatus they may take could not begin until July 8<sup>th</sup> at the earliest.

Mr. Knight asked Commissioner Green whether City Council was intending on taking a hiatus; she stated that they hadn't fully discussed that issue but that they were currently planning on maintaining a regular hiatus schedule.

Mr. Knight noted that the commissioners didn't have to make a decision at the current meeting, and that they could decide on a schedule at the June 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting. Commissioner McKissick stated that with advertising and public notification lead times, the commissioners may want to make a final determination fairly soon. Ms. Baldock noted that the Law Bureau still had to review the entire document to determine whether the information in the document was legally-permissible, but that she was not anticipating that would be the case.

Commissioner McKissick asked when the Law Bureau review occurred. Mr. Knight noted that he had already provided a digital copy the week before and would deliver a hard copy version after the current night's HPC meeting. Ms. Baldock stated that she would be in the office tomorrow and could begin the review then.

Mr. Knight introduced Lauren Good with Wallace Montgomery and solicited questions or comments based on initial reviews of the digital document circulated last week or the hard copy document distributed on May 6<sup>th</sup>. Commissioner Monnier asked whether it was too early to submit spelling or grammatical corrections. Ms. Baldock stated that the commissioners should coordinate on recommendations or suggestions prior to submitting those to Ms. Good. Commissioner Marek inquired as to whether an email thread would be an effective way of submitting comments, and

Ms. Baldock stated that method would be acceptable so long as substantive decisions weren't being made to the document. Mr. Knight noted that commissioners could highlight text within the PDF document to visually identify comment areas.

Ms. Baldock asked Ms. Good whether there was a way to have all the commissioners make edit suggestions within a shared digital document. Ms. Good stated that it would be possible to have the group make edit suggestions and that her company had a method for doing so, which included time/editor stamps for individuals making recommendations.

Commissioner Marek requested additional information on how that process would work. Ms. Baldock stated that the City could host the document on its OneDrive platform, and asked Ms. Good whether the commissioners would need the "pro" version of Adobe Acrobat to engage in this manner, or whether the general Adobe Viewer software would be sufficient. Commissioner McKissick stated that he believed that the commissioners should be able to use Adobe Viewer to recommend edits. Ms. Good stated that the commissioners did not need the "pro" version.

Commissioner McKissick asked how the commissioners could avoid replicating comments, and thus avoid visually cluttering the shared document. Ms. Good stated that she was unsure of all the potential options for editing the documentation and would have to coordinate with her company's IT department.

Commissioner McKissick stated that his firm used Blue Beam, which was a platform that used concurrent cloud-based functionality to allow multiple individuals to edit and comment on a single shared document. Ms. Baldock stated that the City would review its internal platforms to see whether they could provide a solution for shared document editing.

Commissioner McKissick stated that the process review timeline being discussed would result in a formal vote to present the document to City Council at the July 1<sup>st</sup> meeting and that a presentation would then be made at the July 7<sup>th</sup> City Council Workshop session. He noted that under that timeline, the commissioners should expect to begin the document review sessions on Zoom by the end of May. Ms. Baldock noted that it would be helpful for the Law Bureau if the chapter review schedule was decided so that she could ensure that the Bureau could focus on the upcoming chapters first to ensure the process kept moving.

Mr. Knight inquired as to the format of the Zoom sessions and asked the commissioners whether they intended on making presentations on each chapter, soliciting questions or comments from the public, and then having attendees complete a digital survey at the end of each one. Commissioner McKissick stated that he anticipated that the Planning Bureau staff would manage the Zoom session presentations, and that the commissioners would attend the Zoom meetings themselves. He stated that he expected the presentations would be approximately an hour to an hour and fifteen minutes with some time reserved for questions and comments from the public at the end.

Commissioner Alsberry stated that the proposed schedule seemed a bit aggressive. Commissioner Marek stated that she wanted to ensure the commissioners maintained momentum in the process so that they were able to get a final City Council vote on the document by the end of the year. She noted that a review at the July 1<sup>st</sup> meeting and vote to present the document to City Council would

initiate the formal 45-day, MPC-mandate public review period. Mr. Knight noted that the Zoom sessions would be an additional period of public comment and that the public would still have at least 45 days to review the document during this time. Ms. Baldock reiterated that public comment during the formal review period would be directed to City Council. Commissioner Marek noted that the proposed schedule provided the public with two opportunities for comment; she stated that she felt that would provide an adequate amount of time for the public to provide feedback, but noted that the commissioners needed to clarify the structure of the Zoom sessions and public engagement.

Commissioner Marek reiterated that she liked the idea of the Zoom webinars and wondered how the commissioners could encourage written comments through such a format; Commissioner McKissick noted that they could require the public to submit comments through the chat function and use the recorded transcript from the Zoom meeting to compile comments. Ms. Baldock noted that there were some issues with recording the meeting, particularly from a records retention perspective. She noted that the City had established a dedicated email address for City Council meetings and could do something similar for the Comprehensive Plan review process. Ms. Baldock confirmed that the public could submit comments via the Zoom chat function, although someone would have to record those in real time. She also noted that the public could be invited into the Zoom meeting via phone, as was being done with the current meeting, and that the only requirement was the provision of a reasonable method for public comment.

Commissioner Alsberry noted that he had attended a variety of Zoom meetings and concurred that he was getting a bit burned out on the format; he stated that he liked the concept of limiting the time frame of the meeting, covering broad overviews of the chapters, and providing a defined period for questions and comments. Ms. Baldock noted that in other instances, the City had put a two-minute limit on verbal comments and that any feedback beyond that could be submitted via email or written submissions. Ms. Baldock noted that the commissioners did not have to provide a real-time answer to public comment and that they could just accept the comment and consider it later; she suggested that they accept comment without a lengthy back-and-forth discussion.

Commissioner Marek noted that the Comp Plan document would be posted on the City's website as well; Ms. Baldock confirmed that would be the case. Commissioner Marek stated that she liked the idea of coordinating with the various neighborhood groups through a group email requesting support in disseminating the Zoom meeting information.

Mr. Knight stated that he envisioned the document being posted on the City's website along with an email address for those interested in submitting comments, and the dates and times of the Zoom sessions. He noted that prospective dates would be May 20<sup>th</sup>, May 27<sup>th</sup>, June 3<sup>rd</sup>, and June 10<sup>th</sup>; Commissioner Marek noted the Planning Commission meeting was on the third date; Mr. Knight noted that the June meeting agenda would be relatively light and so they could have a session after that meeting. He also noted that they could reassign the Zoom session for that week or perhaps host the sessions on Thursdays instead. Mr. Knight noted that that schedule would result in the commissioners being able to vote on a final document at their July 1<sup>st</sup> meeting.

Commissioner McKissick stated that he believed theBurg would be a partner in advertising the Zoom sessions. Mr. Knight noted that they should also consider engaging the Latino Connection

to ensure the Spanish-speaking community was aware of the meetings and could participate, although he noted that it might be challenging to have the Zoom sessions communicated in Spanish in real-time. He noted that they could also coordinate with Gloria Vazquez-Merrick from the Latino Hispanic American Community Center (LHACC) on providing Spanish translation services. Ms. Good noted that their subconsultant who would be finalizing the document and getting it web-ready had a translation service available as well. Ms. Baldock suggested the logistics be discussed at the upcoming weekly conference call on May 11<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Baldock noted that the commissioners would need a quorum at the meetings since they were primarily for public comment and no decisions would be made.

Mr. Knight asked the commissioners whether they had any questions regarding the information discussed at the night's meeting. A member of the public (Mr. Robert Shoaff) asked whether he could make a comment. Ms. Baldock deferred to Commissioner Alsberry to open the floor to comments; he asked whether anyone from the public had questions or comments.

Mr. Shoaff stated that he was checking in to track the current state of the Comp Plan and how the document differed from that reviewed by the original Steering Committee in 2015. Ms. Baldock noted that the document would be posted to the City website prior to the Zoom sessions and that the public could compare versions at that time. Mr. Shoaff stated that he appreciated the discussion on how best to engage the community through the pending Zoom sessions. He noted that the prior public engagement period was part of the beHBG process in which he participated and he invited students as well. He stated that future public engagement needed to be "mindfully driven" due to the COVID-19 issues and that the commissioners strongly consider the manner in which future public engagement was performed.

Commissioner Monnier thanked Mr. Shoaff for his comments and stated that he also wanted to ensure there was good public engagement before the document made its way to City Council. He stated that he felt they had a good schedule and format through the Zoom platform, particularly given challenges related to COVID-19, and noted that there would be at least one more round of public engagement after the Planning Commission vote. Commissioner Monnier stated that once the County was greenlit to begin reopening, he anticipated that they would conduct similar outreach meetings as the previous public engagement in 2015.

Mr. Shoaff referenced a several cities' comprehensive plan documents that were models for Harrisburg's and noted that they were focused on technical and participatory processes, and that the current process should reflect those goals as well. He noted that Mayor Papenfuse had reached out to him in 2018, and that he had discussed the idea of a community think tank with the Mayor at that time as well. Mr. Knight noted that the City was working on updating its website and stated that he hoped it would be complete in time for the MPC-mandated public engagement period.

#### **ADJOURNMENT: 8:13 PM**

Commissioner Marek moved, and Commissioner O'Toole seconded the motion, to adjourn. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (7-0). The meeting adjourned at 8:13 PM.