

MINUTES

HARRISBURG PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING September 28, 2022

MEMBERS PRESENT: Shaun E. O'Toole
Jamesetta Reed
Anne Marek
Ausha Green

STAFF PRESENT: Jacob Bowen, Deputy Planning Director
Neil Grover, City Solicitor

CALL TO ORDER: 6:15 PM

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Variance & Special Exception Applications for Capitol Heights (Phase Two), located on forty-one (41) parcels on nine proposed sites in the blocks generally bounded by Hamilton Street to North, North 5th Street to the east, Harris Street to the South, and Logan Street to the West, zoned Residential Medium-Density (RM), filed by Chris Bryce & David Long with Midtown Redevelopment, LLC, to request various zoning relief from use and development regulations required for the construction of four townhomes, seventy-six (76) multifamily dwelling units, 9,557 square feet of commercial space, and 95 off-street parking spaces.

Mr. Bowen noted that the purpose of the Special Meeting was to provide the Board with the opportunity to go over the proposed projects given the overall complexity of the proposal. He noted that the Planning Bureau provided a project brief which includes any general concerns related to each project site and what the Applicant is proposing. He stated that the intent is to have the Planning Commission potentially vote on the proposed projects at the next scheduled meeting.

The case was represented by Matthew Long and Chris Bryce (2901 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110) with Midtown Redevelopment LLC, and Matt Krupp (aka the Applicant).

The Applicant stated that all lots in the project have been vacant lots, most since Hurricane Agnes in 1972 and will provide infill development. He stated that the project is a continuation of Capitol Heights (Phase One) which will be breaking ground in October since the Land Development is complete. He stated the proposal includes three mixed use buildings with apartments above commercial, three 16 unit apartment complexes, one 12 unit affordable housing complex and four affordable townhomes with parking scattered throughout.

Commissioner O'Toole asked if there are any comments from the public. The Commissioner noted the public will have the opportunity to make further comments. There were no comments.

Mr. Bowen clarified that Building One was approved as a separate application as 1610 North 4th Street. Commissioner Marek asked if Building One was for senior living. The Applicant stated that it was.

Building Two

The Applicant stated building two included a first floor commercial, six 2-bedroom units, and a surface parking lot behind the proposed building with 12 spaces; 6 spaces used for the building (residential units) and 2 spaces for the commercial space (the remaining spaces are dedicated to different sites within the proposed project).

Mr. Bowen noted that the Planning Bureau will be recommending that the building be approved with conditions that will be provided at the next meeting. He stated that Judd Alley will need to be vacated and that the Applicant should work with residents that may be currently utilizing the alley. He noted it appears that at least one resident is currently using the alley for rear access. One condition will be to require the Applicant to provide an easement to enable future access. The Applicant noted that they are working with the Solicitor of the Zoning Hearing Board to determine if the project can be voted on a per building basis or if buildings can be excluded by condition as opposed to a yes or no vote (on the entire project). Mr. Grover stated that his office has been in discussions regarding how to vote on the package. Commissioner Marek asked for clarification if those discussions were with the Zoning Hearing Board Solicitor. Mr. Grover stated that they were. Commissioner Marek noted that voting by building would be the best approach. Mr. Grover noted that they (the Solicitor) is open to voting by building. Commissioner Marek noted that some of the buildings impact each other including the parking.

Commissioner O'Toole inquired about which relief was being sought for the specific building. Mr. Bowen noted that because all of the sites are located within the RM district relief is needed for the multifamily use with the exception of the townhomes for all sites. He stated the relief will be needed for the impervious lot coverage if impervious pavers cannot be used for the parking lot. He stated that it will be a condition that impervious pavers are used, but that some issues can come up at a site regarding geology. He stated there is also various relief from the Development Standards such as setback encroachment. He noted that the lots are unique and would be difficult to develop providing justification for relief.

Commissioner O'Toole inquired about the required setbacks. Mr. Bowen noted that the front setback is to match the prevailing block of any existing buildings or a minimum of five feet if no buildings exist. He stated there is rear setback of 10 feet and four feet in the side. Commissioner O'Toole noted the request is only for one foot of relief in the side.

Commissioner Marek asked if conversations have begun with neighbors in regards to the street vacation. The Applicant stated that he did approach a neighbor that was parked at the property last summer. The Applicant stated that he informed the individual that they would still be able to

access the area through removing the existing road and putting a new one that would still allow access.

Building Three

The Applicant gave a summary of the proposed building noting that there has been some interest from daycare centers. The Applicant stated the proposed building will be adjacent to a new community garden area which he noted was not illustrated on the map. The Applicant stated that part of the land could be used for a playground if a daycare use were to operate at the proposed site.

Commissioner O'Toole asked for clarification of the project site's location. The Applicant stated that the project site is located at North 4th and Hamilton Street. Mr. Bowen noted the Planning Bureau will be recommending approval for the site considering the challenges of the lot related to dimensions. He also stated the building will be appropriate to the surrounding urban form regarding the setbacks and height.

The Applicant noted that they would work with City Engineering to have a drop off point for a daycare center along North 4th Street if that is the use to occupy the proposed building. Mr. Bowen noted that the proposed building will be attaching to an existing structure which will require the Applicant to coordinate with neighboring property owners.

Building Four

The Applicant gave a summary of the proposed building. The Applicant clarified that the proposed structure is located at Hamilton and North 4th Street. Mr. Bowen noted that the proposed rear parking along the back alley of the project site is appropriate and is the intended function of the reconfigured parcels. He noted that some variances are needed for setback encroachments into the rear yard which is consistent with the development pattern of the adjacent row homes.

Commissioner Marek asked if the rear access is considered a driveway or a City Street. Mr. Bowen noted he does not recall if the rear alley is private or a public. Mr. Bowen noted that he can confirm with City Engineering if the alley is private or public. Mr. Bowen stated that regardless of ownership the Zoning Code allows to design parking lots to back into an alley. The Applicant noted that the alleys did not exist prior to the recordation of the Land Development in 1991.

Commissioner Marek asked if the Applicant began coordinating with CRW. The Applicant stated that they have not. She noted that it might be beneficial to start coordinating with CRW as the project overall covers multiple lots. She stated that some areas may be able to accommodate additional storm water.

Commissioner O'Toole stated that the public is permitted to make comments at any time or they can wait. There were no comments.

Building Five Through Eight

The Applicant gave a summary of the proposed building noting that a 40-space parking lot will be included that will provide parking to both the proposed building and adjacent buildings. Mr. Bowen noted that for project sites five through eight the currently existing parcels could accommodate townhomes by right with their current configuration, including off-street parking from the year. Mr. Bowen noted challenges likely before Zoning (Zoning Hearing Board) given the Applicant will have to demonstrate hardship for the request variances. He stated as submitted; the Planning Bureau will be recommending a continuance for buildings five through eight given the justification for the proposed developments have not been provided with the Application.

Mr. Bowen stated that it would be more appropriate to develop the sites with by right townhomes which is both the position of the Planning Bureau and through discussions with the administration. Mr. Bowen recommended that the Applicant separate buildings five through eight as a different application so the other project sites can proceed through the process.

Commissioner Reed inquired about the number of townhomes that could be constructed by right on the specific project site. Mr. Bowen stated that he does not recall without looking at the County Parcel Viewer.

The Applicant noted that they will be providing additional justification for the requested variances for buildings five through eight. The Applicant stated that the existing infrastructure is damaged due to the length in time the infrastructure has been abandoned. He stated that one developer went bankrupt trying to develop the sites and the other developer almost went bankrupt trying to develop the sites.

Mr. Bowen suggested proving some type of documentation that present the challenges to develop the sites. Mr. Grover stated that documentation will be essential, and that anecdotal statements will not work. He noted that the damage should have been documented. The Applicant stated that they can provide information from a civil engineer. He stated that an aspect of the overall project is to meet the City's goal of have a project 20% affordable which needs which can be reached by lower square footage cost through higher density.

Commissioner Marek asked if there are any affordable buildings as part of the project. The Applicant noted that they will provide affordable units under the fair market rent guidelines. He stated that there will be four affordable townhomes and a mix of affordability at other sites. He stated that the affordable units add an additional cost. Mr. Bowen noted that the Applicant is not going through the formal Affordable Housing process under the City Ordinance. He stated that this is understandable considering the legislation is pending an amendment. He stated that many questions will come up during the Land Development process before Council. Mr. Bowen stated that the Applicant should look into ways to formally reserve the units as affordable.

Commissioner O'Toole noted that the current conversation has related to building five through eight and that there is limited reason to discuss the other buildings. Mr. Bowen noted that many of the specific concerns will be more relevant during the Land Development process, but it is

helpful to discuss any possible issues as early as possible. He stated that there were some differences between lot diminutions on the Applicants site plans and County information. He stated that it is very likely some of the measurements are incorrect. Mr. Bowen encouraged the Applicant to have the lots surveyed in case the inaccuracies effect the zoning requests, which could cause further delay to the project.

Commissioner O'Toole clarified for the record that building sites six, seven, and eight are on the south side of Clinton Street between 4th and 5th Street. Mr. Bowen noted that building eight is proposing to construct the proposed building over a right-of-way which requires a street vacation. He stated that would be concerning during the street vacation process because this would create a dead-end street. The Applicant noted that they would not be vacating the street.

Mr. Bowen noted that the proposed site plan has a measurement indicated at 104 feet while the accurate distance appears to include the right-of-way to the south of the parcels. Commissioner Marek asked for clarification regarding traffic flow of the alley. The Applicant stated that the alley was not large enough for two-way traffic. The Applicant confirmed that the traffic flow is one way. Mr. Bowen noted that the proposed removal of the southern part of the alley could prevent the site from being developed.

Commissioner Marek asked if a Traffic Impact Study was need for the project. Mr. Bowen noted that the overall project will likely require Traffic Impact Study as part of the Land Development Process.

The Applicant noted that the site plan (for building eight) is showing a building size of 92 by 42 feet which would fit on the site. He stated that all sites were field measured and that it is unlikely any sites have inaccurate measurements. He noted that if the measurement were incorrect the building could be reconfigured to have a greater depth.

Logan Street & Clinton Street Townhomes

Mr. Bowen noted that the townhomes are a by right use, but zoning relief is needed for the requirement to have a 1500 square foot lot area per dwelling. He stated that the Applicant is creating lots closer into conformance with the Zoning Code. He also noted that that the proposed seatback encroachments would be consistent with nearby townhomes.

Mr. Bowen asked for clarification if the townhomes are detached or attached given the rendering shows detached dwellings while the site plan shows attached dwellings. He stated this could affect the requested zoning relief needed. The Applicant clarified that the proposed townhomes will be attached.

Commissioner O'Toole asked if the townhomes will be across from building two. The Applicant noted that two townhomes would sit behind Building Two and the other two would be adjacent to the new community garden on the Logan Street side. Mr. Bowen noted it was appreciated that the Applicant has the townhome matching the existing front seatbacks of the surrounding townhomes.

Commissioner O'Toole asked if there was any comment from the public. A resident from the community (name and address was not provided) noted the meeting provided clarification on the project especially for building 5 through 8. She noted that she was happy buildings five through eight had not been voted on. She noted issues with the past developer. The resident noted concerns with constructing four identical apartment buildings that does not match the character of the surrounding homes. She noted the six townhomes will be an "island" of the proposed buildings. The resident stated concerns about the road being one-way streets in relation to the proposed buildings (five through eight). She noted the need for housing but believes that there should be middle ground with smaller or lesser apartments. The resident noted that the proposed project would change the neighborhood and that she would feel unconformable and would move.

- 2. Variance & Special Exception Application for MarketPlace Midtown**, located on fifty-one (51) parcels on 11 proposed sites in the blocks generally bounded by Reily Street to the north, Fulton Street to the east, Sayford Street to the south and James Street to the west, zoned Residential Medium-Density (RM), filed by Chris Bryce & David Long with Midtown Redevelopment, LLC, to request various zoning relief from use and development regulations required for the construction of eighteen (18) townhomes, forty-four (44) multifamily dwelling units, Food Hall, 2,875 square feet of commercial space, and eighty-four (84) off-street parking spaces.

The case was represented by Matthew Long and Chris Bryce (2901 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110) with Midtown Redevelopment LLC, and Matt Krupp (aka the Applicant).

Building One

The Applicant gave a brief overview of the project noting that there had been significant back and forth between Geoffrey Knight and the Planning Bureau, especially for the parking situation. The Applicant stated from an engineering standpoint there were limited concerns about the parking set up. He stated there was a study called the Three P's Study; Pottstown, Pottsville, and Philadelphia that addressed the safety factors of similar style parking in an urban area. The Applicant noted that the parking set up is identical to the parking on Fulton Street one block away, the same style parking at the Broad Street Market and all of State Street. The Applicant stated that more parking will be added as a net gain. The Applicant stated that a previous development plan that proposed to have the parking in a different location involved units that were around 500 square feet each. He noted that the current proposal would allow for family style units with two bedrooms.

The Applicant expressed that a new public right-of-way would be created through a sidewalk in front of the building that would go around the parking. He added that a plant screening could be added to prevent pedestrians from walking behind cars. Mr. Grover inquired if the Applicant intended to initiate a dedication for the sidewalk. The Applicant confirmed that they do and that the civil engineer advised him that it could be done though it would not be normal.

Mr. Bowen noted that the Planning Bureau would be recommending denial as configured. He stated that the other locations of similar parking in the public right-of-way are considered public

spaces and cannot be designated as private parking. Mr. Bowen stated that the street is not considered an alley and therefore the backing of vehicles is not permitted. He noted a sidewalk easement onto private property is not appropriate given the increase in sidewalk length and the encouragement of having people walk into the Street. Mr. Bowen noted the extensive zoning relief needed to develop the parking lot as proposed which is likely related to issues of having the proposed design. Mr. Bowen also noted that the proposed setback in the front was extensive and not an appropriate urban building placement. Mr. Bowen noted that the site could be reconfigured with possibly lesser units to accommodate parking on the site and request lesser zoning relief. He stated that the Applicant used the same building design across all project sites.

Commissioner O'Toole noted that Geoffrey Knight is consistent in regards to proposed parking in front of the YMCA. The Applicant noted that there is limited traffic on the subject street due to limited buildings around the site. Mr. Grover asked if the Applicant has to project future traffic from the new buildings proposed in the neighborhood. Mr. Bowen noted that from a zoning perspective the Applicant will have to justify hardship for the relief being sought.

The Applicant stated that the HOA is acceptable of the proposed design and that they want the parking. Commissioner Marek noted discrepancies for the number of spaces that would be lost on the street. The Applicant stated that five spaces would be lost. The Applicant noted that the Planning Bureau wants additional parking removed from the application. Mr. Bowen noted that primary concerns were for the subject building. The Applicant noted that Fulton Street has the same configuration only 200 feet away from the site.

The Applicant noted the vehicle charging stations recently installed along 3rd Street encourages vehicles to park into a busier street. The Applicant noted that if safety was a concern the spaces would have likely not been constructed. Mr. Bowen again noted from a variance justification standpoint, having something done in another location is not a justification. Commissioner Marek noted that she was not opposed to the proposed layout understanding that there are still some concerns regarding the look of the proposed layout. ‘

Building Two

The Applicant gave a brief overview of the proposed building noting that the buildings for the project were designed specifically for the overall project to allow for two-bedroom units. The Applicant noted that no building will be identical in appearance. Mr. Grover noted that the Applicant will have to present why they must have a specific number of units at the site regarding addressing to request the least amount of relief possible.

Mr. Bowen recommended that all buildings be built up to the prevailing setback of each site to have a more appropriate urban form and more useful space at the rear of the building. He noted that the lots are challenging to develop, and that the Planning Bureau general supports the project.

Building Three

The Applicant give a brief summery of the proposed project noting that the building will not have on-site parking given the design of the lots. The Applicant noted that the lots are very shallow and that additional lots need to be acquired to make the building work. Mr. Bowen inquired if the site is changing from what was originally proposed within the Application. The Applicant confirmed that the site is not changing from what is being proposed. Mr. Bowen noted some discrepancies between the Applicant's site measurements and what is included on parcel measurements (Dauphin County Deed information). Mr. Grover noted that proof of lot acquisitions will need to be provided within the application package. The Applicant noted that all lots to be acquired (other than HRA) properties are from the same seller. Mr. Grover noted that the selling will need a binding agreement for the Zoning Hearing Board.

Building Four

Mr. Bowen noted that the Applicant is proposing a "Food Hall" which is not defined in the Zoning Code. He noted that the request is for a use not specifically prohibited which is a special exception. He noted that the original request was for a Farmers Market, which is limited to the sale of produce as defined within the Zoning Code. Because the Applicant is proposing food services with different tenants the more appropriate use would be a Food Hall.

Mr. Bowen noted that the use is appropriate given the proximity of the Broad Street Market. Mr. Bowen noted that the parking requirements are set to the most similar use when a specific use is not defined within the Zoning Code. He noted that the most similar use is a Farmers Market which requires two spaces per tenant with five tenants being proposed on site requiring 10 off-street parking space. Mr. Bowen noted the relief is for five off-street parking spaces as five spaces will be dedicated to the proposed parking lot.

The Applicant noted that they have rehabbed two additional buildings for expanding businesses from the Broad Street Market that wanted to extend their hours of operation. The Applicant noted that they have two tenants interested in the site with one being Tacos Amigos for a possible second location. The Applicant stated that the project has been well received by the public and the HOA. He noted that regarding the parking relief there is a lot of foot traffic and the use will likely pick up from customers from the Market and that there will be available parking on the days that the market is closed.

Commissioner Marek noted that the proposed building seemed to be similar in design to the Mill Works building. The Commissioner inquired about how the parking arrangement will work at other properties given the use will be for the public. The Applicant noted that the specific spaces will be assigned with markings for spaces dedicated to the specific use. Commissioner Marek noted that Sayford Street does not have public parking, but there are public parking lots within a close proximity.

Building Five

Mr. Bowen gave a brief overview of the proposal. He noted that the Applicant will likely require additional zoning relief for the commercial portion of the proposed building. Mr. Bowen noted

that a multifamily use would be appropriate at the site. Mr. Bowen recommend that an exterior rendering be included for the specific building.

The Applicant noted that the building will provide workforce housing (at workforce housing rental rates) the Applicant stated that they can provide floor plans and square footages for the proposed units at the next meeting. Mr. Grover asked for clarification regarding the Applicant needing to work with the property owner at 331 Reily Street. Mr. Bowen noted that the comment is in regards to the proposed structure being attached to 331 Reily Street. Mr. Bowen stated that the Applicant will need to coordinate with the neighboring property through the process of attaching to the structure.

The Applicant stated that the property is too narrow facing Reily Street to provided even two townhomes. He stated that the lots are very challenging to accommodate development. Mr. Bowen stated that he agreed with the assessment and the zoning relief would be needed to develop the site. The Applicant stated that there is a vision to have Reily Street as more of a mixed-use street.

Marion Street Townhomes

Mr. Bowen noted that the Applicant should provide more details on the proposed site plan to include items such as the front porches as indicated on the proposed renderings which could affect the seatbacks. Mr. Bowen recommended that the townhomes be moved up to the prevailing front seatback to match the existing homes and possibly provide parking to the rear of the homes. The Applicant stated that there is not enough space for rear parking given each parcel has an easement in the portion of the rear yards containing a road. Mr. Bowen noted that moving the homes forward would create a more functioning rear yard if not used for parking. Mr. Bowen stated as a general comment for all townhomes was that they be built up to the front seatback.

The Applicant stated that there is an eight-foot front seatback from the front porch given they are not shown on the site plan. The Applicant was agreeable to having a four-foot seatback which would create a 13-foot rear yard. The Applicant noted that the townhomes would be affordable. Mr. Bowen noted the requested relief is not for the use but from the Development Standards.

Commissioner O'Toole asked if affordable is defined as workforce housing. The Applicant clarified that it was not workforce housing but affordable. Mr. Bowen noted that how the units will remine affordable and defining affordability will be things to address in the Land Development process. He encouraged the Applicant to provide a plan on how the units will remain affordable. Commissioner Marek inquired it would be appropriate to incorporate the affordability aspect into city documents. Mr. Grover noted that there was a proposed amendment in front of Council (for the Affordable Housing Ordinance). Mr. Bowen noted that the process is still being worked out.

Mr. Grover noted that there is limited legislation available with other municipalities and that there is a recently adopted state law in June which makes some benefits for affordable housing. The Applicant stated that there are challenges with the ordinance. Mr. Bowen suggested that the Applicant have estimated rental rates prepared before going in front of Council.

North 4th Street North End Townhomes

Mr. Bowen noted that it is recommended that the buildings be built up to the front setbacks and that the Applicant should double check the measurements of the site given any issues could affect the zoning relief being requested. He noted that there was some discrepancies between county information and the Applicants site plan. He noted that the rendering likely shows a smaller front setback than what's presented on the site plans. The Applicant noted that they will update the site plans to include the porches. Commissioner Reed asked if the homes are two bedrooms. The Applicant confirmed that they were and that the townhomes on Capital Heights are three bedrooms.

Commissioner Reed asked if the homes abut building three. The Applicant confirmed that they were. Mr. Bowen clarified that the homes would be abutting building two not three.

North 4th Street South End Townhomes

Mr. Bowen noted staff comments from the south end townhomes are the same as for the north end townhomes given the lot sizes and building sizes are the same. The Applicant stated that they would be amendable to have the homes have a four-foot front setback to allow for a larger front yard.

Commissioner Marek asked what the need was for the parking spaces being angled. The Applicant stated that the spaces can be changed to 90 degrees. Mr. Bowen stated that the Code does not permit the parking spaces as designed. The Applicant stated that a brick walkway was also included in the plan, so the residents do not have to walk around the block (to access the proposed six space parking lot).

Commissioner Marek asked if screening needs to be provided along the proposed walkway. Mr. Bowen stated that because the walkway is technically development screening should be provided. Mr. Bowen noted that more details of the walkway will need to be included with the Land Development Plan. Commissioner Marek asked if lighting would be provided. The Applicant stated that there would be lighting on the back side of the building.

Six-Space Marion Street Parking Lot

Mr. Bowen noted that the proposed parking spaces should not be angled. He also noted that the proposed parking lot has sufficient space to accommodate a plant screening which would obviate a portion of the variance.

Mr. Bowen noted that the proposed lot being between two buildings might create visibility issues. The Applicant stated there would be some extra visibility created from the wide sidewalks and additional buffer area created from making the spaces 90 degrees. The Applicant noted that they will include bollards and a vegetative screening. Mr. Bowen noted that the existing buildings would help buffer headlight glare to the surrounding residential properties.

Mr. Bowen noted that variance for the use of a parking lot as a standalone use requires a variance. He stated that for all parking lots within the application a use variance is required. Mr. Bowen noted that the use variance can be challenging in front of zoning regarding the justification. He stated more information will be helpful for the variance request.

Mr. Grover inquired about the ownership of the parking lot. The Applicant confirmed that the lot would be owned by a new HOA. Mr. Bowen noted that more details will be needed for Land Development process will be useful.

Eight-Space Calder Street Parking Lot

Mr. Bowen noted that the Planning Bureau was unsure of the exact properties to be included for the proposed project site given parcels number were not provided. He stated that based on the lot measurements it appears 1405 Marion Street is part of the proposed project site. The Applicant confirmed that the site plan was illustrated incorrectly, and the site will not include 1405 Marion Street. He stated that the plan sets were placed on the incorrect parcels and that the measurements are off. He stated that there is sufficient space for the proposed configuration with a reduced buffer in the front of the proposed lot. Mr. Bowen stated that the width presented was 64 feet. The Applicant confirmed that the correct width was 44 feet.

Mr. Bowen stated that the Applicant should consider reconfiguring the parking lot to have the access from the private easement to reduce the need for a curb cut onto Calder Street which would preserve the on-street parking supply. Mr. Bowen noted that the Applicant needs to revise the site plans to be accurate as it would change the amount of zoning relief being requested.

The Applicant asked for clarification regarding the staff comment to construct townhomes onto the project site. Mr. Bowen noted that a different use would be more appropriate for the site but was aware of residents concerns regarding parking.

44 Space Parking Lot

Mr. Bowen noted that there is an active dwelling unit at 1338 Williams Street on the proposed site that will be demolished. Mr. Bowen noted that the Applicant will need to have permission for requesting the zoning relief from the property owner. Mr. Grover noted that the issue of property ownership will be an issue at zoning. The Applicant stated that the lot is owned by the same owner of other properties within the overall project.

Mr. Bowen noted that the Planning Bureau recommends that the configuration of the lot be modified to reduce curb cuts through internal connections of the proposed lots. He stated that some on-street spaces would be persevered. The Applicant noted that after meeting with Mr. Knight the proposed changes would result in the loss of eight parking spaces. Mr. Bowen stated that a condition will be added to reconfigure the parking lot. The Applicant stated that there would be a net loss of up to eight spaces to preserve two off-street parking spaces.

Richard Gribble (1704 Fox Hallow Lane Susquehanna township) stated that he formally lived in the city. Mr. Gribble expressed gratitude for having the meeting and that the Applicant really

cares about the city. He noted that there have been many empty lots in the area since the 1970's. Mr. Gribble suggested that the City add parking lots. He stated that there is an opportunity to construct on the lots. He suggested that alternative approaches should come from the City when someone tries to develop a significant portion of the City. He stated much higher costs from the challenges of the process. He expressed general frustrations about the process. Mr. Grover noted that they must follow the law and that there is a process to change the law. Mr. Grover noted that ignoring the law will cause a project to fail in front of the Zoning Hearing Board. Mr. Gribble stated that the process needs to change. He stated that the process is taking too long and that things should be expedited. He stated that from an urban planning approach the project has what the City needs noting that the Applicant has not made money from the project so far.

Commissioner O'Toole noted that the purpose of the special meeting was to speed the process up. Mr. Bowen noted that the City is expending resources to have extra meetings.

Albert Kopelman (1319 Marion Street) stated that he has ran the Sandwich Man for over 25 years. He stated that he does not agree with the parking situation on Marion Street. Mr. Kopelman stated that he knows the street very well having also lived on the street for 40 years. He noted that the street fills up with cars from the Broad Street Market and events from Mill Works. He also noted that events from HMAC adds demand to the street. He stated that there have been many accidents within the area and that people sometimes drive-up Marion Street from the wrong way. He stated that he agrees with Mr. Bowen regarding the parking situation. He expressed general concerns regarding parking. He noted that there should be extra scrutiny in making sure the housing will be maintained as affordable.

Commissioner O'Toole noted that Council is working on the Affordable Housing Ordinance. Mr. Bowen noted that at the next meeting conditions will be prepared for all the project sites with outstanding concerns in regards to building five through eight (Capital Height) meeting the criteria for variances and concerns regarding building one. He stated that a more in-depth case report will be prepared considering that all projects need to be reviewed equally.

Mr. Grover stated that the Applicant indicated that they will provide updated materials. Mr. Grover inquired if the updated materials will be reviewed to address concerns. Mr. Bowen noted that there is insufficient time to review revised materials in the updated case report. Commissioner O'Toole clarified that there will be an additional meeting to vote on the project. Mr. Grover inquired if the Applicant will need to present the project again for the board members that are not currently present.

Commissioner O'Toole inquired about other items on the next meeting's agenda. Mr. Bowen noted that there will be four additional items on the agenda.

ADJOURNMENT: 8:29 PM

Commissioner Reed moved, and Commissioner Marek seconded the motion, to adjourn. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (4-0).