

MINUTES

HARRISBURG PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR/VIRTUAL MEETING June 2, 2021 ZOOM PLATFORM

MEMBERS PRESENT: Joseph Alsberry, Chair
Vern McKissick, Vice Chair (arrived at 6:48 PM; left at 8:29 PM)
Shaun E. O'Toole
Jamesetta Reed
Anne Marek
Ausha Green
Zac Monnier

MEMBERS ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT: Geoffrey Knight, Planning Director
David Clapsaddle, Deputy Planning Director
Tiffanie Baldock, Senior Deputy City Solicitor
Isaac Gaylord, Deputy City Solicitor

OTHERS PRESENT:

CALL TO ORDER: 6:34 PM

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Commissioner Marek moved, and Commissioner Monnier seconded the motion, to approve the minutes from the May 5th meeting without corrections. The motion was adopted by a unanimous (6-0) vote.

NEW BUSINESS:

1 Variance and Special Exception Applications for 68 North 13th Street, zoned Residential Medium-Density (RM), filed by Keith and Diane Maynard, to establish a three-unit Multifamily use, to request relief from the Off-Street parking Standards of the Zoning Code, and to request relief from the density regulations in Section 7-307.3 and the Specific Criteria in Section 7-309. (v) of the Zoning Code.

Mr. Clapsaddle noted that the request is to convert a three-story building into a three-unit multifamily use. He summarized the special exception and variance applications and whether and how they met Code standards, noting that staff had concerns about the impact on available on-street parking. Residents from the Summit Terrace neighborhood, during a prior case regarding an apartment project to the north of this site, felt that having future residents using on-street spaces could be a detriment to the area. Mr. Clapsaddle stated the Code would allow one unit by right, and noted that the request was for triple the density Bureau staff recommended that two units be

approved, based on findings that one unit was unreasonable, given the design of the building, and three units was not the minimum variance required to afford relief. He then read the staff recommendation of Approval, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Applicants will only be permitted to establish two units on-site with a corresponding relief from the off-street parking requirements of two spaces.
2. The Codes Bureau will perform inspections of the interior of the building, both prior to and during work, to ensure that the project results in the construction of two code-compliant residential units.

The application was represented by Keith and Diane Maynard (the property owners), 4114 Dowling Road, Jacksonville, FL 32203, although they stated that they also occasionally reside at the subject property (aka “the Applicants”).

Chairman Alsberry asked the Applicants if the Planning Bureau’s conditions were acceptable. The Applicants stated they wanted to find another way to get three units, and asked if they could have three units if they found another way to get parking. Mr. Clapsaddle stated parking is a big issue, but tripling of the density also is a concern. Parking reductions and density variances could have a cumulative negative impact on the neighborhood. He stated that a survey of the neighborhood found that most were developed as two units per building.

The Applicants stated they were confused about the density standard. Mr. Clapsaddle explained how densities are calculated, and noted that one unit would be permitted on-site by right. He also stated the request does not meet the standard requiring the variance to be the minimum deviation needed for relief from the regulations, but that two units would be an appropriate compromise. Finally, he also noted that Bureau staff took the neighbors’ concerns about parking, expressed during the review of a prior case, into consideration.

Chairman Alsberry asked the Commissioners for comments or questions.

Commissioner McKissick stated he had no questions or comments.

Commissioner O’Toole stated he had no questions or comments.

Commissioner Reed stated she had no questions or comments.

Commissioner Green asked the owners to explain the layout of the building. The Applicants stated that the building was three floors, and thought the first floor was commercially zoned, as a hair salon, with the upper two floors being residential. She acknowledged that the zoning had changed since they originally bought the property. The stated that they intended on converting the first-floor space into a residential unit, since it was ADA-accessible, and that upper floors would be two one-bedroom units, with the third floor being a studio-style apartment. The stated that each unit will have a kitchen and bathroom. Commissioner Green stated she had no more questions, and understood the arguments for both two and three units.

Commissioner Marek stated that she had questions about the application. She noted that the Applicants had to provide a justification that met the standards for receiving a variance and stated

that the Applicants had not provided such evidence. She asked if there was a financial hardship, or if there is something about the structure preventing conformance with the Code. She asked whether the Applicants could provide a pro-forma or other information provided to justify the request; the Applicants stated that they did not have such documentation. The Applicants stated they couldn't construct two units on the upper floors and leave the first floor empty. Commissioner Marek asked whether the second and third floors could be one apartment, with the first floor being another; the Applicants concurred that the building could be set up to have the second and third floors be one, large apartment, with the first floor being a second apartment.

Commissioner Monnier stated when the building was constructed, it likely had the business on the lower floor and the owner lived above the business. He stated that he was glad to see an ADA-accessible unit and that the city needed more of those. He noted that Allison Hill is the most densely populated area in the city, and that many residents traveled without cars; he stated was less concerned about parking than the other members of the Commission. He stated that he supported the two-unit configuration and that he thought there would be demand for the two-floor unit.

Chairman Alsberry asked whether there is 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.

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

2 Variance & Special Exception Applications for 423 Division Street, zoned Residential Medium-Density (RM), filed by Dale Hair of KD3 Design Studio, to establish a twenty-four unit "Multifamily Dwelling" use, and to request relief from the Off-Street Parking Standards of the Zoning Code.

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

The case was represented by Mr. Dale Hair with KD3 Design Studio (the project architect), 130 South Baltimore Street, Dillsburg, PA 17019; and David Peffley with D&F Realty (the property owner), 700 Angenese Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110 (aka "the Applicants").

Chairman Alsberry asked the Applicants why the Planning Commission should not deny the request. The Applicants stated that they were working on an agreement with the Scottish Rite Cathedral, which is close to the site, to provide off-street parking for the project. They stated that they intended to address the off-street parking in this manner. They acknowledged that strict adherence to the Code would only allow 11 units, but stated that the units would be affordable housing for lower-income tenants, with rents at \$800 to \$900/month. Mr. Hair also stated he did not understand staff's comments regarding 1122 Green Street, noting that his firm did the design work for that project. He noted that 16 units were approved, but stated that under the density standard of 1,500 square foot of lot area per unit, only 5 would be allowed. They Applicants stated that there was no consistency in the Planning Bureau's recommendation. They also referenced another project on Boas Street in which 8 units were allowed, while under the density standard

provided by staff, only 3 units would be allowed. They state that they felt Bureau staff was not being consistent.

The Applicants referenced an HRA study done in 2015, stating that the Uptown area of the city had the largest demand for rental units, and they noted the City is looking to provide more affordable housing. They stated that they worked with the Harrisburg Housing Authority (HHA) and were familiar with that organization's needs. The Applicants addressed concerns about the impact on the neighborhood character, noting that additional windows would be added but the architectural look would not change.

Chairman Alsberry asked Bureau staff if they wanted to respond. Mr. Knight noted that the property at 1122 Green Street was approved for 16 units, but that that building was 700 square feet larger than the subject property; as such, while the site was smaller, the building itself was larger. He noted that the current proposal was for 50% more units than that project in a smaller building, and that they were happy to discuss a proposal for a comparative number of units given the size of the buildings. Regarding the lease agreement for parking, Mr. Knight noted that the distance from the property to the Scottish Rite Temple was further than the 500-foot radius in the Code. He noted that it wasn't as simple as whether the Applicants were providing parking, but whether it also conformed to the Zoning Code. The Applicants stated that the units at 1122 Green Street were being offered at market rates and thus the units were larger. They reiterated that they needed smaller apartments to make them more affordable; Mr. Knight noted that the Applicants had not provided a pro forma justifying the density at the proposed rents. Mr. Knight also noted that while the units in the current proposal were cheaper than the comparable project, they were also much smaller and thus that tenants would be getting much less space for a slightly lower rent. He noted that the basement units were fairly small.

Chairman Alsberry interjected and asked the Commissioners for comments or questions.

Commissioner McKissick stated he understood both sides but was concerned about referencing the use of precedent with the increase in density, which could be opening up a Pandora's Box, and that he felt like the deviation was being increased each time. He also was concerned about parking and appreciated the information about the distance to the parking lot. He stated that he would defer judgement until after listening to his fellow Commissioners.

Commissioner O'Toole stated he was in the same place as Commissioner McKissick, and that he understood the need for affordable housing, but had concerns about density and parking as well. He stated that he would also reserve judgment until after hearing from other Commissioners.

Commissioner Reed asked if \$800 to \$900 a month is considered affordable, specifically with respect to the percentage of income. Mr. Knight stated this issue came up during discussion of the affordable housing legislation recently passed by City Council, noting that there were differences between affordable calculations made from Census data versus those provided by the US Department of Housing & Urban Development (HUD). He stated that there is no one right answer as to what is affordable, but that he believed the legislation uses HUD standards. Ms. Baldock interjected and agreed with Mr. Knight, stated that the City's legislation uses HUD guidelines, and also noted that there were different levels of affordability, so there was no true definition. She

inquired as to how the Applicants defined affordable housing. The Applicants stated they get calls from low income people all the time in need of one- and two-bedroom apartments.

Ms. Baldock noted that low income people often qualify for subsidized housing such as that provided by HHA, but that it did not look like this will be subsidized, just a lower price point. She stated that it should be clear what specifically “affordable” meant. The Applicants clarified that they didn’t say they were creating “affordable housing,” but that they were creating “low income” units and confirmed that they would not be accepting Section 8 vouchers. The Applicants stated that Mr. Peffley owned several boarding houses, and that some of his tenants were looking for larger places with a kitchen; they stated that some of the tenants did not qualify for subsidized housing, but also couldn’t afford market rate units. They stated that there was “no housing in the city” and that people making \$15 to \$18 dollars an hour couldn’t afford housing.

Commissioner Green stated she had no questions or comments.

Commissioner Marek stated she agreed with points made regarding affordable housing and levels of density and parking. She asked if the Applicants had any meetings or conversations with the neighbors, noting that while it was a residential area, it differed from much of the surrounding properties. The Applicants stated he has talked with eight residents; four of them living in units he owned, and that they had no negative feedback. He stated that more housing was needed. They stated this building has been abandoned for about 10 years and people want it to be used, and that the City should want the tax dollars Commissioner Marek stated that the property needs to be reused and the commissioners were not opposed to development, but that it was more a matter of numbers and impact.

Commissioner Monnier provided a background and history on the Jewish population in the city, as the property had once been a synagogue, and noted the gradual movement of the population and their places of worship northward through time. He noted the building had to be in a residential area because congregants walk to the synagogue on the Sabbath. Commissioner Monnier stated that preserving the cultural heritage and the building would be a huge win for the city. He noted that the Comprehensive Plan envisioned Division Street becoming a mixed-use corridor with more commercial uses and higher residential densities in the future. He stated that he felt too much of the city was devoted to residential use and that he felt there needed to be more neighborhood commercial uses interspersed in those areas. He stated that he was not concerned about the 500-foot distance to the parking, but recommended the developer fix the sidewalk so it would be more accessible. He stated that he was not as concerned about the density, and felt that the smaller, denser units were appropriate, but that he wasn’t sure he would want to live in the basement. He stated that he was in favor approval of the project as proposed.

Chairman Alsberry asked whether there is 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. Matthew Long (311 South River Street, Harrisburg, PA) stated that as a developer in Harrisburg, he felt there was a lot wrong with this project. He stated that the Planning Commission had the opportunity to stop the project at this point. He stated he recently purchased a religious facility that is three times this size of this building and was proposing a total of 24 units. He stated that if the Applicants were proposing affordable housing, and worked

with HHA, they should state their intention to pursue Section 8 tenants. He stated that a similar project in Midtown had been approved with attached parking, but that the developer had sold the property without the nearby off-street parking required by the Zoning Hearing Board. He stated that he was aware of the potential reuse for the Zembo Shrine and that he didn't think the parking lease would stand up in court. He stated that he didn't feel the basement units would pass building code regulations and that the Applicants were just attempting to squeeze as many units into building as possible. He stated the Planning Commission had every right to review this project and encouraged them to recommend denial to the Zoning Hearing Board.

Ms. Baldock stated that she was muting Mr. Long and again gave instruction to the public on how to request to be unmuted so they could provide comment. There were no additional comments.

The Applicants asked if they could respond to the public comments. The Applicants stated the parking lot will be at the Scottish Rite Temple, not the Zembo Shrine site. They also stated that basement units are permitted by the building code; and that they were intending on installing window wells around the building.

Chairman Alsberry asked whether any of the other commissioners had additional comments. He stated that he had concerns with the density and parking, and stated that he believed people would park in front of the building, instead of in the leased spaces. Chairman Alsberry asked if there were any additional comments; there were no other comments.

Commissioner Marek moved, and Commissioner O'Toole seconded the motion, to Deny the project. The motion was adopted by a majority vote (6-1) , with Commissioner Monnier voting against Denial.

3 Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan for 1103 South Front Street, zoned Riverfront RF), filed by Christine Hunter with H. Edward Black and Associates, Ltd., to establish a fifteen-unit “tiny home” village for homeless veterans, along with a community center and associated site improvements.

Mr. Clapsaddle deferred discussion of the project to Mr. Knight, as he was not here when the project was first presented. Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the report, recommending Approval with Conditions. the conditions were that:

1. All easement agreements for access through Lot 1 to Lot 2 will be provided to the Planning Bureau.
2. The Applicant will submit a Floodplain Development Permit application for the proposed fence across the northern property line of the parcel, as well as for any other permanent installations added as part of the project.

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

Chairman Alsberry asked if the Applicants agreed with conditions in the case report. The Applicants stated they agreed and requested approval of the application as presented.

Chairman Alsberry asked the Commissioners for comments or questions.

Commissioner McKissick stated he did not have any questions.

Commissioner O'Toole stated he had no questions.

Commissioner Reed stated she had no questions.

Commissioner Green asked whether the issue of a piece of land that was to be dedicated as an easement was resolved. Ms. Baldock stated that at a previous Planning Commission meeting, there was a condition requiring the dedication of an easement across Lot 1 of the project; however, subsequent to that meeting, it was determined this land was owned by the Green Chair Trust and there was no legal requirement to provide an easement. When the subdivision was heard at the last City Council meeting, Ms. Peggy Grove stated she was not inclined to provide an easement until after the property was sold. Ms. Baldock stated it was possible to reroute the Greenbelt to avoid conflict. Commissioner Green asked if the easement situation affected the Land Development Plan; Ms. Baldock stated it did not.

Commissioner Marek thanked Ms. Baldock for the easement update, and stated that she found it very disconcerting that the Greenbelt issue had not been resolved and that it was a point of concern for her. She asked if Capital Region Water (CRW) would be reviewing the application, noting that their formal review was not included in their packet. Mr. Knight said they would have to review the plans regarding utilities, water and sewer service, and stormwater management. He stated that the Applicants had been in contact with CRW, and that they had provided an easement through Lot 1 to Lot 2. Commissioner Marek asked the Applicants for clarification. They stated they have been working with CRW and that they were reviewing the stormwater management plans and report. She stated that the easements for the utilities were provided in the Subdivision Plan, and were identified as existing easements on the LDP plan sets.

Commissioner Monnier stated he was devastated about the lack of an easement being provided by the property owner for the Greenbelt, and that he was disappointed the legal issues had prevented that aspect from being completed, but stated that it wouldn't affect his decision on this application.

Chairman Alsberry asked whether there was anyone from the public that was for or against this 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 inquired about signage for the project, noting that access was being provided through a private property, namely the PennDOT facility; she stated that she wanted to avoid confusion from people leaving the PennDOT site. The Applicants stated that they had not included signage in the plan set, and that it would be submitted through a separate permitting process. She noted that the proposed access was currently a dead-end street and added there would be gates at the access to keep traffic out of the village.

Commissioner Reed moved, and Commissioner McKissick seconded the motion, to Approve the request with Staff Conditions. Commissioner McKissick stated that he believed there would be a substantial payment from the City in the future to secure a right-of-way easement for the Greenbelt. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (7-0).

4 Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan for 28-38 North Cameron Street, zoned Downtown Center (DC), filed by Matthew Long with Harrisburg Commercial Interiors, to convert the existing vacant building into an office building and “Multifamily Dwelling” use with six units.

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

1. The Applicant shall include landscaping and lighting plans to accompany the Land Development Plan application prior to recordation of the project with the Dauphin County Recorder of Deeds; revised plan sets will also need to include any and all conditions adopted by City Council.
2. The parking area along the Cameron Street frontage will have a physical division along the property line between the parking lot and the sidewalk, to prohibit encroachment of vehicles into the public right-of-way.
3. The Planning Bureau would recommend that the sidewalks along Cameron Street will be reconstructed to remove any unnecessary curb cuts and driveway aprons.
4. The Applicant will ensure that all property investment and floodproofing measures will be discussed with the Floodplain Administrator in advance of the work to ensure that it conforms to applicable local and national floodplain regulations.

The case was represented by Matt Long with Harrisburg Commercial Interiors (the property owner), 311 South River Street, Harrisburg, PA 17104; and William Pompeii with K&W Engineers (the project engineer), 2201 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110 (aka “the Applicants”).

Chairman Alsberry asked if the Applicants agreed with the conditions in the case report. The Applicants stated that constructing a wall or vegetative screening would create a visibility hazard, but that a lower physical division would be feasible. Mr. Knight stated that Bureau’s concern was that one of the parking spaces on the north side of the lot abutted the sidewalk, and that this configuration often led to sidewalk parking, a common problem along Cameron Street, which created safety problems for pedestrians. He noted that the project would induce more trips to the site, so this was an important consideration. Mr. Knight also noted that the intersection of Cameron Street and Market Street is one of the more dangerous in the city, due to poor pedestrian infrastructure and stated that physical separation would help address this concern. He noted that a line on the ground would likely be ignored and that or vegetative screening would eventually be damaged and driven over, although he agreed with the Applicant’s statement regarding visibility. Mr. Knight stated that he thought parking stops may help. The Applicants stated if the recommendation is to have an 8-inch curb, and to redo the saw cuts on both sides of the property, that would be acceptable. Mr. Knight said staff agreed with that proposal.

Mr. Long stated he is a real estate developer and commercial contractor; he stated that his office would have one or two cars that will not affect any other tenants of the property. He stated that he wanted to provide parking for each tenant, and that spaces would be assigned and marked for each unit.

Chairman Alsberry asked the Commissioners for questions or comments.

Commissioner McKissick stated he had no questions and that the discussion about the separation addressed his concerns.

Commissioner O'Toole stated he had no questions or comments.

Commissioner Reed stated she had no questions or comments.

Commissioner Green stated she had no questions or comments.

Commissioner Marek agreed that the verbal agreement between the Applicants and Bureau staff made a lot of sense and would address concerns about pedestrian safety. She asked how the buildings are connected and whether the buildings had been elevated because of their presence in the floodplain. The Applicants explained the construction history of the buildings and noted that the southern building was about two and a half feet above the northern building. They noted that there were interior connections between the buildings, and that they would address things like fire separation when they began preparing structural plans.

Commissioner Marek asked whether the buildings configurations created floodplain issues; the Applicants noted that some of the proposed work might require creating openings in the building to meet floodplain requirements, and confirmed that the floodplain issues would need to be addressed before construction could begin. Mr. Knight noted that the Applicants might be referencing flood vents, and noted that dry floodproofing through an impervious treatment to the exterior of the building with flood gates at entrances may be required, depending on whether the proposed project meets the substantial investment threshold for improvements on the property. He stated that they would coordinate with the Applicants once any necessary approvals were received.

Commissioner Marek stated that she felt that the submittal documentation was lacking, as lighting, landscaping, and stormwater management plans were not provided. The Applicants stated that they had reviewed the building many times with CRW and confirmed that there were 6" and 8" sanitary lines that tie into mains along Cameron Street; they also noted that there was an operable fire line in the building that would accommodate the residential units. They further explained that separate electrical service would be provided to each building to meet the code requirements. They stated that they didn't believe there would be soil disturbance and that they felt they would be granted an exemption from stormwater management regulations. Commissioner Marek asked whether there would be exterior landscaping or lighting; the Applicants confirmed there would be exterior LED lighting on the structures. They also noted that they had submitted similar plan sets as had been done with similar projects that involved interior conversions.

Commissioner Marek noted that Paxton Creek ran adjacent to the properties and stated that she was surprised and frustrated CRW had not provided comments relative to naturalizing Paxton Creek and that these issues should be discussed in reviews of projects such as this; she asked whether any of those conversations had been held and whether that was a consideration in the project. The Applicants thanked her for mentioning that aspect, stating that they had retained a lobbyist to jump start the Paxton Creek project effort, noting that momentum had stopped several years ago. They stated that they had numerous conversations with HRA and K&W Engineers on how to move the planning and construction effort forward; they noted that the project would move forward with or without action on the Paxton Creek project.

Mr. Knight added some information to the Applicants' testimony, confirming that PennDOT's involvement lessened when a new Director was appointed, although he noted that some of the delay was due to a US Army Corps of Engineers review of the required H&H Study, which usually took at least a year and a half, but was taking longer partially due to COVID. He stated that the Planning Bureau always considered this proposal when reviewing projects in the Paxton Creek area, noting some other project reviews that were conditioned on the provision of easements. Mr. Knight also noted that while a final design had not been approved, it was likely that widening the channel would occur on properties that were primarily parking lots, which was most of the properties west of the creek; he noted that most of the industrial buildings on the east side of the creek along Cameron Street would likely remain. The Applicants confirmed that in the draft proposals created by PennDOT, the subject buildings were planned to remain. Commissioner Marek noted that there might be proposals for easements along the creek at some point in the future.

Commissioner Monnier stated it was good to see this restoration of the building because it was in a severely deteriorated state, and that he hoped it was successful. He noted that it was important to see redevelopment of the properties along the corridor prior to beginning the Paxton Creek project, if that long-term effort was to be successful. He agreed that the curb cuts needed to be removed, noting that walking along this portion of Cameron Street was dangerous.

Chairman Alsberry asked whether there was anyone from the public that was for or against this 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. She also wanted the minutes to reflect that Commissioner McKissick had to leave the meeting early.

Chairman Alsberry stated the building has been an eyesore for years. He said many studies on the Creek had been done, noting those which accompanied a nearby development at 100 North Cameron Street, and expressed frustration with the bureaucracy that resulted in a lack of movement on the Paxton Creek project. He noted that his former office had been adjacent to the creek and recalled previous clean-up and redevelopment efforts.

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

OTHER BUSINESS:

1 Report on Harrisburg Just Climate Action Stakeholders' Group

Commissioner Reed gave an update on the Climate Action Group, noting that recent meetings had focused on the commercial building sector as well as rooftop solar installations on municipal buildings. She also noted that the group had discussed the transportation sector, including promotion of electric vehicles, noting that the City had begun that effort, as well as improving bike infrastructure and public transit through a citywide shuttle service that would complement Capital Area Transit (CAT). She noted that there would be two more meetings in the future, reviewing wastewater management and overall issues and concepts included throughout the document.

Commissioner Reed noted that after the discussions amongst the stakeholder group, they would begin rewriting the document and soliciting public input. She noted that most of the aspects of the document were complementary to the ideas and goals of the Comprehensive Plan.

2 Comprehensive Plan Update

Mr. Knight provided the Board with an update to the Comprehensive Plan. He noted that the first public meeting would be held Wednesday, June 9th at the Department of Public Works' building at 6:00 PM. He stated that the intention was to have the meeting being less-instructional, without formal presentations, than previous meetings had been and to allow more opportunity for additional questions and comments from the public. He stated that he was meeting with Councilman Madsen on June 3rd to discuss how the meeting would be structured. Mr. Knight stated that a second meeting would be held on June 16th at Italian Lake. He stated that the comments received during the town halls and the other public session would be reviewed during the required public hearing held at the end of June, with a final vote hopefully being taken at the Council's last legislative session before their hiatus on July 6th.

Mr. Knight noted that he wasn't sure how City Council would approach the inclusion of public comment into the document, but thought that they might adopt the document as-is, alongside an appendix of the public comments which would separately be voted on, after which the City would work with the copyediting consultant, Wallace Montgomery, to incorporate the comments and potentially additional photos into the document.

Commissioner Reed asked how the public was being notified of the meetings. Mr. Knight noted that the meeting was being advertised on the City's website and via various social media channels, and that he believed Councilman Madsen was coordinating directly with community groups to ensure the meetings were being promoted as well. He stated that City Council was working to get the message as well as possible.

Commissioner Reed asked whether the notification process was the same as during a previous public meeting that occurred in City Council Chambers; she noted that there was a large turnout at that meeting. She noted that the document during those meetings was unreadable and thick, and noted that the current document was much better in that regard but that public turnout was less. Mr. Knight noted that the process had changed, as there was a large shift to digital notification and participation, and less in-person participation due to COVID. He noted that pre-COVID, members

of the public could attend regular City Council meetings in person, during which they could get hard copy documents or provide feedback in person. Mr. Knight stated that City Council was making an effort to expand outreach, noting that there was a focus on bilingual notification, and reiterated that Councilman Madsen was focused on making sure the process was as good as possible. He solicited suggestions from the commissioners.

Chairman Alsberry asked whether the various neighborhood groups could be notified; Mr. Knight stated that he believed Councilman Madsen was currently engaging community groups in the notification process.

Commissioner Monnier asked whether there would be a member of the Administration in attendance who was fluent in Spanish and could address any questions or comments that may come from Spanish-speaking individuals. Mr. Knight noted that a new employee in the Communications Department was fluent in Spanish and would be in attendance at the public meeting. Commissioner Monnier noted that he had four headphones that could translate into twenty different languages that he could provide for use during the meeting.

3 Subdivision & Land Development Ordinance regulations

Mr. Knight noted that he had sent out a Word version of the SALDO regulations to the commissioners so that they could begin reviewing the document and recommending edits, but noted that he had not yet received comments or edited documents from them. He noted that it might be prudent to wait to see whether City Council was going to take a vote on the Comprehensive Plan document in July. He stated that he wasn't sure whether the commissioners had recommendations they wanted to discuss at the meeting, but welcomed any comments at the current meeting. He stated that it might be easiest if the commissioners could provide a "track changes" version of the Word document, as that would be easier to fold into a final draft of proposed revisions.

Commissioner Marek thanked Mr. Knight for distributing a digital Word version of the document so that they could make their own edits, and stated that she intended on focusing on SALDO updates over the next month or so.

4 Other Business

There was some final discussion about how Planning Commission meetings may occur in-person in July and afterwards, noting that the recent State legislative action to terminate the COVID emergency order may mean that they could not have Zoom meetings anymore. She noted that the public meetings may go to a hybrid format during which people could participate both in-person and via Zoom, but that the City had not yet determined how that would occur. Commissioner Monnier asked whether that meant that people would still be able to comment over the phone at meetings; Ms. Baldock concurred that that would be the case.

Commissioner Monnier noted that he had accepted a new job in Georgia, and that he would be moving down south after the August 2021 meeting. He thanked all of the commissioners for their support and effort, and that he appreciated the opportunity he had been given. Chairman Alsberry

stated that he appreciated his youthful talent and energy and stated that he had brought some good ideas to the Planning Commission in their review of projects.

ADJOURNMENT: 8:50 PM

Commissioner Marek moved, and Commissioner O'Toole seconded the motion, to adjourn. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (6-0), with Commissioner McKissick absent. The meeting adjourned at 8:50 PM.