

City of Pittsburgh
Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes

September 6, 2022 at 2:05 PM, Meeting called to order by Acting Chair Burton-Faulk

In Attendance

Acting Chairwoman LaShawn Burton-Faulk
 Secretary, Holly Dick

Becky Mingo
 Rachel O'Neill
 Dina (Free) Blackwell

Not Present

Chairwoman Christine Mondor
 Commissioner Brown

Jennifer Askey
 Sabina Deitrick

Staff Present

Corey Layman, Zoning Administrator
 Kate Rakus, Principal Planner
 Mary Russo, Recording Secretary
 Deputy Director, Andrew Dash

Anne Kramer
 Kevin Kunak
 Joe Fraker
 William Gregory
 Katherine Reed

Index

Item	Page Number
1. DCP-ZDR-2021-14139 – 350 Forbes Avenue	2
2. DCP-ZDR-2022-05156 – 429-433 Wood Street	5
3. DCP-MPZC-2021-01727 – Carnegie Mellon University	3
4. Plan of Lots –	4
1. DCP-LOT-2022-01098, Masette Road, Major Consolidation, Fairywood	
2. DCP-LOT-2022-01042, Progress Street, Major Consolidation, Troy Hill	
3. DCP-LOT-2022-01026, Carrington Street, Minor Consolidation, Central Northside	
4. DCP-LOT-2022-01029, Shaler Street, Minor Subdivision, Duquesne Heights	
5. DCP-LOT-2022-01051, Saint Michael Street, Minor Consolidation, South Side Slopes	
6. DCP-LOT-2022-01062, Seward Street, Minor Subdivision, Duquesne Heights	
7. DCP-LOT-2022-01025, 41st Street, Minor Subdivision, Central Lawrenceville	
8. DCP-LOT-2022-01101, Camp Street, Minor Subdivision, Upper Hill	
9. DCP-LOT-2022-01100, Goettman Street, Minor Subdivision, Troy Hill	
10. DCP-LOT-2022-01626, Cedar Avenue, Minor Lot Line Revision, East Allegheny	
11. DCP-LOT-2022-00361, Kent Way, Minor Subdivision, Upper Lawrenceville	

A. Approval of Minutes

Minutes for 05/31/22 and 06/14/22 – Ms Kramer stated that staff is still working through corrections. Each set of minutes for 06/23/8/22, 07/02/22, and 07/26/22 was approved separately.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve the 06/28/22 Minutes.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: Ms Mingo
 IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo
 ABSTAINED: Ms O'Neill
 CARRIED

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve the 07/02/22 Minutes.

MOVED BY: Ms Blackwell
 SECONDED BY: Ms Dick
 IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick
 ABSTAINED: Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill
 CARRIED

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approve the 07/26/22 Minutes.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick
 SECONDED BY: Ms O'Neill
 IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Dick,
 ABSTAINED: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

The Commission is in receipt of the following correspondence:

- DCP-MPZC-2021-01727 – Carnegie Mellon University Institutional Master Plan
 - Shadyside Action Coalition
 - C. Leon Sherman
 - Alan Ackerman
- DCP-MPZC-2021-10110 – 2028 Fifth Avenue – *NOTE: this is a future Project Development Plan, but is not currently scheduled for Planning Commission Briefing*
 - Uptown Partners of Pittsburgh
- DCP-ZDR-2020-04322 - 24 S. 18th St., South Side Flats – *NOTE: this is a Site Plan Review case*
 - South Shore Place HOA
- DCP-MPZC-2022-00702 Larimer Zone Change Petition Ac
 - Larimer Consensus Group

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk proposed a motion to appoint Commissioner Dick as Secretary as Commissioner Mingo is stepping down from that role but continuing as a Commissioner.

MOVED BY: Ms Mingo
 SECONDED BY: Ms O'Neill
 IN FAVOR:, Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill
 APPROVED

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk acknowledged Ms Mingo's service as secretary and welcomed Commissioner Dick as Secretary

C. Development Reviews (See Attachment C for staff reports)

1. Hearing and Action: DCP-ZDR-2021-14139 – 350 Forbes Avenue Amendment to PDP 15-004 for Point Park Playhouse Urban Open Space Central Business District Neighborhood
 Ms Rakus presented the project for the City of Pittsburgh. This is an amendment to PDP 15-04 for Point Park University Playhouse project in 2015. The playhouse was originally approved with required urban open spaces at ground level and the second floor, with a condition from the Planning Commission to install signage indicating the space is open to the public. The property owner was cited for installing signs stating the space was closed to the public in September of 2021. That signage has since been removed. The applicant proposed adding fencing and gates that will be closed overnight. New signage will be added saying the space is open to the public.

The fencing and gates are a significant change to the urban open space. The zoning administrator has determined this is not approvable as a minor amendment to the project development plan. The change must return to Planning Commission for approval. A Development Activities Meeting was not required because the application existed before the Registered Community Organizations were formed. The applicant went to a Development Activities Meeting on August 11th, 2022. The fencing and gates were reviewed at Staff Design Review in January of 2022. Staff recommended lower fence and gate heights or other design options that better align with the existing building. The applicant chose to proceed to Planning Commission with the current design with two different height options, the original height from Design Review at six and a half feet and a lower option at five and a half feet. Staff still has concerns that both fence designs without any other design changes remain inhospitable for pedestrians. Staff believe there likely exists a design that would improve overnight security of this urban open space without the harshness of these current fencing proposals. With the full PDP criteria in the Planning Commission report and the applicant's submission of their statement of compliance with the project development plan, Staff cited two criteria that the proposed development must adequately address: 1) protections of views and view corridors for the urban open space; and 2) the functionality of urban open space. Staff feels it will likely discourage the use of open space thereby directly lessening its function. Staff recommends the Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh deny without prejudice the project development application for Point Park University. Staff would be happy to continue to work with the applicant on this application.

Shawn Gallagher along with Chris Haupt, and Chris Hill were present for Point Park Univ. Mr Gallagher stated they are seeking to amend the prior project development plan approved for the playhouse open space requirement. The plaza has become a problem for the university to police after normal business hours, making it necessary to add a fence and gate to close it off after hours. The plaza was approved under the zoning code's urban open space regulations which specifically allow for a fence as long as it is open during normal business hours. Under either option of proposed fencing, it will be open from 8 a.m. to 9 p.m. every day, which includes normal business hours. The fencing and proposed signage all are permitted under the zoning code. Mr Gallagher respectfully requested approval of the application.

Mr Haupt presented for Point Park Univ. The existing open urban space's sunken courtyard has a scissor-accessible ramp integrated into a staircase that also serves as seating. There are two openings to the far left and far right of the space that the public can enter from the sidewalk. The proposed fence that matches existing railings and fencing will be between the piers with two operable gates that will be open during the hours that were mentioned. The higher option fencing is designed as if they were windows like a two-to-one-third to two-thirds ratio that lines up with one of the mortar joints in the stone. The lower option drops about a foot and is more open in response the comments received at the last review. It is a deterrent, but it is not as high as the previous scheme. The proposed signage will be in three locations on each of the piers so that people know the hours of operation. The existing bike racks will remain.

Mr Hill discussed safety issues. Some of the issues that the university in policing this open space area over the past three or four years since 2019 involved the PPU public safety department for loitering, public drunkenness, and several other issues, most happening after hours. In some cases it was happening while students were at the playhouse overnight doing presentations. Lighting was increased at the entrances, and there were more patrols at that area overnight, PPU increased the foot patrols, bike patrols, and more car patrol, which have all proven ineffective. Mr Hill cited 217 incidents so far in 2022.

Mr Gallagher stated there are no objective standards, and Planning has proposed something that the university would not be able to comply with.

Ms Rakus replied there are related standards in the project development criteria. First, the proposed development must adequately address protection of views and view corridors including, if applicable, important views along major public streets; views from surrounding private properties; and views to and from significant public places such as parks open space or riverfronts. Fourth Avenue is a major street and view corridor downtown into Market Square. The fences appear inhospitable to pedestrians. Second, the proposed development must adequately address the location, development, and functions of open space, including but not limited to additional open space were necessary for light and air to the property. Additional open space is desirable to lessen pedestrian impacts and increase safety or maintenance of existing open spaces which serve these same purposes.

Ms Rakus commented there may be a solution where the Commission feels like the current design is inhospitable to pedestrians. There may be a scenario we could continue to work on with a lower intensity, less fencing, that might be more hospitable to pedestrians.

Mr Layman interjected as a representative of the Department this is a significant design challenge where the ultimate goal of a public open space is to be welcoming and inviting. While the Department is not in the business of dictating what a design solution should be, we understand the public safety and property maintenance and management concerns. What has been presented to date still does not achieve the sort of dual needs and goals as we see it.

Mr Gallagher asked what other alternatives could be proposed other than what is before Commission right now?

Mr Layman pointed out he was not sure about when the wooden benches and fences were installed or the process involved, or if they were part of the original design, or if it was originally all open and they were later additions. Also, the signage is a requirement, and he doesn't think the signage alone resolves the problem. Mr Layman believed that what staff was responding to is adding a substantial amount of fencing changes the character of the space to something that's closed up.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked if the presentation was over and then asked for public testimony. Mr Fraker recognized Jason Hobbs.

Mr Hobbs commented that he would like to see a little more consideration given to the public safety elements. As someone who has little kids, he is reluctant to bring his kids downtown as he has done in the past because it is often unsafe. He appreciates that Point Park is trying to make their environment both safe and welcoming at once and understands the city's concerns. He would like to see some credence given to the public safety concerns.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked for Commissioners' questions or comments

Ms Mingo commented that things frequently change and perception matters. She advised PPU to take a very careful look at their drawings and see that the black fence looks like they are trying to keep something in or something out. She suggested consulting with their marketing department or seek some help from others with more design expertise. She also suggested looking carefully at how George Washington University and New York City University dealt with similar situations. Also, she commented about brilliant solutions to both help with public safety through design elements. She believed this can be solved by design and wished they had spent more time thinking through and getting more design expertise.

Ms Dick commented about the difficulty in policing this property at night and pointed out another major problem for downtown, the need for public restrooms in various places downtown. She thinks it is something that the city should think about in the future.

Ms O'Neill commented that while she appreciated the design and the thoughts that went into echoing what is already there. Based on the Commission's comments it is not welcoming and gives a cage-like appearance and thought the design could be a little more thoughtful. Ms O'Neill suggested looking at EQT Plaza's gate fence that fully retracts during the day. She also suggested that, since it is a playhouse, incorporating something related to what was going on there or some art. She sympathized fully with the public safety issues, but the black fence is really giving a lot of pause.

Ms Blackwell agreed with the other commissioners and suggested natural plants because it's beautiful, good for the air, not offensive, and not as expensive. Ms Blackwell mentioned PNC at Wood Street, citing something green would match other buildings downtown. She commented that people would see it more as decoration or an upgrade instead of keeping them out, it goes along with the storm water, and will be welcoming and friendly while also protecting their property.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk agreed with the Commissioners. She felt that there is work to be done and wished PPU had a chance to sit down with staff and work through things and thought more work needed to be put into it.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked if Commissioner were ready to make a motion based on the recommended motion.

Ms O'Neill asked if the recommended motion could be reread.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh denies without prejudice the project development plan application DCP-ZDR-2021-14139 filed by Buchanan, Ingersoll and Rooney on behalf of Point Park University.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

Ms O'Neill interjected and asked if the applicant was interested in tabling the motion for two weeks to work on the design so it would get a favorable recommendation from Commissioners.

Mr. Gallagher agreed to come back in two weeks with an improved design.

Ms Dick withdrew her motion

MOTION: that the applicant come back in two weeks with an improved design.

MOVED BY: Ms O'Neill

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

IN FAVOR: Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Blackwell, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

2. Hearing and Action: DCP-ZDR-2022-05156 – 429-433 Wood Street Demolition, new construction, and exterior alterations Central Business District Neighborhood
Mr Kunak presented the project for the City of Pittsburgh. The project includes demolition of an existing structure on parcel 1-H-237, and new construction of a 5-story structure with exterior alterations to The Skinny Building and The Roberts Building. A public facing art installation is proposed for The Skinny Building. The applicant proposed to consolidate and interconnect the three structures. There are no requests to the Zoning Board of Adjustment. Staff Design Reviews were held 05/16/22 and 06/26/2022. CDAP was not recommended. A Development Activities Meeting was held with the Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership 04/14/2022. The recommended motion is that Planning Commission approve the PDP with the condition that DOMI shall review the final plans and issue the necessary DOMI approval prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval and final construction documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval.

D.J. Bryant, AE7, Teresa Bucco, and Ryan England, presented the project.

Mr Bryant stated the project is a shell and core adaptive reuse of the three buildings. The interior fit-out will come much later. The exterior renovations will update the existing structures with modern materials to extend the life of the buildings. The use of the Skinny Building will be either an uninhabited digital LED art installation or a physical shadowbox art installation with the ground level occupied by retail or walk-up food and beverage. The Roberts Building will be updated with materials compatible with the existing architecture. The intent is to keep the use as a flexible event/collaboration space. The third building at 433 Wood St will be demolished and an infill structure will be built.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked for public testimony.

Mr Fraker stated no hands were raised.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked for questions or comments from commissioners.

Ms Dick asked for clarification to the access to the upper floors of the Skinny Building is from the rear of the Roberts Building with no public access to the upper floors of the Skinny Building. She also asked if the art work will be visible from the front of the building.

Mr Bryant stated there is a stair in the rear of the Roberts Building to access the Skinny Building, and the upper floors are only for the art program, not the public. The access will only be used for maintenance and upkeep of the art installations. The art is meant to be viewed from the street.

MOTION:

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk stated the recommended motion is to approve with two conditions, 1) that DOMI shall review the final plans and issue the necessary DOMI approval prior to issuing the Record of Zoning Approval and 2) final construction documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to issuing the final Record of Zoning Approval

MOVED BY: Ms Mingo

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

3. Hearing and Action: DCP-MPZC-2021-01727 – Carnegie Mellon University Institutional Master Plan and Zone Change (revised to remove parcel 53-C-93) Squirrel Hill North, North Oakland, Shadyside Neighborhoods

Mr Kunak presented the project for the City of Pittsburgh, This is a zone change of two locations to EMI, parcels 52-J-60 and 52-J-50 from RM-H. The second location are parcels 52-K-175, 52-K-182, 185, 188, 191 from R1D-L. Parcel 53-C-93 will remain as R2-L. No development is proposed for these locations in the ten-year envelope. All development is already within the EMI zoning district. Notice was mailed to abutting property owners, posted on-site and posted online. There are 20 development sites in the ten-year development envelope. Site 17 is within the RM-VH zoning district and is not regulated by the Institutional Master Plan. The applicant team participated in the City's performance target program which reviews performance targets based on City and 20-30 District goals, such as energy use, energy generation, water use, standards and certifications, storm water, open space, tree canopy, public art, neighborhood enhancement, mobility, waste and resilience. This process was designed to correspond with the IMP best practices guide adopted by the Planning Commission in 2018. The TIS was approved by the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure. Registered Community Organizations for Squirrel Hill Urban Coalition, Oakland Planning and Development Corporation, Oakland Business Improvement District. The recommended motion is that the Planning Commission recommend approval to City Council the zoning change petition to rezone 7 parcels associated with Carnegie Mellon University from RM-H and R1D-L to EMI and recommend to City Council the IMP for CMU dated September 2022. Mr Reppe presented the IMP for CMU. CMU has been performing outreach with public meetings with neighbors, on-campus groups, special focus groups, town hall meetings, and open meetings to reach as many as possible for input into the master plan. The master plan is based on 12 principals, making the university a much more public part of the public realm of the City of Pittsburgh. It also provides the understanding for it's neighbors of where the university is going and how it will adapt and respond to the coming future. The IMP contains existing conditions of the campus the institutional needs to enhance and expanse teaching spaces, how to grow the public spaces, and to continue to be a leader in sustainable building and operating practices. It will also be used to identify areas beyond the ten years might be looked at. The ten year plan identifies 20 potential development sites that might be interested in building over the next ten years. These sites are divided into three sub-districts of campus, the core campus, the north campus, and the Craig St area. They are a combination of projects continued from the last master plan and current projects in the new master plan. Standards of the three areas different slightly to address the specific design guidelines of each area.

Ms Beck discussed mobility, sustainability, and neighborhood engagement. To effectively serve mobility, there are 5 areas of importance, pedestrians, biking, transit, vehicles, and single-occupancy vehicles, to improve connections, safety, calm traffic, and have a more neighborhood feel to the campus. Sustainability is a core function that factors into how to heat and cool buildings, LEED certified buildings, use water, manage storm water, tree preservation and replacement, campus open space, and in research and education. The master plan also manages negative impacts to neighbors in the community around the campus. Neighborhood engagement includes meetings with community groups which will continue on a monthly basis to inform the community about events, development activities, closures, student move-in days, and to find ways to be more engaged in the activities of the neighbors.

Mr Reppe discussed comments from the community about mobility, infrastructure, and neighbor engagement. Documents are available online on the CMU Website.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked if there was any public testimony.

Mr Fraker recognized Georgis Petropolous, Chief Exec. Officer, Oakland Improvement District, reaffirmed their full support expressed in their letter dated 07/22/22.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked for commissioners' questions or comments.

Ms Mingo appreciated the way the master plan was presented and incorporated the comments from the public and the Craig St development and pedestrian safety included in the plan.

Ms Dick said she did not see mention of renewable nonfossil energy on campus and their position on those things. She also encouraged a wider diversity of business development on Craig St as possible.

Mr Reppe stated that 100% of the electricity is from renewable resources. Also, the moving the coal fired boiler to natural gas, and are continuing to move away from those. To addressed Ms Dick's comment on Craig St saying they are happy to wait until they get the right fit for the business district. They are hopeful to move toward more local supporting businesses.

MOTION:

The Planning Commission of the City of Pittsburgh approval to City Council and recommended motion to City Council for the IMP for the university.

MOVED BY: Ms Blackwell

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk , Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill

CARRIED

D. Plan of Lots

1. DCP-LOT-2022-01098, Masette Road, Major Consolidation, Fairywood
2. DCP-LOT-2022-01042, Progress Street, Major Consolidation, Troy Hill
3. DCP-LOT-2022-01026, Carrington Street, Minor Consolidation, Central Northside
4. DCP-LOT-2022-01029, Shaler Street, Minor Subdivision, Duquesne Heights
5. DCP-LOT-2022-01051, Saint Michael Street, Minor Consolidation, South Side Slopes
6. DCP-LOT-2022-01062, Seward Street, Minor Subdivision, Duquesne Heights
7. DCP-LOT-2022-01025, 41st Street, Minor Subdivision, Central Lawrenceville
8. DCP-LOT-2022-01101, Camp Street, Minor Subdivision, Upper Hill
9. DCP-LOT-2022-01100, Goettman Street, Minor Subdivision, Troy Hill
10. DCP-LOT-2022-01626, Cedar Avenue, Minor Lot Line Revision, East Allegheny
11. DCP-LOT-2022-00361, Kent Way, Minor Subdivision, Upper Lawrenceville

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk said there will be batched into two groups, batch #1 Items 1 and 2, and batch #2, Items 3 through 11.

Mr Kunak explained that he believed he should present the two plans separately, reading the first one, voting on the motion, then reading the second one followed by the motion on it.

Mr Kunak presented plan 1 the recommendation that each plan be preliminarily approved and then final review 09/20/22. He then presented plan 2 with a recommendation preliminarily approve and schedule or final review 09/20/2022.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk called for public testimony regarding the two plans.

Mr Fraker said there were no hands raised.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk hearing none called for commissioners comments.

Ms Blackwell asked if there was a proposed use for plan 2.

Mr Kunak said he was not familiar with a proposed use but he would research it and let the commissioners know.

Mr Fraker said that he saw two hands raised and recognized Mark Reidenbach.

Mr Reidenbach, surveyor of record for the subdivision in Ferrywood, explained there were 3 parcels with the intention to vacate the city streets and have two parcels for RIDC Park.

Ms Blackwell commented that this is a very large space that used to hold housing and wanted to know what would replace all of those houses.

Mr Fraker recognized Kelsey Canspedos

Ms Canspedos, Development Manager, RIDC, commented that this was a joint venture with the URA to develop 150,000 square feet user that is Ferguson to go in the first building.

MOTION: Acting Chair Burton-Faulk thanked the commenters and asked for a motion to approve plan of lots 1 and 2 as recommended

MOVED BY: Ms Blackwell

SECONDED BY: Ms Dick
 IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill
 CARRIED for Items 1 and 2

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked if they would now be doing plans 3 through 11 heard as one group.

Mr Kunak replied yes.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk read the plan of lots.

Mr Kunak presented each plan, Items 3 through 11 with the recommended motions that each plan be approved.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk called for public testimony.

Mr Fraker said there was a hand raised and recognized Steven Pascal

Mr Pascal of 728 Cedar Ave. pointed out that Christopher Gates, the current owner and he have negotiated an agreement regarding this revision of property lines. The plan shown in this meeting does not show the revision and requested the plan be tabled until the corrected plan could be produced for approval

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk explained that the plan will have to be pulled until the revised, agreed plans are sent in so commissioners is approving the corrected plan.

Mr Layman corroborated that there is a pending agreement regarding this plan and apologized. He recommended that the commission table this particular plan and reconvene with the that one.

MOTION: Ms Dick moved to table the plan until such time the corrected plan can be presented.

SECONDED BY: Ms O'Neill.

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill.

CARRIED: Acting Chair Burton-Faulk stated for the record that which they have voted to table and pull out Item 10, DCP-LOT-2022-01626, Cedar Avenue minor lot line revision, East Allegheny.

Mr Fraker said there was still another hand raised and recognized Stewart Gall.

Mr Gall, attorney representing the developer for the project on which Mr Pascal was speaking, which is East Ohio Development, explained that Mr Pascal is correct. They had called this previously to the attention of the City that the wrong plan was included. If anyone has access to email or if Mr Pascal is still on the line, we are in a position to once again email the correct plan to the City. He realized it has been tabled for two weeks, but stated that this project has been going on for a long time and he would like to keep it moving. I thought Mr Pascal had picked up on the fact that it said TMP in the lower right hand corner of the drawing that was presented. There is another drawing that should have VB-101 in the lower right hand corner and they have confirmed with Mr Pascal and Mr Gates's counsel this morning and that is the plan that the commission was going to consider this afternoon if there is any way to address that now.

Mr Layman apologized and said the individual that normally works with subdivisions is not in this week. If there had been something we had missed.

Mr Gall interrupted Mr Layman, saying this was conveyed last week and if there was anyone around who he could email the plan now it could be integrated into the presentation that would be great.

Mr Layman stated he understood the urgency and apologized and stated he was not sure the commission felt comfortable acting on a plan it has just received by email right now.

Ms O'Neill said that normally staff has time to review, and receiving it from someone on the phone is really pushing it through.

Mr Gall said his understanding was that the application was submitted with the correct drawing and that this incorrect drawing was somehow substituted in the process of preparing for the meeting, which is why Mr Pascal called it to our attention.

Mr Layman said there could have been a mix-up on Planning's side. He didn't want to presume anything and again apologized if there was a mistake on Planning's side.

Mr Kunak asked if just the map was wrong but the report is accurate or are they both inaccurate?

Mr Gall said it was his understanding that the map is wrong.

Mr Stewart said the lot plan graphic and documentary side that contains the signators have been changed.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk explained that at this time commissioners have taken a motion to table, and that would probably be the best path forward because we are trying to look through and very quickly. She apologized to those impacted by this, but the commission would need to delay to ensure that careful review has been done and that it is accurate at this point. The commission would continue to move forward with the vote to table.

Acting Chair Burton-Faulk asked if there were any more comments.

Mr Fraker said there were not more hands raised.

MOTION: Acting Chair Burton-Faulk thanked the commenters. She asked for a motion on Items 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 11, taking Item 10 from the batch.

MOVED BY: Ms Dick

SECONDED BY: O'Neill

IN FAVOR: Ms Blackwell, Ms Burton-Faulk, Ms Dick, Ms Mingo, Ms O'Neill

CARRIED: plans 3 through 9, and plan 11, with the exception of plan 10, DCP-LOT-2022-01626.

E. Director's Report

Mr Layman said there is no Director's Report.

F. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn made by Acting Chair Burton-Faulk with all in favor. The meeting adjourned at 4:55 PM.

Approved by:, Secretary

Disclaimer

The official records of the Planning Commission's meetings are the Minutes of the Meetings approved by the Commission's Secretary, Becky Mingo. The Minutes are the ONLY official record. Any other notes, recordings, etc. are not official records of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission cannot verify the accuracy or authenticity of notes, recordings, etc. that are not part of the official minutes.