

MINUTES

HARRISBURG PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR/VIRTUAL MEETING February 3, 2021 ZOOM PLATFORM

MEMBERS PRESENT: Joseph Alsberry, Chair (arrived at approximately 7:00 PM)
Vern McKissick, Vice Chair
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 Reed moved, and Commissioner O'Toole seconded the motion, to approve the minutes from the January 6th meeting without corrections; the motion was adopted by a unanimous (5-0) vote.

OLD BUSINESS:

NEW BUSINESS:

- 1 Variance & Special Exception Applications for Capitol Heights, in the block bounded by North 3rd Street, Hamilton Street, Logan Street, and Clinton Street, zoned Residential Medium-Density (RM), filed by Erica Bryce, Chris Bryce & Matthew Long with Midtown Redevelopment LP, to request various zoning relief from use and development regulations required for the construction of eight, single-family townhomes and a mixed-use building featuring a community center with twelve apartments above, along with associated site and access improvements.**

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

1. The Applicant will file a Street Vacation application for the rights-of-way which run across the proposed project site, if a survey or research determine such requests are necessary.

2. The Applicant will file a Lot Consolidation, Subdivision & Land Development Plan application for the proposed development of a combined community center/apartment building and eight townhomes.
3. The Applicant will establish one of the off-street parking spaces proposed for the combined community center/apartment building as an ADA-accessible space.
4. Because the proposed community center/apartment building will require more than ten spaces, the Applicant will need to install bike racks on-site; the Planning Bureau would recommend that these be installed in the front yard of the proposed building, alongside the community garden which the Bureau is recommending be retained in its current location.
5. The Applicant will coordinate with the City Arborist on the type and location of vegetation to be planted on-site.
6. The Applicant will coordinate with the Department of Public Works to update the billing account and identify the appropriate refuse storage needs and location.

Mr. Knight also stated that he wanted to add another comment on the record, specifically that the Planning Bureau recommended the community center/apartment building be set back from the North 3rd Street frontage; he noted that while the zoning did not require such a setback, due to the buildings to the north and south having a prevailing setback of zero feet, he noted that a relocated footprint would allow the retention of the community garden along North 3rd Street and greater visibility of the mural along the side of the building to the north.

The case was represented by Chris & Erica Bryce (the developers), 2901 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110; and Matthew Long with Harrisburg Commercial Interiors (the contractor), 28-38 North Cameron Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101 (aka “the Applicants”).

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicants whether they had a chance to review the Planning Bureau’s case report and whether they had anything to add to the case report. The Applicants addressed Mr. Knight’s additional comment, stating that they had been in contact with the owners of the building with the mural who were planning on changing the mural at regular intervals; they stated that the project would make the mural more visible by having a glass façade so that it could be seen from inside the building. They also stated that they had spoken with the community garden organizer, Mike Lacey, who was in support of the proposal to relocate the community garden to the block between Logan Street and North 4th Street, and that they would be meeting with him to discuss the specifics of the new community garden location.

The Applicants reiterated that a benefit of the building being constructed along the sidewalk would be that the community would be able to see the entire mural from inside the community center, and that a setback building would “break up” the visualization of the mural. They also stated that relocating the footprint would adversely impact the public courtyard area in the rear of the community center building.

The Applicants referenced the site plan they had provided with the application; they noted their original plan envisioned all townhome construction, but that after community discussions which stated a need for a park or community center, they decided to go with the latter concept. They referenced the grassy area between the community center and townhomes and the urban meadow

which connected them, and stated that the community would be able to use that entire space for events.

The Applicants stated that they were going to establish a non-profit in conjunction with nearby community groups which would operate the community center. They stated that the public could sign up for a membership, and would receive a magnetic card to access to the space, which would provide security and organization for the facility. They stated that the proprietors of the improv theater to the north would help manage the space. The Applicants also stated that they had spoken to owners of adjacent properties and that both were in support of the project; they stated that they expected to have letters of support from those individuals before the Zoning Hearing Board meeting.

Commissioner McKissick 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. Wallace McKelvey (1619 Logan Street, Harrisburg) noted that the Applicants had stated that the public would be able to view the mural through the building, but that the renderings indicated that was not the case. The Applicants stated that people inside the building could see the mural and that it would thus be a significant artistic feature of the building; they stated that the façade would be translucent, and that the mural was only visible once someone passed a street tree in front of the property, so they'd have the same line of sight in both cases.

Mr. McKelvey inquired as to the public access to the proposed community center space, and asked what assurances the Applicants could make that nearby residents that did not live in the project apartment units could use the space. They stated that the goal was to establish a non-profit to run the community center, and that they were currently communicating with an unnamed group to partner on the operation of the space. They stated that a board made up of community members would be responsible for overseeing day-to-day operations and making decisions. The Applicants reiterated that any city resident would be permitted to use the space, and that they would commit to ensuring access in writing.

Mr. McKelvey noted the mixed-use and mixed-income nature of the overall project, and asked whether the Applicants had received tax credits to fund the project. They stated that they had been considering the project for a couple years and recently finalized the conceptual plans, noting that they had held public engagement sessions in Summer 2020 at which they discussed what the community might want to see in the project. The Applicants noted that one of the most common requests from the public was for a community center space. They reiterated that there were no public funds being utilized in the project.

The Applicants stated that they wanted the project to reflect the “melting pot” nature of the city and the nation, and were planning on having units at three income levels in the apartment building aspect of the project: family units, workforce housing, and market rate units. Mr. McKelvey asked whether the mixed-income component only applied to the apartment building, and the Applicants confirmed that was the case.

Commissioner Monnier asked Ms. Baldock to clarify whether the public comment was to be a back-and-forth conversation. She stated that it was up to Commissioner McKissick on how to proceed with the meeting; he stated that he would solicit comments from other members of the public and then return to Mr. McKelvey if he had additional questions or comments.

Richard Gribble (203 Harris Street, Harrisburg) stated that the project was exciting, that he was happy to support it, and that he was looking forward to being a member of the community center.

Commissioner McKissick asked whether there was anyone from the public that was for or against the project; Ms. Baldock reiterated the instruction on how to request to be unmuted so they could provide comment. She noted that there were no additional hands being raised, and Commissioner McKissick asked Mr. McKelvey whether he had any other questions or comments. He expressed concern about the amount of parking being provided, and inquired about the total number of units being proposed. The Applicants confirmed that there would be twelve apartment units and eight townhomes, each of which had a garage. Mr. McKelvey noted that there would only be nine parking spaces on site for the community center and apartment; the Applicants confirmed that they were working with the owner of a surface parking lot a block to the south and that they were hopeful they could reach an agreement since the Applicant for another project being heard at the meeting had been able to secure a lease for spaces.

The Applicants stated that fourteen off-street parking spaces with an ADA-accessible space would be required for the residential units. They noted that the community center was serve residents of the surrounding neighborhood and thus they didn't expect that aspect to generate vehicular traffic; they also noted that, per the Planning Bureau's case report, the project would need to incorporate bike racks as well. They reiterated they would be seeking additional spaces in the surface parking lot to the south.

Mr. McKelvey expressed concern that the project would increase the density of the neighborhood and make it more difficult to park. He also noted that the current site plan submission proposed removing the community garden on-site; the Applicants noted that the community garden would be relocated a block to the east, and would be enlarged as part of the proposal.

Ms. Baldock noted that a member of the public had submitted a written question through the Zoom Q&A feature; she read the submission from Jari & Burak Kurama (no address provided), inquiring about the maximum capacity of the community center space. The Applicants noted that the space was approximately 4,000 square feet, with an additional 4,000 square feet of outdoor space at the rear of the building, but that they weren't sure what the actual capacity would be. Mr. Knight noted that that aspect would be regulated by either the Codes Bureau or Fire Bureau, and that he wasn't sure what that number would be. Commissioner McKissick stated that he believed the regulation was approximately 15 square feet per person, which would allow about 250 people once other aspects such as bathrooms were removed from the calculation.

Commissioner Marek noted that Mr. Knight had provided an additional public comment to the commissioners that afternoon; Ms. Baldock noted that it was an anonymous comment and that it would be up to Commissioner McKissick on whether he was willing to hear it. Mr. Knight stated that the comment was transcribed from a phone conversation between the individual from the

public and the City's Planner I, and that while they did not want to provide their name, they did confirm they lived in the area of the 1500-1600 block of Logan Street; he confirmed that the individual would thus have general standing with respect to the project.

Commissioner Marek noted that the individual had received a required notification letter from the Applicants which confirmed that they owned a property nearby. She read the individual comments from the letter, which addressed concerns about: the impact of new impervious surfaces on the stormwater infrastructure; the impact on the availability of on-street parking; the proposed removal of the community garden; and the loss of green space and the loss of tree canopy.

Commissioner McKissick asked whether any of the commissioners had comments or concerns about the project. Commissioner Marek stated that she was pleased with the mixture of residential unit types and that the neighborhood needed more of the rowhome typology being proposed by the Applicants. She stated that it was important to retain publicly-accessible community garden space in the area. Commissioner Marek stated that the other questions she had involved the community center space which had been addressed in the discussion.

Commissioner Monnier stated that he appreciated the Planning Bureau's desire to retain the community garden and the existing visibility of the mural, noting that community gardens were sometimes not consulted when development projects would impact their space. He thanked the Applicants and the Planning Bureau for keeping that consideration in mind. Commissioner Monnier stated that Sprocket Mural Works recognized the murals and their environments could change, and that he felt the project should not be designed around the visibility of the mural wall. He also stated that while he supported a building fronting 3rd Street, he recommended that the bike racks in the Planning Bureau's case report should be located near the front of the building, and potentially along Logan Street as well, as opposed to being relegated to an otherwise unused corner of the project site.

Commissioner Alsberry noted that the Applicants had discussed the project with the community, and stated that he felt keeping those lines of communication open throughout the process would be important. He also stated that he hoped there was adequate parking for the community center use to ensure it did not adversely impact the available on-street parking for neighborhood residents.

Commissioner McKissick asked the Planning Bureau to confirm the specifics of the zoning relief request for off-street parking relief. Mr. Knight noted that the request was only for the combined community center/apartment building, as each of the townhomes had their own garages; he noted that the Zoning Code required a total of 28 off-street parking spaces for the mixed-use building, and possibly more if there were employees serving the community center use. Mr. Knight noted that the building was designed to serve the neighborhood so that most people would be able to walk or bike to the community center; he also noted that there was an existing community center several blocks to the north. He noted that if the community center was viewed as largely serving people who could walk or bike, then the off-street parking relief request primarily applied to the proposed "Multifamily Dwelling" on the upper floors, which would require fourteen parking spaces; thus, the Applicants were requesting relief from five off-street parking spaces. Mr. Knight confirmed that the full request was for relief from nineteen off-street parking spaces.

Commissioner McKissick reiterated that the primary consideration for off-street parking was for the proposed twelve apartment units, and thus the project was seeking relief from five off-street parking spaces, which he noted was approximately a third of that required by the Zoning Code. Mr. Knight noted that the Applicants had stated in their documentation, and confirmed at the meeting, that they were working to secure additional spaces in the surface lot a block to the south; he stated that it was his observation during trips past that property that it was lightly used. He stated that the Applicants may be able to secure the discussed lease of spaces prior to the Zoning Hearing Board meeting.

Commissioner Reed asked the Planning Bureau staff whether the first condition of approval included in the original case report; Mr. Knight confirmed that it was being removed but noted that he referenced it in the reading of the case report because he felt it should be a consideration of the Planning Commission and the Zoning Hearing Board. He noted that the Planning Bureau felt that maintaining the garden along 3rd Street would create a better public entrance to the community center, but that in communications with the Applicants, had noted that the Planning Bureau would be supportive of the proposed design if the community was supportive. Mr. Knight stated that his intention was to consider the perspective of neighborhood residents and gardeners who frequented the current space, and that he was encouraged to see that the Applicants had made contact with the stakeholders and secured their support.

Commissioner Monnier referenced the pervious pavers proposed for the entrances to the townhome garages and noted that the Applicants may want to consider a rainwater collection system for the community center/apartment building for use by those with plots in the relocated community garden. He noted that this may partially address the public comments regarding the increase in runoff as part of the development.

Commissioner Marek noted that withdrawing Condition #1 in the case report may also remove the requirement to retain the community garden and asked whether the commissioners should include that condition in the resolution. Mr. Knight stated that he felt that was a good idea.

Commissioner McKissick asked the Applicants whether they would object to an additional condition that they secure a lease for five parking spaces in the surface lot in the block to the south. They stated that they would not be opposed to that condition. Commissioner McKissick noted that the condition wasn't specifically addressing the current project, but rather that they did not want to set a precedent for other projects that might seek relief from the off-street parking requirements.

The Applicants also addressed the anonymous public comment regarding impervious surfaces and runoff; they emphasized the use of pervious paving for the driveways of the townhomes and noted that the townhome frontages along Logan Street were staggered with two- to four-foot setbacks, per discussion with the Planning Bureau, to allow for more impervious surfaces. They noted that this kept the impervious surfaces percentages below the maximum thresholds as indicated in the Development Standards of the Zoning Code.

The Applicants also noted that, with respect to the parking concerns, they were considering using a vacant lot along Logan Street for a parallel parking lot, although they noted that it wasn't under discussion in the current proposal. They stated that they would coordinate with the City Engineer

on whether such a proposal would be feasible, and that they thought widening the road for parallel parking might be a good solution to address parking concerns. They noted that they understood that the Planning Bureau could not support such a proposal.

Commissioner Marek moved, and Commissioner Alsberry seconded the motion, to Approve the request with Staff & Additional Conditions; the additional conditions were that the Applicants would retain the community garden on the adjacent block, and that the Applicant would retain a lease for five parking spaces in the lot at 1601 North 3rd Street. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (6-0).

2 Variance & Special Exception Applications for 430 Reily Street, in the block bounded by Boyd Street, North 5th Street, Reily Street, and Fulton Street, zoned Residential Medium-Density (RM), filed by Kevin Baird with 400 Reily Street Management LLC & KevGar Holdco, LLC, to request various zoning relief from use and development regulations required for the construction of a seven-story, mixed-use development featuring commercial space for grocery store, restaurant, coffee shop, and office uses; 85 residential apartments; and an approximately 500-space parking garage along with associated site and access improvements.

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

1. If granted approval for the requested zoning relief, the Applicant will subsequently file a Street Vacation application for the rights-of-way that run through the project site and receive approval from the Planning Commission and City Council.
2. If granted approval for the requested zoning relief, the Applicant will file a Lot Consolidation, Subdivision & Land Development Plan application for the proposed mixed-use development.
3. The Applicant will coordinate with the Department of Public Works to confirm the appropriate size and location of refuse collection on-site.
4. Given the entire site (44,100 square feet) will be “paved,” the project will need to plant fifteen (15) trees, per Section 7-307.12(b) of the Zoning Code; the Applicant will coordinate with the City Arborist on the selection and location of trees in the surrounding rights-of-way.
5. Given the parking requirements and the construction of the proposed parking garage, the project will need to provide bike racks for the project; the Applicant will coordinate with the Planning Bureau on the number and location of bike racks around the site.

The case was represented by Charles Suhr with Stevens & Lee (the legal counsel), 17 North 2nd Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101; Kevin Baird (the developer), 1435 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19102; and Greg Holtzman with BL Companies (the project engineer), 2601 Market Place, Suite 350, Harrisburg, PA 17110 (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 there was anything they wanted to add to the case report. The Applicants stated that it was a large project with a number of complicated aspects and noted that they hoped to answer any questions the commissioners may have, although they did note that they prepared a presentation for the meeting.

Commissioner Alsberry invited them to present the information prior to the commissioners asking questions.

The Applicants opened the presentation with an aerial view of the project location and noted its relation to adjacent streets and properties. They then showed a rendering of the project viewed from the south, and discussed the various uses and access points to businesses on site, as well as the proposed floor plans of uses within the building. The Applicants then showed another rendering of the project alongside existing and proposed projects for the corridor, comparing the design and massing of the project to other development.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether any of the commissioners had comments or concerns about the project. Commissioner McKissick stated that he was happy to see a quality project that was similar to developments in other cities, noting that the city hadn't seen a development like that in 25 years. Commissioner McKissick stated that the project site was outside of the Competing Parking Area, and thus would not have any issues from that perspective, but Commissioner Marek corrected him and noted that it was. Ms. Baldock confirmed that it was in the Competing Parking Area and that the City was in negotiations with TriMont and PEDFA regarding the allowance of a parking structure in the area. Commissioner McKissick noted that he was the chair of the Parking Authority Board, but that he had not heard of this project and was not aware of the status of the negotiations.

The Applicants stated that there was an agreement in principal between themselves and TriMont, and that they were hoping to formalize a letter of intent shortly. Commissioner McKissick said that he was curious to see that agreement once it was formalized.

Commissioner O'Toole stated that he thought it was a good project and that he was looking forward to seeing it completed.

Commissioner Marek stated that she was pleased with the overall development and mix of uses. She noted that the project proposed completely covering the site, and asked how the project would handle stormwater management. The Applicants noted that they were currently working with Capital Region Water (CRW) on the design of stormwater infrastructure, and stated that they intended on including some form of infiltration. They stated that the stormwater issues would be addressed prior to the filing of the required Land Development Plan. The Applicants also stated that they were working with Greenworks [note: a nearby property owner] and CRW to identify areas to incorporate green spaces such as parks; they stated that they were evaluating the stormwater management potential of the proposed Boyd Street urban meadow expansion at the rear of the project site.

Commissioner Marek asked whether the proposed building would be approximately the same height as the condominiums to the east; the Applicants confirmed that it would. Commissioner Monnier noted that it may look slightly lower due to the topography of the corridor which rose to the east. The Applicants confirmed that was the case, and noted that they proposed locating the loading dock on the western side of the building specifically due to the topography that required the floors to the east to be elevated. Commissioner Marek stated that she was excited to see the development proposed for this area, and that it was definitely needed.

Commissioner Monnier asked the Applicants whether the parking structure would be designed so that it could be converted to other uses in the future; the Applicants confirmed this was the case, and stated that building penetrations through the floor plates would be designed in such a way as to make conversion of some areas to other uses easier in the future. Commissioner Monnier asked whether the Applicants would consider converting proposed parking spaces to bike parking in the future; he noted that there was an increase in demand for secured bike parking versus publicly-accessible bike racks. The Applicants stated that they would consider providing such parking for residents in the future, noting that they considered the impact of alternative transportation methods – including bikes, scooters, and car share – in the feasibility of the project. They stated that they could likely identify space in the building footprint for secured bike parking in the future. Commissioner Monnier then asked whether the Applicants had considered installing showers and changing rooms for people who might commute to the proposed businesses on-site or the Federal Courthouse; they stated that they could consider the installation of such facilities but they were concerned about issues such as liability.

Commissioner Monnier referenced the proposed grocery store on-site, and asked whether they had secured an anchor tenant, or whether they would be doing so in the future; the Applicants confirmed that they had had “high-level” conversations with several different ones, that there was a lot of interest in the project, and that they were 100% confident they would get an urban grocer model. They stated that once the project was approved, there would be even more interest.

Commissioner Monnier stated that he felt the project was one that was desperately needed in the neighborhood, and that there was a lot of support from the public and the commissioners for the proposed parking on-site. He stated that he was very excited for the

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 public comments.

Commissioner Alsberry concurred with the other commissioners and stated that he felt it was a great project and that he was happy to see it being proposed. He reiterated his support for projects that provided a sufficient amount of parking attached.

Commissioner McKissick stated that he liked the project and was prepared to make a motion for approval, but that he wanted to attach a condition that an agreement be reached to secure approval of the parking proposal with the entities managing the City’s parking assets, but that he wasn’t sure with which entity specifically they would need to coordinate. Ms. Baldock stated that the agreement would likely be between the City and one of either TriMont or PEDFA, and not between the Applicant and those entities. She stated that the City was closely evaluating the project, as was the legal counsel for the Harrisburg Parking Authority; she noted that there were some obstacles to address and that the City was supportive of the project.

The Applicants spoke and discussed their history of engagement with the issues regarding the Competing Parking Area. They noted that the Mayor had introduced the team to the TriMont partners in Summer 2020, and that they had been negotiating since then on what would be a fair

and equitable agreement. They stated that TriMont did not have the resources to provide their own parking facility to meet the needs of the Federal Courthouse project, and that TriMont's main concern was that a new facility be revenue-neutral, a point with which they agreed. The Applicants noted that there were no existing parking garages or meter spaces in the area around the Federal Courthouse and that that project would increase parking revenue; they stated that they were in support of the proposed meters.

The Applicants provided some background on the history of the project, noting that they were originally looking to do a multifamily development in the Midtown area, but were not looking specifically at the current project site. They stated that that spoke with the Mayor, who noted that any new residential building in the Midtown area would have a significant impact on parking, which would be exacerbated after the completion of the Federal Courthouse. The Applicants stated that the City offered the use HRA-owned lots and convinced them to incorporate a parking garage on-site as well; they stated that they would have a third party managing the parking facility component. The Applicants stated that this type of project was essential to helping realize the potential of the area around the Courthouse.

The Applicants noted that the transfer of the City's parking assets was done at a difficult time for the City, but that he didn't feel it should be used as a "sword of Damocles" held over any development project in the Midtown neighborhood. The Applicants stated that he felt TriMont had been negotiating with them in good faith from the beginning, and that a final agreement would involve getting all the stakeholders at the table. They reiterated that they were confident the issues would be resolved and that they would have a contract relatively soon. Commissioner McKissick noted that the Applicants had provided a good description the issues the City was facing regarding development projects in the Midtown and Downtown neighborhoods. Commissioner O'Toole stated that the Applicants' description of the project history made it evident he had a clear understanding of the issues involved in this type of development.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether one of the commissioners wanted to make a motion. Commissioner McKissick asked the Planning Bureau staff to restate the conditions of approval in their case report; Mr. Knight re-read the conditions from the case report, and provided a bit of additional background as to the importance and manner in which the conditions could be met.

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 Application for 1507 North 3rd Street, zoned Commercial Neighborhood (CN), filed by Nathaniel Foote w/ Third Street Realty, Co., to convert the existing building into a five-unit "Multifamily Dwelling" on-site, which requires a Variance for exceeding the allowable units on-site per Section 7-307.3 of the Zoning Code.

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

1. The Applicant will receive approval from the Planning Commission and City Council for the accompanying Land Development Plan application, and will incorporate any conditions adopted in the approval of that application.

2. Any new signage to advertise businesses in the proposed first-floor commercial space will be in conformance with the applicable regulations of the Zoning Code or, if not, will receive approval for a zoning relief request, as necessary, from the Zoning Hearing Board.
3. The Applicant will coordinate with the Department of Public Works to ensure that the account billing reflects the establishment of active uses on-site; if it is determined that the uses on-site will require a dumpster, the Bureau recommends that the Applicant consider either sharing one with adjacent commercial uses along Reily Street or making one accessible via the adjacent surface parking lot.

The case was represented by Nathaniel Foote (the contract purchaser), 227 Muench Street, Harrisburg, PA 17102; and Matthew Long with Harrisburg Commercial Interiors (the contractor), 28-38 North Cameron Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101 (aka “the Applicants”).

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicants whether the conditions in the case report were acceptable; they stated that they were. The Applicants stated that their project “piggybacked” on the first two projects that the commissioners had heard; they stated that they observed the proposed development plans for the 3rd Street and Reily Street corridors and wanted to see the subject property be revived at the same time.

Commissioner Alsberry stated that he was very impressed with the project, and noted that the public and commissioners were aware of how long the property had been vacant and deteriorating.

Commissioner McKissick referenced the master lease agreement submitted by the Applicants regarding the provision of off-street parking at the neighboring property, and noted that the master lease agreement with HACC was only for a year and that after that the lease would expire. They noted that HACC’s parking lease expired in June 2022, after which they would be vacating the building across the street; the Applicants stated that the property owner (Greenworks) had agreed to pick up the lease at that point. Commissioner McKissick noted that there were many letters included with the application packet; the Applicants noted that the overall support from the community had been very strong.

Commissioner Reed stated that she was glad to see so much interest in Midtown.

Commissioner Marek stated that she was also supportive of a viable reuse of the building.

Commissioner Monnier stated that he appreciated the background documentation the Applicants had provided with their submission. He suggested the Applicant consult with the City Arborist on the planting of street trees in front of the building, noting that the area could use an increase in urban tree canopy.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether there was anyone from the public that was for or against the project. Before providing instruction to the public, Ms. Baldock noted that she wanted the Applicants to confirm that they would be submitting a Land Development Plan that was in conformance with the City’s SALDO regulations; the Applicants and noted that they were working under a tight deadline to submit the requisite application and receive zoning approval, but confirmed that they would submit the necessary documentation before the City Council review.

Ms. Baldock noted that the formal plan set would need to be stamped or approved by a professional engineer or a licensed architect.

Ms. Baldock gave instruction to the public in attendance on how to request to be unmuted so they could provide comment. Rich Gribble (203 Harris Street, Harrisburg) expressed support for the project as nearby neighbor of the property, and stated that he was happy to assist in the project. There were no other comments.

Commissioner Alsberry again expressed his support for the project and referenced the letters of support from stakeholders in the neighborhood, including the Historic Harrisburg Association.

Commissioner Monnier 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 Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan for 1507 North 3rd Street, zoned Commercial Neighborhood (CN), filed by Nathaniel Foote with Third Street Realty, Co., to convert an existing industrial property into a mixed-use building featuring five residential units with first-floor commercial space.

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

1. Any new signage to advertise businesses in the proposed first-floor commercial space will be in conformance with the applicable regulations of the Zoning Code or, if not, will receive approval for a zoning relief request, as necessary, from the Zoning Hearing Board.
2. The Applicant will coordinate with the Department of Public Works to ensure that the account billing reflects the establishment of active uses on-site; the Bureau recommends that the Applicant consider either sharing dumpsters with adjacent commercial uses along Reily Street or making a required dumpster accessible via the adjacent surface parking lot.
3. The Planning Bureau would recommend that the Applicant coordinate with the owner of the adjacent surface parking lot to coordinate on the installation of bike racks in the pedestrian access space between the parking spaces and the subject property.

The case was represented by Nathaniel Foote (the contract purchaser), 227 Muench Street, Harrisburg, PA 17102; and Matthew Long with Harrisburg Commercial Interiors (the contractor), 28-38 North Cameron Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101 (aka “the Applicants”).

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicants whether the conditions in the case report were acceptable; they stated that they were, and thanked Mr. Knight for rescinding Condition #2 related to HARB review, as the project is not in a Municipal Historic District.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether any of the commissioners had comments or concerns about the project. Commissioner Marek addressed a technical question and asked whether the commissioners could approve the application since the submitted Land Development Plan was not done by an engineer or surveyor. Ms. Baldock concurred that it was an issue, and one she had discussed with the Applicants, but felt it should not delay the project or Planning Commission action, so long as they submitted a final plan set done by an architect, surveyor, or engineer prior

to having the application introduced before City Council. Ms. Baldock stated that there were more plan sets than she would like that were delivered to the Planning Commission and were not in compliance with the SALDO regulations, although she felt that a resolution of the commissioners was appropriate in this case. She noted that if the plan changed in any way, they would resubmit the application to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Marek asked what documentation was submitted to CRW and the Dauphin County Planning Commission. Mr. Knight confirmed that those entities had received the same plan sets as the commissioners. Commissioner Marek asked whether the plan sets need to be resubmitted to those entities prior to being heard by City Council. Ms. Baldock confirmed that they only had an opportunity to review the projects and documentation, and that if the project was substantially in the same format, additional reviews would not be required.

Commissioner Marek stated that she supported the project and did not want to delay the review, but also noted that she wanted to ensure the commissioners were acting properly within their powers. She stated that she felt comfortable approving the project with a condition that the Applicant submit a Land Development Plan set that was done by a professional engineer, architect, or surveyor. Ms. Baldock stated that she felt that was appropriate and noted that it was somewhat common that application materials not in complete conformance with the SALDO were submitted.

Commissioner McKissick noted that if the commissioners received such submittals in the future, they should consider reviewing them as Preliminary Land Development Plans, but not Final Land Development Plans. Ms. Baldock reiterated that she had spoken with the Applicants, who acknowledged that the Planning Commission might choose to treat it as a Sketch Plan review, make recommendations to the Applicants, and then have them return at a future meeting with certified plan sets. Ms. Baldock noted that the City and the community were largely in support of the proposal, and referred to the pending deadlines that were applicable to the project and that she did not want to see the developers lose the opportunity to purchase the building and move forward.

The Applicants provided some background to the deadline issue, noting that when they initially approached the current owners about purchasing the property, they sought a period of several months to receive approval, but noted they were under a more-strict timeline to secure financing which was dependent on zoning approval. They stated that if they were not able to close by March, they may not be able to get the property. The Applicants again confirmed that a condition to submit the required certified plans before City Council review was acceptable, and that they expected that that could be done in a couple weeks.

The Applicants also stated that because the project involved an interior renovation with very minimal impacts on the exterior, the proposal would not really change much. Commissioner McKissick concurred that it seemed as though it were a minor land development proposal, but stated that there was an issue of precedence that he wanted to consider. Ms. Baldock agreed and noted that Land Development Plans that involved the conversion of interior space without exterior development impacts should be reconsidered as to whether they required review. She noted that it was onerous and expensive on applicants, City staff, and the Planning Commission and that while it was in the SALDO, the Planning Commission could discuss changes to requirements for Land Development Plan applications.

Commissioner Marek moved, and Commissioner McKissick seconded the motion, to Approve the request with Staff & Additional Conditions; the additional conditions were that the final LDP plan set would be certified by a professional. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (6-0).

5 Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan Application for 130 State Street, zoned Riverfront (RF), filed by Derek Dilks with 130 State Street LLC, to convert the existing office building into a five-unit apartment building, which will include a live-work unit on the first floor.

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

1. Any new signage for the commercial component of the proposed live/work unit will be in conformance with the regulations in Chapter 7-325 of the Zoning Code; or will file zoning relief as necessary and receive approval from the Zoning Hearing Board.
2. The Applicant will submit a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) application for HARB review for any proposed exterior alterations to the building, including any potential signage.
3. The Applicant will coordinate with the Department of Public Works to ensure that the account billing is updated to reflect the proposed change in use.

The case was represented by Derek Dilks with 130 State Street LLC (the property owner), 1701 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17102; and Marc Kurowski with K&W Engineers (the project engineer), 2201 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110 (aka “the Applicants”).

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicant 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 McKissick asked the Applicants to clarify the relationship of the project to the off-street parking on an adjacent parcel, referencing the 99-year lease of the parking spaces attached to the subject property. The Applicants confirmed that 512 & 514 North 2nd Street had six parking spaces that were deeded to the subject parcel. They noted that those properties were under the same ownership as that of the subject property and confirmed that the six spaces would be reserved for the tenants of the current project. Commissioner McKissick asked whether that arrangement was reflected in the plan set, and the Applicants confirmed that it was.

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 public 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 (6-0).

6 Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan Application for 25 North Front Street, zoned Riverfront (RF), filed by Derek Dilks with 25 N Front Street, LLC, to convert the existing

office building into an eight-unit apartment building with off-street parking in the rear of the property.

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

1. The Applicant will submit a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) application and receive approval from HARB for any proposed exterior alterations to the building.
2. The Applicant will coordinate with the Department of Public Works to ensure that the account billing is updated to reflect the proposed change in use.

The case was represented by Derek Dilks with 25 N Front Street LLC (the property owner), 245 North 25th Street, Camp Hill, PA 17011; and Marc Kurowski with K&W Engineers (the project engineer), 2201 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110 (aka “the Applicants”).

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicant 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 McKissick asked the Applicants whether they had an easement with the adjacent property [note: at 27 North Front Street] to access the parking spaces on their property. The Applicants noted that the neighboring property actually had an easement across their property since a carriage house occupied the most of the rear frontage of that lot.

Commissioner McKissick requested clarification on the parking arrangement; the Applicants confirmed that the property line roughly ran down the center of the drive aisle that provided access to all the parking in the rear of the two lots. The Applicants confirmed that they intended on maintaining the existing access agreement with the adjacent parcel. Commissioner McKissick asked for confirmation of a written access agreement, and the Applicants confirmed that they had that documentation. Commissioner McKissick asked whether that easement was included in the Land Development Plan application documentation; the Applicants confirmed that it existed prior to their purchasing the property and that it was already recorded with the deed.

Commissioner Monnier stated that he was excited to see more apartments coming online downtown.

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 public comments.

Ms. Baldock requested that the Applicants provide the Planning Bureau with the deed for the property so that they had documentation related to the access easement for parking in the rear of the two properties.

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

7 Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan Application for 321 North Front Street, zoned Riverfront (RF), filed by Derek Dilks with 321 N Front Street LLC, to convert the existing office building into a six-unit apartment building, including an expansion on the rear façade of the structure, with off-street parking in the rear of the property.

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

1. The Applicant will coordinate with the Department of Public Works to ensure that the account billing is updated to reflect the proposed change in use.
2. The Planning Bureau would recommend that the Applicant consider additional amenities such as landscaped area or bike racks for any of the rear portion of the property not dedicated to off-street parking.

The case was represented by Derek Dilks with 321 N Front Street LLC (the property owner), 245 North 25th Street, Camp Hill, PA 17011; and Marc Kurowski with K&W Engineers (the project engineer), 2201 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110 (aka “the Applicants”).

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicant 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 McKissick referenced the proposed “stacked parking” arrangement in the rear of the property, but noted that there were differences in the Applicant’s property and the referenced properties in the parking concepts documentation submitted with the application; specifically, he noted that it was easier to have such parking arrangement for a single occupant building since people could be located and asked to move vehicles. He noted that while the Applicants may only be adding a few vehicles to the parking demand, it would exacerbate existing concerns about on-street parking in the area. Commissioner McKissick stated his preference for seeing some off-site parking provided to enable easier access for residents who park on the subject property.

Commissioner McKissick asked how much parking was required for the use. Mr. Knight noted that a zoning relief application the project had been reviewed by the Planning Commission in 2020, and that the Applicants had reduced the proposed density from nine units to six units, partially to address the concerns about the intensity of the parking relief being requested, and that the Zoning Hearing Board had granted them relief from four off-street parking spaces. Mr. Knight referenced the conceptual plans provided by the Applicants and stated that the Applicants may be able to better describe the proposed approach to parking.

Commissioner McKissick stated that his main concern was creating a precedent, and was not regarding this project specifically; he noted that the Planning Commission may see more such proposals and that if the parking concerns couldn’t be addressed, they may not be feasible. The Applicants stated that they were going to explore a diagonal parking configuration on-site; they concurred that while a “stacked parking” arrangement for an apartment building might be difficult, they had not created the issue and were trying to accommodate the concerns while moving forward with a viable project. The Applicants stated that while the lot was fairly narrow, they did feel they

could provide three diagonal parking spaces on-site. They also stated that they felt they could address some of the parking concerns by directing future tenants to the various parking garages in the area, and noted that while future residents would be eligible for a parking permit, the difficulty in parking on South Street may prevent some from relying on on-street parking.

Commissioner McKissick noted that the future tenants were not yet residents, and that the proposal may impact the current residents living in the area, and stated that the Planning Commission needed to be mindful of the impact of adding residents through conversions of existing buildings. The Applicants noted that the proposed change from offices to residential units would result in a reduction in the required off-street parking, although they noted that commercial and residential parking generally had complementary periods of use.

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 public comments.

Commissioner McKissick moved, and Commissioner O'Toole seconded the motion, to Approve the request with Staff & Additional Conditions; the additional condition was that the Applicant would install a diagonal parking arrangement in the rear lot. The motion was adopted by a majority vote (5-1).

8 Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan Application for 260 Boas Street, zoned Residential Medium-Density (RM), filed by Derek Dilks with Church 1 Holding LLC, to convert the existing, vacant church into an eight-unit "Multifamily Dwelling."

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

1. Per the Zoning Hearing Board decision on January 25, 2021, the Applicant will designate the required off-street parking for the use at 909 Green Street.
2. The Applicants will coordinate with the City's Historic Preservation Specialist on any proposed exterior alterations to the property and will file a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) application and receive approval from HARB for any work City staff deems it necessary to do so.
3. The Applicants will coordinate with the Department of Public Works to ensure that the account billing is updated to reflect the new development and to identify the appropriate refuse storage needs and location.

The case was represented by Derek Dilks with Church 1 Holding LLC (the property owner), 245 North 25th Street, Camp Hill, PA 17011; and Marc Kurowski with K&W Engineers (the project engineer), 2201 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110 (aka "the Applicants").

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicant 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 McKissick inquired as to how the Applicants were addressing the off-

street parking requirements. The Applicants noted that the Zoning Code regulations did not require the provision of off-street parking, but that they had surplus off-street parking available at a nearby property (909 Green Street) which was held by the same ownership. They stated that they would not include a lease agreement in the deed, but would sign a lease for off-street parking between the ownership of each property. They stated that they were reserve one off-street parking space at 909 Green Street for each of the units in the subject property, and would stipulate in leases that tenants were required to utilize that parking. The Applicants stated that they believed this would alleviate the concerns about tenants parking on Boas Street.

Commissioner Monnier stated that he really liked the plan, but noted that there was some concern in the public regarding the proposed rental prices. He stated that he believed there was a market for units in the proposed price range and that he felt the project would be successful. The Applicants noted that there might be some doubt about the demand for the units, but stated that for professionals working at the Capitol Complex or the Federal Courthouse, the rates would be reasonable.

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 public comments.

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

9 Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan Application for 21 South 2nd Street, zoned Downtown Center (DC), filed by Brad Jones with South Second Associates, to construct a six-story, mixed-use, infill building with retail and office space on the first two floors, and eight residential apartments on the four floors above.

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

1. The Applicant will submit an Easement Application and receive approval by the City for the proposed awning and any other projections from the front of the structure, as indicated in the rendering.
2. Any proposed signage advertising the businesses on site will conform to the regulations in Chapter 7-325 of the Zoning Code, or file a zoning relief request and receive approval from the Zoning Hearing Board.
3. The Planning Bureau would recommend that the Applicant consider using a green roof to manage stormwater runoff generated by the development or install a roof painted with high-albedo colors to reduce the impacts of the urban heat island effect.

The case was represented by Brad Jones with South Second Associates (the property owner), 320 Market Street, Suite 273E, Harrisburg, PA 17101; Marc Kurowski with K&W Engineers (the project engineer), 2201 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110; and Kathryn Sterner with ByDesign Consultants (the project architect), 1950 Market Street, Camp Hill, PA 17011 (aka “the Applicants”).

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

Commissioner Alsberry recollected that the property had previous been a restaurant, the Coronet, and Commissioner Reed noted that it had also been a jazz club, Lounge 21, as well.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether any of the commissioners had comments or concerns about the project. Commissioner Monnier stated that he was excited to see the project come to fruition, noting that the previous proposal to have a newly constructed building connect to the existing building at 17 South 2nd Street had not been realized. He stated that he liked the proposed balconies on the rear elevation, but noted that the view would be of a parking garage and the rear of the pending Harrisburg University project. The Applicants noted that it would add a bit of outdoor space to those units, and bring some light and air to the rear of the building.

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 public comments.

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicants whether they had anything to add to the discussion; they stated that they were looking forward to finalizing the building and bringing it online with a year or so.

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).

10 Lot Consolidation, Subdivision & Land Development Plan Application for 1605-1609 Swatara Street, zoned Residential Medium-Density (RM), filed by CR Property Group, LLC, to consolidate and resubdivide the parcels comprising the project site into three parcels of roughly the same area, and then to construct three, single-family residential townhomes with associated site improvements, on the resulting lot.

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

1. The Applicant will submit an Easement Application and receive approval by the City for the proposed awning and any other projections from the front of the structure, as indicated in the rendering.
2. Any proposed signage advertising the businesses on site will conform to the regulations in Chapter 7-325 of the Zoning Code, or file a zoning relief request and receive approval from the Zoning Hearing Board.
3. The Planning Bureau would recommend that the Applicant consider using a green roof to manage stormwater runoff generated by the development or install a roof painted with high-albedo colors to reduce the impacts of the urban heat island effect.

The case was represented by Aaron Navarro with Snyder, Secary & Associates, LLC (the project manager), 227 West Market Street, Suite 104, York, PA 17401 (aka “the Applicant”).

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicant 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 Marek noted that the project proposed that subsurface detention basins on the end units would manage the stormwater runoff and requested confirmation on how the runoff from the center building would be managed. The Applicant confirmed that the downspouts on the end units would handle all of the runoff from the entire roof area. Commissioner Marek also asked whether the Applicants were proposing to construct a party line for the sewage service; the Applicant stated that the initial intent was to have a party line, but that such a configuration was not permitted by City regulations, so they would be having direct connections from each unit to the sewer main. Commissioner Marek noted that in the past, it was common to have a party line, but that it ended up causing issues between property owners. The Applicant noted that CRW had noted that aspect in their review.

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 public 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).

OTHER BUSINESS:

1 Comprehensive Plan Update

Mr. Knight informed the commissioners that the City Council-led public comment sessions would be held on February 17th and February 24th. Commissioner Marek asked whether the meetings had been changed from the previously discussed dates; Mr. Knight confirmed that Councilman Madsen wanted to provide the public with additional notice and enough time to review the chapters to digest the information and development questions and comments. He noted that the meetings would still occur over three different Wednesdays, with the last session occurring on March 10th. Mr. Knight stated that the setup would be similar to the configuration of the Planning Commission meetings, and noted that Councilmembers, City staff, and the copyediting consultant, Lauren Good with Wallace Montgomery, would be in attendance; he also noted that Commissioner Alsberry had extended an invitation to all the commissioners as well.

Mr. Knight noted that the commissioners may want to discuss the process at the meetings, noting that there had been a significant amount of time between the public engagement portion of the process and the current reviews, and that he expected there would be questions about the document development process and comments on aspects of the document that would need to be revised. He noted that he wasn't sure what the process would look like after the public comment sessions and that Councilman Madsen was planning on seeing how the first meeting went before he determined how the remainder of the process would be rolled out. Mr. Knight noted that the MPC required at least one public hearing prior to City Council taking a vote on the draft document, and stated that he expected there would be some revisions to the document prior to that public hearing.

Commissioner Marek asked whether the Planning Commissioners would be receiving invites to attend the Zoom meetings; Ms. Baldock noted that the City Clerk would be responsible for sending out the invitations, and that she would confirm that the commissioners would receive those invites. Mr. Knight stated that the City Clerk's Office had been in charge of arranging and advertising the meetings and that he believed the City Clerk would be sending out invitations.

2 Subdivision & Land Development Ordinance regulations

Commissioner Marek requested that a discussion item regarding amendments to the City's Subdivision & Land Development Ordinance (SALDO) regulations be added to the March Planning Commission agenda, so that the Planning Commissioners could review the regulations that outlined which projects required a Land Development Plan application.

Ms. Baldock noted that the current SALDO regulations required a Land Development Plan for any building that required "substantial rehabilitation" or which resulted in four or more units, although these types of conversion projects may not have any type of actual "land improvement." She noted that while these projects had to go through the time and expense of an LDP review, the plan sets themselves showed very few, if any, changes occurring. Ms. Baldock noted that these plans would still require zoning relief and thus reviews by the Planning Commission and Zoning Hearing Board, but noted that it did not make sense to have such projects also submit an LDP application.

Ms. Baldock noted that the commissioners may want to similarly consider their review of zoning relief applications, as the Zoning Code required Planning Commission review of these applications [note: the MPC does not mandate this review], but that the Zoning Hearing Board's reviews involvement a strict interpretation of the zoning regulations whereas the Planning Commissions' reviews were more qualitative. She noted that the Zoning Hearing Board did not reference the Planning Commission's reviews in their decisions because they evaluated projects on different metrics. She noted that she had researched other communities in Pennsylvania, and that most did not have zoning relief applications be reviewed by their planning commissions.

Ms. Baldock noted that removing extraneous responsibilities would allow the Planning Commission to spend more time on land development and the nuances of the Zoning Code and the SALDO, and that they could make more recommendations on revisions to enhance their effectiveness and impact on the community. She noted that once the Comprehensive Plan document was finalized, the Planning Commission would have more time to devote to planning and zoning recommendations. Commissioner Marek agreed that the issues were worth a conversation. Ms. Baldock stated that the goal was not necessarily to make the City's regulations more developer-friendly, but to free up the Planning Commission to address more important issues.

Mr. Knight noted that the pending agenda for the March Planning Commission meeting was relatively light, and thus that the commissioners would have more time to discuss the SALDO regulations. Commissioner McKissick stated that the commissioners should consider increasing the use of design schematics and preliminary submissions. Commissioner Marek concurred and noted that they could evaluate the various review paths and discuss the differences between Sketch Plans, Preliminary Plans, and Final Plans. Ms. Baldock reiterated that the goal would not be to reduce regulations on developers, but to make the processes fairer and easier to understand.

Ms. Baldock noted that Planning Bureau staff often spent a lot of time on guiding developers, engineers, and architects through the land development process, and that a clearer and more streamlined SALDO might obviate such time commitments. Mr. Knight noted that the current SALDO was almost as old as the Comprehensive Plan, and thus did not necessarily reflect current trends and realities in the land development process, such as more digital information.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether the commissioners had any other questions or comments. Commissioner Monnier asked whether the Planning Commission could revisit the off-street parking requirements in the Zoning Code. Ms. Baldock noted that the Planning Commission was always able and welcome to make suggestions on Zoning Code amendments, and that amendments introduced by the Planning Commission may carry more weight with City Council. She noted that there were some aspects of parking, such as those involving the Competing Parking Agreement, that may not be able to be changed, but if Zoning Code or SALDO amendments addressed more restrictions on parking, then they could be considered. Ms. Baldock noted that the Planning Commission could spend more time making recommendations to improve regulations based on the feedback they received at their meetings.

Mr. Knight noted that the Planning Commission may want to consider updating their regulations and processes to adopt and support digital submissions and reviews. He stated that he understood that many people preferred to have a physical copy of documentation, but noted that it was resource-intensive and expensive for applications, and that compiling hard copy packets could be a time-intensive effort for Planning Bureau staff. Mr. Knight noted that going from the Planning Commission reviews and packets, directly into the Zoning Hearing Board documentation and packets, and then directly back to Planning Commission reviews was exacerbated by the need to compile hard copy packets of information.

Commissioner Marek stated that she understood Mr. Knight's points, but asked how they would review cases when they were attending meetings in person again. Commissioner McKissick noted that the commissioners could go to an all-digital format if they had computers, laptops, or tablets on which to view the documentation. Ms. Baldock noted that the City may be able to provide laptops or tablets for commissioners, as well as more digital capabilities in the meeting room itself. She stated that she did not expect in-person Board meetings to begin until Fall 2021 at the earliest. Mr. Knight noted that he had considered ordering tablets for Board members in the current year's budget, but noted that an overall plan had not been confirmed by the Planning Bureau or the Boards. Commissioner Alsberry agreed that the tablets might be a good idea.

ADJOURNMENT: 9:23 PM

Commissioner O'Toole moved, and Commissioner Reed seconded the motion, to adjourn. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (6-0). The meeting adjourned at 9:23 PM.