

MINUTES

**HARRISBURG PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR/VIRTUAL MEETING**

July 7, 2021

10 North 2nd Street, Room 205

City of Harrisburg.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Joseph Alsberry, Chair
Shaun E. O’Toole
Jamesetta Reed
Anne Marek
Ausha Green
Zac Monnier

MEMBERS ABSENT: Vice Chairman McKissick

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

CALL TO ORDER: 6:32 PM

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Commissioner O’Toole moved, and Commissioner Marek seconded the motion, to approve the minutes from the June 2nd meeting without corrections. The motion was adopted by a unanimous (6-0) vote.

NEW BUSINESS:

1 Special Exception Applications for 1125 North Front Street, zoned Riverfront (RF), filed by David Pedroza, to expand two, existing non-conforming aspects of the property: the “Multifamily Dwelling” will be increased from six units to seven units, and the required off-street will increase from seven spaces to eight spaces, most of which can be met by the spaces in an existing surface parking lot.

Mr. Clapsaddle noted that the request is to convert a three-story building with six units into a seven-unit multifamily use. He summarized the special exception and variance applications and how they met Code standards, noting that the parking variance was for one guest parking space, which could be met by on-street parking. He then read the staff recommendation of **Approval**, subject to the following conditions:

1. Any exterior work will be discussed with the city’s Historic Preservation Specialist, who will determine whether such work can be administratively approved, or whether approval from HARB will be required.

2. The applicant will coordinate with the Department of Public Works to ensure appropriate location of a trash enclosure, if that is deemed necessary, and to update the billing account.
3. The Applicant will coordinate with the Floodplain Administrator to ensure that the investment being made in the property, as well as any development on-site, will be done in conformance with the applicable regulations in Chapter 7-315 of the Zoning Code.
4. The Planning Bureau would recommend that the Applicant consider the installation of a more robust and visually-appealing screen along the Front Street for the accessory parking area on-site.

The Planning Bureau staff recommends the request be approved for the following reasons:

1. The Applicant has met their burden of proof to warrant approval of the Special Exception.
2. The proposal will provide an additional residential unit in an existing "Multifamily Dwelling" which will contribute to the neighborhood's housing inventory and will assist the property owner in affording flood insurance for the property.
3. Because the Applicant will be reusing the garage parking area at the rear of the property the additional unit will not increase the intensity of the existing non-conforming aspect with respect to parking.
4. The proposal is harmonious and compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and the proposed use will not adversely impact the character of the neighborhood.

The application was represented by David Pedrosa, the property owner, 1125 N. Front Street Apt. 3, Harrisburg, PA. 17102.

Chairman Alsberry asked the Applicant if the Planning Bureau's conditions were acceptable. The Applicant stated he did not understand the conditions. After Mr. Clapsaddle explained the conditions to the applicant, Mr. Pedroza stated he understood and agreed with the conditions.

Chairman Alsberry asked the Commissioners for comments or questions.

Commissioner O'Toole stated he believed the request was reasonable and had no questions or comments.

Commissioner Reed stated she had no questions or comments.

Commissioner Green stated that she had no questions or comments.

Commissioner Marek stated that she had no questions or comments.

Commissioner Monnier stated he was for the project and had no questions or comments.

Chairman Alsberry asked if there is anyone from the public that was for or against the project. There was no public comment.

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

2 Variance Application for 1455 & 1457 South Cameron Street, zoned Commercial Neighborhood (CN), filed by Lamont Palmer, to establish an “Auto, RV, Boat, or Manufactured Home Sales” use on-site.

Mr. Clapsaddle gave a synopsis of the report, recommending **Approval**, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall ensure that the proposed use is operated in conformance with the Specific Criteria in Section 7-309.2(g) of the Zoning Code and, if an accessory auto repair operation is proposed (which is permitted by the definition in Section 7-333.2(a) (21) of the Zoning Code), that that aspect will be in conformance with Section 7-309.2(f) of the Zoning Code as well.
2. The Applicant shall ensure that any new signage for the proposed use is installed in conformance with the signage regulations or, if not, will submit the necessary zoning relief applications and secure approval 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, and to identify the appropriate location for refuse containers.
4. The Applicant will create a physical barrier or landscape barrier between the accessory parking area/product display lot and the sidewalk; the prevalence of sidewalk parking along this stretch of Cameron Street creates additional pedestrian safety concerns, and alleviating them through site design is the best approach.

Planning Bureau staff recommends the request be **Approved** for the following reason(s):

1. The proposal will re-establish a productive use on-site for a property that has been vacant for approximately seven years and for which other potential uses may not be viable given the existing development on-site and the location of the property.
2. The proposed use is supported by the isolation of the property from a potential customer base, the presence of the property along this stretch of a high-traffic State highway, and the prevalence of other such uses nearby.

The case was represented by Mr. LaMont Palmer, (the property owner), 1457 South Cameron Street, Harrisburg, PA. 17104).

Chairman Alsberry asked the Applicant if the Planning Bureau’s conditions were acceptable. The Applicant stated they were. Chairman Alsberry asked the Commissioners for the questions or comments:

Commissioner O’Toole stated that he had no questions.

Commissioner Reed stated that she had not questions.

Commissioner Marek asked staff if an auto repair use is permitted. Mr. Clapsaddle stated that as defined by the Code, it is permitted by right. Mr. Knight clarified that it is permitted as an accessory use and not as a stand-alone business. Commissioner Marek asked the Applicant how many cars would be on the lot. The Applicant stated no more than five or six.

Commissioner Marek stated she had no more questions.

Commissioner Monnier asked Planning Bureau staff if sidewalk repair was the responsibility of the Applicant. Mr. Clapsaddle stated yes, and when the Applicant applies for a permit, Planning Bureau staff will ensure all Code standards and conditions of approval will be met.

Chairman Alsberry asked if there is anyone from the public that was for or against the project. There was no public comment.

Commissioner Marek moved for approval, amending Condition 4 to add sidewalk repair was the responsibility of the Applicant. Commissioner Green seconded the motion. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (6-0).

3 Special Exception Applications for 2043 & 2045 North 4th Street and 401 & 407 Maclay Street, zoned Residential Medium-Density (RM), filed by Ashish Desai with Keshav Care, LLC, to convert the “Place of Worship,” parsonage, and parking lots into an “Adult Day Care Facility” and to request relief from the Off-Street Parking Standards of the Zoning Code.

Mr. Clapsaddle gave a synopsis of the report, recommending **Approval**, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall ensure that the proposed use is operated in conformance with the Specific Criteria in Section 7-309.2(g) of the Zoning Code and, if an accessory auto repair operation is proposed (which is permitted by the definition in Section 7-333.2(a) (21) of the Zoning Code), that that aspect will be in conformance with Section 7-309.2(f) of the Zoning Code as well.
2. The Applicant shall ensure that any new signage for the proposed use is installed in conformance with the signage regulations or, if not, will submit the necessary zoning relief applications and secure approval 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, and to identify the appropriate location for refuse containers.
4. The Applicant will create a physical barrier or landscape barrier between the accessory parking area/product display lot and the sidewalk; the prevalence of sidewalk parking along this stretch of Cameron Street creates additional pedestrian safety concerns, and alleviating them through site design is the best approach.

Planning Bureau staff recommends the request be **Approved** for the following reason(s):

1. The proposal will re-establish a productive use on-site for a property that has been vacant for approximately seven years and for which other potential uses may not be viable given the existing development on-site and the location of the property.

2. The proposed use is supported by the isolation of the property from a potential customer base, the presence of the property along this stretch of a high-traffic State highway, and the prevalence of other such uses nearby.

The case was represented by Ratilal B. Patel, of ProCMS, 4815 Sheffield Court. Harrisburg, PA, 17122.

Chairman Alsberry asked the Applicant if the conditions were acceptable. The Applicant stated they were, but did have a question about the lot consolidation. The Applicant wants to eliminate the parsonage lot, as it has a separate lot. He was also unsure of the process. Mr. Clapsaddle stated the Planning bureau had no objection to eliminating the parsonage lot, and the process is administrative, and does not come back to the Planning Commission or Zoning Hearing Board.

Chairman Alsberry raised parking concerns; this is a very busy corner and he felt that ten spaces were not enough parking. The Applicant responded that the Manager and some of the employees will live in the parsonage house, which will reduce the need for parking.

Commissioner O'Toole asked Director Knight about the structural issues with the church. Mr. Knight stated the Codes Bureau was aware of the structural deficiencies and will ensure patrons of the facility will not be put in danger. Commissioner O'Toole had a question regarding pick-up and drop-off. Mr. Clapsaddle stated it was Planning Bureau staff's understanding that individual drop-off and pick-up of facility patrons would not be allowed. Patrons of the facility would be transported by vans to and from their residences or a designated pick-up and drop-off point. Commissioner O'Toole's main concern was what would happen if individuals were allowed to pick up and drop off. Mr. Clapsaddle stated Planning Bureau staff was concerned about that as well, and a condition is suggested that staff be notified should van transportation be eliminated.

Commissioner Reed asked about the hours of operation. The Applicant stated between 10:00 to 4:00 or 4:30 pm. Commissioner Reed also asked how food and beverages for patrons would be handled. The Applicant stated that food will be brought in from outside the facility.

Commissioner Green asked a follow-up question about food. The Applicant stated that no cooking would take place in the facility. A microwave would be available to re-heat food. Commissioner Green asked if the transportation company was the Applicants, or if it was a separate vendor. The applicant stated that it is not his company. Commissioner Green asked about the parsonage; would employees be required to live there. The Applicant stated that the manager will be required to live there, other employees would not. Commissioner Green stated that parking and the transportation of individuals were her main concerns.

Commissioner Marek stated she has several questions, one was the reliance on a transportation company for transportation services. She stated that there were no loading and unloading zones shown on the site plan, and asked how that would be accommodated. The Applicant stated that loading and unloading of patrons and supplies would be on Maclay Street. Commissioner Marek stated she had a major concern about that, as Maclay is one of the City's busiest streets. Commissioner Marek also asked if visitors would be allowed. The applicant stated visitors could come in to go to the office and ask questions about the facility.

Commissioner Green intervened and stated it seems like the applicant is going to figure everything out after opening. She felt the Commission needed more information before deciding. After discussion among the Board members, Mr. Clapsaddle asked if the Board wanted to continue this item for 30 days, to give the Applicant time to develop a more detailed plan and answers to your questions. Commissioner Marek moved, and Commissioner Green seconded the motion, to hold this item to the August 4th meeting of the Planning Commission me. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (6-0).

4 Variance Application for 2218 Susquehanna Street, zoned Residential Medium-Density (RM), filed by Justin Heinly of Heinly Homes, LLC, to establish a “Parking Lot or Structure, Commercial” use on-site.

Mr. Clapsaddle gave a synopsis of the report, recommending Approval, subject to the following conditions:

The Planning Bureau recommends the request be **Approved** with the following condition(s):

1. The Applicant shall receive approval of a building permit and Mercantile Permit prior to the commencement of activity to establish the parking lot.
2. The Applicant shall receive approval from the Floodplain Administrator for any new permanent installations in the AE Floodplain, prior to commencement of activity to establish the parking lot.
3. The Applicant shall include a lighting plan as part of a complete submittal package at the time of application for a permit to establish the parking lot.

The Planning Bureau recommends the request be **Approved** for the following reason(s):

1. The Applicant has met their burden of proof for approval of the Variance by demonstrating substantial conformance to the standards for granting a Variance in the Zoning Code.
2. The proposal will provide parking for residents of this area of the city, which is a complaint of businesses and residents.
3. The Applicant has demonstrated that the commercial parking lot, as designed, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood or be detrimental to the public welfare. As demonstrated by the letters of support accompanying the application, the Applicant has coordinated with neighborhood residents to secure support for the proposal.

The case was represented by Carolyn DuBois of K & W Engineers, 2201 North Front Street, Suite 200, Harrisburg, PA. 17110

Chairman Alsberry asked if the Applicant agreed with conditions in the case report. The Applicant stated she agreed and nothing more to add.

Chairman Alsberry asked the Commissioners for comments or questions.

Commissioner Reed stated she had no questions.

Commissioner Green asked if this would be an open lot or fenced in. The Applicant stated it would be an open lot with thirty-five numbered parking spaces. Commissioner Green stated she had no more questions.

Commissioner Marek stated she believed the parking lot could spur redevelopment of this area of the City. Commissioner Marek asked is this within the boundary where additional parking was not allowed. Mr. Knight and Solicitor Gaylord stated it was well north of the boundary.

Commissioner Monnier asked if the lot would be lighted. The Applicant stated yes.

Chairman Alsberry asked if there was anyone in the public who wanted to speak. The following per person rose to speak:

Laura Harding, 2646 North 3rd Street, Harrisburg. She stated she is the one who filed the ethics complaint. Her objection to the request was that it does not meet the standards of the Code and that the Commission does not know how to properly apply the standards of the Code. She will save other questions for the Zoning Hearing Board. No Commissioner had any comments or questions.

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

5 Variance & Special Exception Applications for Bethel Village, on five parcels located at 1008 & 1012 North 6th Street, zoned Commercial Neighborhood (CN), and 429-441 Herr Street, zoned Residential Medium-Density (RM), filed by Bethel Village, LLC to request relief from various Development Standard regulations in order to construct a 49-unit “Multifamily Dwelling” use and associated site and access improvements.

Mr. Clapsaddle gave a synopsis of the report, recommending **Approval** with Conditions, subject to the following conditions:

1. If granted approval for the requested zoning relief, the Applicants will subsequently file a Lot Consolidation & Land Development Plan, and a Street Vacation for the various rights-of-way along and through the site, and receive approval from the Planning Commission and City Council.
2. The Applicants will receive approval from HARB for the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) application submitted for the proposed design.
3. The Applicants will coordinate with the Department of Public Works to confirm the appropriate size and location of refuse collection on-site, and update the billing accounts to reflect the new use.
4. The required Lot Consolidation & Land Development Plan application will indicate where additional trees and landscaping are provided to mitigate the loss of the mature trees on-site.

5. The Applicants will provide bike parking on-site, either by providing racks accessible from Herr Street or North 6th Street, via a secure, indoor area, or made available to the public as racks installed along the sidewalk.

Planning Bureau staff recommends the request be **Approved** for the following reason(s):

1. The Applicant has met their burden of proof demonstrating that the approval of the Special Exceptions and Variances are warranted.
2. The project will finally enable the productive redevelopment of a site, in a manner consistent with the surrounding neighborhood, that has long been vacant since the former church was destroyed in a fire in 1995. Subsequent zoning applications allowed temporary use of the site as a parking lot, with the expectation that it would be redeveloped at some point.
3. The project is consistent with Section 7-301.2(7), which states that one purpose of the Zoning Code is to protect existing residential neighborhoods and to provide diverse housing opportunities, including housing that is affordable, and of Section 7-305.4(d) which seeks to “encourage...corridors with a mix of medium- and high-density residential and neighborhood retail activities...and pedestrian-oriented uses, while avoiding auto-related uses.”
4. The project advances City initiatives to encourage the construction of affordable housing in order to promote the public welfare of the city, particularly for the 6th Street corridor which is poised for new development as several projects near completion, such as the Federal Courthouse and State Archives.

The case was represented by Esch McCombie of McNeese Wallace & Nurick LLC, 100 Pine Street, Harrisburg, PA. 17101; Ava Goldman, 1423 Church Street, Philadelphia; Ron Secary, of Snyder, Secary & Associates, LLC 2000 Linglestown Road, Suite 304, Harrisburg, PA. 17110.

Chairman Alsberry asked if the Applicants agreed with the conditions in the case report. Mr. McCombie commented on the condition requiring vacation of the right of way. He stated that he has met with the City Solicitor and Planning Bureau staff, and wants to investigate the matter in more detail between now and the Zoning Hear Board meeting. Solicitor Gaylord stated they can continue to look into the matter between now and the Zoning Hearing Board, but suggested the applicant file the application to vacate the right-of-way. The Applicants stated they agree with the City Solicitor, and had no questions regarding the other conditions. Mr. McCombie stated that he and his team wanted to make a presentation to the Board.

Mr. McCombie began by introducing members of his team, and others who are here to support the project. Mr. McCombie provided background information regarding the project and stated they had two neighborhood meetings. Each meeting drew about twenty-five people; the feedback received from the neighbors was generally favorable.

Mr. McCombie introduced Ava Goldman to provide additional information about affordable housing aspects of the project. Ms. Goldman stated she has been working on affordable housing projects for 40 years, and is a consultant for this project. She provided the Board with a history about how the project came to fruition. She stated that this will be a 100% affordable housing project age-restricted for seniors aged 62 and over. Regarding automobile ownership, she

stated her experience is that no more than 10% of residents will own a car, and it is usually well below that. She finished her presentation, providing more detail about the neighborhood meetings.

Mr. Secary, the project engineer, provided details regarding the site plan. About 67% of the lot is zoned Neighborhood Commercial; the remainder is Medium Density Residential. The building is a four story, 40,000 square foot building that will accommodate 49 apartments. It will provide a multi-purpose room, a library, and other ancillary amenities. Pertaining to parking, he stated that the standards do not apply to the CN zoned property; the RM zoned property need to provide twenty spaces according to standards of the Code. He stated changes have been made to the site plan provided submitted earlier, the slope of the property prevents compliance to ADA standards. There are now four spaces.

Mr. McCombie closed the presentation by the providing the Board with justifications for each of the four variances:

Pertaining to parking, the reduction is justified due to the age restriction and the fact that the project will consist of one- hundred percent affordable housing units. Future residents are very unlikely to own a car. There are there are ten parking spaces available along the Herr Street frontage, to accommodate visitors, and two CAT bus line are in close proximity to the site.

Pertaining to the variance for a parking encroachment into the setback, only one parking space along Snipe Alley is affected. The configuration of the site presents a hardship which prevents strict conformance to Code standards.

Pertaining to the variance to the impervious surface standards of the Code, the split zoning on the site presents a hardship in meeting the standard. The standards do not apply to the CN portion of the site. The project would meet a blended average; however, the Code standard for RM zoned properties is that not more than 70% of the site can be impervious surface. The site plan shows 72.5 percent of that portion of the site is impervious; we believe this is a *de minimis* variance that warrants approval.

Pertaining to the variance for tree removal, only a few trees will be removed, again due to the configuration of the property. Mr. McCombie stated that is a recap of the site plan and variances. He stated he would be glad to answer any questions.

Chairman Alsberry thanked the applicants for the presentations. He stated he is well aware of the history of the site, and is a member of the Bethel AME church. He will have some questions about parking later.

He turned to the Board for questions and comments.

Councilman O'Toole had a question regarding ownership of the property.

Mr. Ben Sanders, one of the property owners, rose to speak. He stated that he contacted Mr. Ryan Sanders, who is also one of the owners of the property. Mr. Sanders could not raise the fourteen

million dollars required to do this project. He contacted Eva Goldman; their partnership has been able to raise over \$13 million to fund this project.

Commissioner O'Toole stated he wanted to know if Ryan Sanders was still a part of the project. The speaker stated yes. Commissioner O'Toole had a question about the parking variance. Mr. Knight stated the Code requirement for RM is 19.2 spaces, which was rounded up to twenty. The revised site plan submitted by the Applicant showed four spaces. Mr. Sanders the average age of residents is 82 years of age; most will not have cars. They also can provide evidence that there is adequate off-site parking to accommodate visitors and the few residents that will have cars.

Commissioner Reed she had not questions.

Commissioner Green stated she did have some parking concerns. She did have a question about the process for selecting residents of the project. Ms. Goldman replied there will be a site-based waiting list to apply. Some units will be subsidized housing and there will be a rental office to help with that process.

Commissioner Marek stated she was very pleased with the project and how it is bringing a different type of housing to the City. Regarding parking, she asked if the tower across the street would have some available spaces. There was no real response to that question. She asked Planning Bureau staff about the governing rule regarding properties that were split zoned. Mr. Knight stated that in his experience with the City, it has only happened once. He noted that the City Solicitor could discuss legal issues, but in meetings with the applicant, the Bureau took a conservative approach. Rather than a blended approach, the project was reviewed according to how many unit footprints were in each district and calculated were done in that manner. He noted in a perfect world, a map amendment would have been preferable, however the applicant was hoping to break ground in September and tax credit deadlines are also a consideration. Mr. McCombie added that if the zoning line went through a unit, it was considered to be RM and added into the parking calculation. He further stated that if the City decided to do a map amendment, they will be supportive of a rezoning to zone the entire site as CN. Ms. Goldman noted that they looked at constructing only on the CN portion of the building, but to maintain neighborhood compatibility, it was determined the best approach was to develop the entire site.

Mr. Monnier commented that he believed this type of housing was needed not only in the City of Harrisburg, but others as well. He stated he liked the design of the building. He suggested that any off-street parking be directed to 6th Street, as it is a two-way street and has a bike lane to accommodate any on-site bike infrastructure. Pertaining to the tree removal, he advised the applicant to contact the Friends of Midtown for suggestions.

Chairman Alsberry asked if anyone from the public wanted to speak for or against the project. The following people spoke:

Before members of the public spoke, Mr. Sanders rose to relate the story of the project. He stated this is his first project in the City, and there will be many more in the future that will encourage minority ownership and investment in the community.

(inaudible name and address) – stated she was a member of Bethel Church and supported the project.

Mr. Ray Burnett stated he is an employee of the City of Harrisburg, in the Building and Housing Bureau. He noted that the City manages about 600 homes; he knows what the City needs in terms of affordable housing and feels this will bring in reliable homes for the elderly. He asked the Board to approve the project and stated the Bethel community is excited about it.

Mr. Aaron Burroughs, Senior Vice-President of the Harrisburg Housing Authority stated the authority proudly supports this project.

Ms. Mary Randolph, 6741 Morton Drive, Harrisburg, stated she was a member of Bethel AME Church and asked for approval of the project.

Mary Sangers, 2317 Market Street, Harrisburg. She has been a resident of Harrisburg for over 40 years, and is a member of the Bethel AME Church. She is in favor of the project, she feels the people involved with the project are committed to building a good project, one where people will be proud to live.

Mr. Alexander, 220 Kelkar, Harrisburg, was in favor of the project, and asked for approval.

Unnamed Person, 1531 N. 3rd Street stated she has been a member of Bethel AME since 1933. She voiced support for the project.

Chairman Alsberry asked if there was anyone else. Mr. McCombie rose, and asked Ms. Goldman to talk more about the neighborhood meetings. Ms. Goldman stated they received letters of support. She further stated they advertised the meetings by provided residents in the neighborhood with a flyer.

Chairman Alsberry called for a motion. Commissioner Green moved, and Commissioner Monnier seconded to Approve the request with staff conditions. The vote was unanimous (6-0).

OTHER BUSINESS

1 Comprehensive Plan Update

Mr. Knight provided the Board with an update of the Comprehensive Plan process. He stated that two neighborhood meetings were held. One was June 9th at the Public Works Building, with about 50 people in attendance, the other on June 16th at Italian Lake, with about 30-35 people in attendance.

Commissioner Madsen is working on how to best compile and organize comments received at the meetings and in writing. Mr. Knight stated he will in contact with Commissioner Madsen during the hiatus to work on a process after hiatus, most likely with a public hearing, then proceed with a discussion and decision on the document.

Responding to a question, Solicitor Gaylord stated that administration comes back in August, the document will like be before the Council at their October meeting. Mr. Knight added that Commissioner Madsen wants the document to be brought up for a vote before consideration of the 2022 budget begins. He stated that the 2022 budget is going to be considered with implementation of the Comprehensive Plan in mind. Solicitor Gaylord stated that the new administration needs to take office before action takes place. Mr. Knight said he will be keeping the Commission informed as the process moves forward.

2. SALDO Review

Mr. Knight stated he has not received many comments and the window is still open. Commissioner Monnier stated he is getting through it. Mr. Knight suggested that a good place to start is to compare the Zoning Code and SALDO, as they were adopted about 26 years apart. This may help your review from a Commissioner's perspective, what could be streamlined, what works and doesn't work.

3. Report on Harrisburg Just Climate Action Stakeholders' Group

Commissioner Reed stated their last meeting was in June, the surveys are out and looking forward to get their report out to the State. Over the summer, they hope to get Commission feedback and finalize the document in November or December.

Chairman Alsberry called for a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Green moved, and Commissioner Monnier seconded to adjourn the meeting. The motion was passed by unanimous vote (6-0) at 8:42 PM.

ADJOURNMENT: 8:42 PM