

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

TOWNSHIP OF SOUTH PARK
PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

- - - - -

IN RE: MENDIP PLAN OF LOTS)
MINOR SUBDIVISION -)
PRELIMINARY/FINAL APPROVAL)

- - - - -

IN RE: RED ROCKS GROUP)
ZONING AMENDMENT APPLICATION)

- - - - -

SOUTH PARK TOWNSHIP MUNICIPAL BUILDING
2675 BROWNSVILLE ROAD
SOUTH PARK TOWNSHIP, PA 15129
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 22, 2023
7:00 P.M. - 10:04 P.M.

- - - - -

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

- H. RUSSELL BRACKER
- ADRIAN WEIL
- MARK DEPRETIS
- CYNTHIA KLEIN
- JOHN PAPINCHAK
- PATRICK SABLE
- JAMES WAYCHOFF

THOMAS BONIDIE, ZONING OFFICER
DAN DEISEROTH, TOWNSHIP ENGINEER
CAROLYN YAGLE, PLANNING CONSULTANT

- - - - -

LESLIE NEMETH, STENOGRAPHER

- - - - -

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

- - - - -

1
2
3 MR. BRACKER: Ladies and gentlemen, welcome
4 to the Planning Commission meeting for the Township of
5 South Park for Wednesday March 22, 2023. Please rise for
6 the Pledge of Allegiance.

7 (Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

8 MR. BRACKER: Please be advised the Planning
9 Commission makes recommendations to the Board of
10 Supervisors concerning the applications we will review
11 this evening. The Board of Supervisors will meet on
12 Monday, April 10, 2023, at this location.

13 In addition to the zoning amendment
14 application, there will be a public hearing that same
15 night, April 10, 2023, at 6 p.m. Anyone who wishes to
16 express a concern with our recommendations this evening
17 are encouraged to attend the supervisors meeting.

18 Role call. Russ Bracker, here.

19 Adrian Weil?

20 MR. WEIL: Here.

21 MR. BRACKER: Mark Depretis?

22 MR. DEPRETIS: Here.

23 MR. BRACKER: Cynthia Klein?

24 MS. KLEIN: Here.

25 MR. BRACKER: John Papinchak?

1 MR. PAPINCHAK: Here.

2 MR. BRACKER: Patrick Sable?

3 MR. SABLE: Here.

4 MR. BRACKER: James Waychoff?

5 MR. WAYCHOFF: Here.

6 MR. BRACKER: Dan Deiseroth, township
7 engineer?

8 MR. DEISEROTH: Here.

9 MR. BRACKER: Carolyn Yagle, planning
10 consultant?

11 MS. YAGLE: Here.

12 MR. BRACKER: Thomas Bonidie, Code
13 Enforcement Officer?

14 MR. BONIDIE: Here.

15 MR. BRACKER: We need a motion to approve
16 the February 22, 2023, Reorganization Planning Commission
17 minutes.

18 MS. KLEIN: I'll make a motion to approve.

19 MR. WAYCHOFF: I'll second it.

20 MR. BRACKER: All those in favor?

21 (All responded aye.)

22 MR. BRACKER: All those opposed?

23 (No response.)

24 MR. BRACKER: Motion is carried.

25 We need a motion to approve the minutes of

1 the February 22, 2023, regular Planning Commission
2 meeting.

3 MR. SABLE: Sable moves.

4 MR. WEIL: I second that.

5 MR. BRACKER: All those in favor?

6 (All responded aye.)

7 MR. BRACKER: All those opposed?

8 (No response.)

9 MR. BRACKER: Motion is carried.

10 First item on the agenda tonight is the
11 Mendip Plan of Lots, Minor Subdivision, preliminary and
12 final approval.

13 Is there someone here to represent the
14 Mendip Plan of Lots?

15 MR. VICTOR: My name is Steven Victor from
16 Victor-Wetzel Associates. I have a drawing of the plan,
17 if you would like me to put it up in front of you. Do
18 you need that?

19 what we're proposing is pretty simple.
20 It's an existing property, so we're doing a lot line
21 revision, so...

22 MR. BRACKER: Uh-huh.

23 MR. VICTOR: The Mendip property is
24 approximately 7 acres in sight along the westerly edge of
25 the property. It abuts against four existing single

1 family lots. And so what we're doing is subdividing off
2 some portions of the 7 acres to be able to give to the
3 rear yard of those neighbors. That's why I just refer to
4 it as a simple lot line revision. We're taking their lot
5 lines and moving them further into our property in order
6 to expand theirs and slightly decrease the area that we
7 have. There's no increase in the number of lots.
8 There's no utilities or improvements necessary, no
9 streets, extensions, anything necessary for this. Again,
10 it's simply just a matter of adjusting the lot line
11 between property owners.

12 MR. BRACKER: Okay. Mr. Deiseroth, as
13 township engineer, do you have any comments for this
14 plan?

15 MR. DEISEROTH: Sure, I do. We issued a
16 letter dated March 7, 2023. It was our second review of
17 the plan. As Mr. Victor noted, it is a simple
18 subdivision plan, and the plan that has been submitted
19 now addresses all our technical comments, and I would
20 recommend it be approved.

21 MR. BRACKER: Ms. Yagle, as planning
22 consultant, do you have any comments?

23 MS. YAGLE: I have no technical comments
24 related to this plan and -- as things have been
25 identified through the application process, and I would

1 recommend that it move forward for the Board of
2 Supervisors' consideration.

3 MR. BRACKER: Okay. Mr. Bonidie, do you
4 have any comments as the township code enforcement
5 officer?

6 MR. BONIDIE: No comment.

7 MR. BRACKER: Does anyone in the audience
8 have any questions or comments?

9 (No response.)

10 MR. BRACKER: Does anyone on the board have
11 any questions or comments?

12 MR. PAPINCHAK: I have -- I have one, so the
13 revisions to these decreases the size of your primary Lot
14 1 on your plan, correct?

15 MR. VICTOR: Yes, sir.

16 MR. PAPINCHAK: And for Lot 1, is there a
17 plan to further develop that at a later time?

18 MR. VICTOR: No, there is no plan to develop
19 it.

20 MR. PAPINCHAK: Okay. So --

21 MR. VICTOR: Now, they may in the future
22 because there is a public street right-of-way that comes
23 up to it.

24 MR. PAPINCHAK: Correct.

25 MR. VICTOR: But as it sits at this time,

1 there are no plans for it.

2 MR. PAPINCHAK: So have -- we don't have
3 that type plan. My concern is just if -- for any future
4 development, that, you know, future homeowners are aware
5 that that property -- those properties abut against
6 Carrick Sportsmen Gun Club.

7 MR. VICTOR: Okay.

8 MR. PAPINCHAK: And that property owners are
9 then made aware.

10 MR. VICTOR: All right.

11 MR. PAPINCHAK: That would be my only
12 request for -- for a future site plan.

13 MR. VICTOR: Certainly.

14 MR. PAPINCHAK: Thank you.

15 MR. DEISEROTH: So, Steve, would you be able
16 to have -- just put a note on the plan just advising that
17 the property does abut the gun club, just a simple note?

18 MR. VICTOR: Sure.

19 MR. DEISEROTH: Thank you.

20 MR. VICTOR: Tell me which direction, Dan.

21 MR. DEISEROTH: We'll talk about it.

22 MR. VICTOR: Okay.

23 MR. BRACKER: Looks like -- looks like to
24 the less.

25 MR. DEISEROTH: Thank you, sir.

1 MR. DEPRETIS: I have a question. I don't
2 know why there would be a concern from the residents that
3 are getting their lots extended, but what kind of
4 feedback did you receive from that, if any?

5 MR. VICTOR: I was not a part of any
6 negotiations or discussion with them, but we're drawing
7 this up because they all agreed to wanting the additional
8 property.

9 MR. DEPRETIS: Yeah, I would -- I would
10 assume that unless -- who knows why, unless they felt it
11 was a reassessment issue or something. But for the most
12 part, I would assume people wouldn't be opposed to giving
13 additional property to them.

14 MR. VICTOR: Correct.

15 MR. BRACKER: Any other questions or
16 comments?

17 (No response.)

18 MR. BRACKER: So there are two items for us
19 to vote upon. The first is regarding the paperwork, is
20 it complete, and the second is for the actual approval or
21 recommendation related to the subdivision. So we need a
22 motion to accept, not accept, or table this preliminary
23 and final application for a minor subdivision as being
24 complete per the subdivision and land development
25 ordinance.

1 MR. WAYCHOFF: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion
2 that we accept it.

3 MR. DEPRETIS: I'll second.

4 MR. BRACKER: All those in favor?

5 (All responded aye.)

6 MR. BRACKER: All those opposed?

7 (No response.)

8 MR. BRACKER: Motion is carried.

9 We need a motion to recommend, not
10 recommend, or table this application for preliminary and
11 final approval for a minor subdivision identified as the
12 Mendip Plan of Lots to be located at the intersection of
13 Mendip Drive and Barnsley Drive, Lot/Block 770-F-7.

14 MR. DEPRETIS: Mr. Chairman, I'll make a
15 motion to recommend.

16 MR. WEIL: I'll second -- I'll second that.

17 MR. BRACKER: All those in favor?

18 (All responded aye.)

19 MR. BRACKER: All those opposed?

20 (No response.)

21 MR. BRACKER: The motion is carried. Thank
22 you very much.

23 (Discussion off record.)

24 MR. BRACKER: I know everyone is here this
25 evening to talk about the Red Rocks Group zoning

1 amendment application. Just to let everyone know the
2 process that we'll go through, the first thing, we will
3 ask the developer to speak to present his request to the
4 board and, by extension, to the community. We will then
5 ask the township consultants for their information, their
6 input. We will ask code enforcement for their input and
7 comments. And at that point, we will open the floor for
8 comments by the audience.

9 There are some ground rules or requests
10 that I would have. When you want to make a comment or a
11 question, please come forward, sign in on the paper on
12 the podium, also state your name and your address. This
13 helps our staff be able to put together accurate minutes.

14 The second, please respect whoever is
15 speaking, whether it is the developer, one of our
16 consultants, a board member, or, obviously, someone in
17 the audience. Please show them the respect that you
18 would like as well. Please limit redundant comments. I
19 know there's a lot of -- everyone has different opinions,
20 everyone has thoughts that they would like to share, and
21 we want to hear those, but we don't need to hear just a
22 constant rehashing of the same comments. There's a lot
23 of people. If we're going to get through everyone
24 tonight, the only way we're going to do that is to limit
25 comments to new items.

1 Also, we would like you to try to limit
2 your comments to three minutes. Once again, it's just
3 there's a lot of people here to speak, and we want to
4 make sure everyone has an opportunity to speak.
5 Otherwise, we'll be here until tomorrow morning. So
6 thank you for that.

7 And so do we have someone here from Red
8 Rocks? And can you tell us, Mr. Victor, tell us about
9 your request for changing the zoning on this property
10 from R-2 to R-4?

11 MR. VICTOR: My name is Steven Victor from
12 Victor-Wetzel Associates, here on behalf of the Red Rocks
13 Group who have made an application to rezone property
14 along Sleepy Hollow Road. I'm here tonight to formally
15 initiate our request to rezone 54 acres from R-2 to R-4.
16 Thank you for letting me make a brief presentation, an
17 introduction to you and those who were in the audience
18 last month.

19 You may not be aware that only 2 percent
20 of the township is currently zoned R-4. Are you also
21 aware that all of this R-4 is currently developed and
22 there are no R-4 development sites available in the
23 township? The fact that -- the fact that only 2 percent
24 of the South Park Township is zoned R-4 is reason enough
25 to add our property to the R-4 zoning.

1 Comprehensive Plan, the township should support housing
2 affordability for the future generations. The
3 Comprehensive Plan also encourages residential infill.
4 Now, my definition of infill means that properties that
5 have existing infrastructure like streets, sewer, water,
6 and other utilities, would be an infill site. This
7 property that we're asking for rezoning is a perfect
8 example of an infill site where we already have all of
9 this infrastructure along Sleepy Hollow Road.

10 Last month -- last month we heard concerns
11 that might arise out of this rezoning. Most are common,
12 same old comments you hear about every new development
13 such as we will destroy the streams and wetlands. Now,
14 this is not even a debatable subject in that under the
15 township, county, and state laws, streams and wetlands
16 are well protected.

17 Another comment might be -- that was made
18 is we are not aware of the past mining. That is
19 incorrect. We have reviewed the Bureau of Mines maps,
20 and we know that this property, just as much as the
21 township, is undermined, and we will take the appropriate
22 mine remediation to ensure that there will be safe
23 housing constructed above the mine. Again, common
24 practice here in South Park.

25 Another concern was what about flooding

1 caused by the development. Both the township and the
2 DEP, Department of Environmental Protection, have strict
3 ordinances and laws that regulate storm water management.

4 Another comment is multifamily development
5 will reduce our property values. Again, this is an old
6 real estate myth that just isn't true. You don't have to
7 take my word on that. You have several examples in the
8 township where multifamily are close to single family
9 homes. For example, did the Squire Manor and the Hidden
10 Ridge properties reduce the property values in the
11 Wallace Road and Lindfield neighborhood?

12 Another concern was that townhouses will
13 scare the horses in the stables in the township. Now, I
14 don't see any evidence that townhouses or the people who
15 live in townhouses such as at Patrick Place have harmed
16 the two stables nearby, South Park Stables and
17 Dreamcatcher Stables.

18 Another comment that I think was the most
19 unusual one I've ever heard in all my years of experience
20 was that this development will upset the buffalo in the
21 park. The buffalo -- the buffalo came to South Park in
22 1927, 95 years ago. I have a series of photographs and
23 aerial photos. This was a photograph from archival
24 photos of 1937. South Park is highlighted there in the
25 yellow color; and if you have the opportunity to look

1 closer at it, you will see that almost all of the area
2 around it in 1937, there was no development.

3 In 1949, we again see South Park; and
4 right after post World War II, we start to see the
5 beginning of some subdivisions that are starting to come
6 into place. But it's only a matter of a very small part.

7 When we jump to 1982, we can start to see
8 almost a completion of the residential suburban
9 development that had taken place in the township. You
10 can see all of that growth that's taken place between '49
11 and '82.

12 Then if we just jump ahead to the last one
13 which is a current, 2022 --

14 MR. BRACKER: Can you -- can you go back to
15 the microphone, please.

16 MR. VICTOR: Sure.

17 MR. BRACKER: Thank you.

18 MR. VICTOR: So we go back to 2022, and we
19 can see that almost the whole township has now been
20 developed except for a few of the infilled sites. The
21 point --

22 MR. BRACKER: Ladies and gentlemen, please
23 let --

24 MR. VICTOR: The point that I'm trying to
25 make is not whether there is infill or not infill sites.

1 The point is that we were -- we were told that the
2 development of a few hundred people coming into a
3 development such as ours, an increase from the allowed
4 123 units to the approximately 290 units that we were
5 proposing to do, that increase would have a detrimental
6 impact to the buffalo. I would say from 1947 to the '80s
7 and on to today there has been a 10,000-person increase
8 in your population. The buffalo have survived, and the
9 buffalo will not know the difference between a few
10 hundred additional residents that we might bring to the
11 township. Again, it's --

12 MR. BRACKER: Ladies and gentlemen, please
13 let Mr. Victor complete his presentation.

14 MR. VICTOR: It's rare -- it's rare that we
15 have to go to the extent to explain how we're not going
16 to affect buffalo, but I've sort of taken that extra step
17 to explain to you that that really is not relevant to the
18 fact of this rezoning.

19 So you saw the presentation we made last
20 month. You see what we have done tonight. So at this
21 point, I'll rest and let the staff speak and then the
22 audience and then if I could maybe make a closing
23 statement at the end. Thank you.

24 MR. BRACKER: Thank you very much.

25 Mr. Deiseroth, as township engineer, do

1 you have any comments that you would like to share
2 regarding this rezoning?

3 MR. DEISEROTH: As the township engineer, I
4 have no opinion regarding rezoning. I would --

5 MR. BRACKER: Ladies and gentlemen, the
6 township engineer is looking at this from an engineering
7 perspective, so that is why he is responding in this way.

8 MR. DEISEROTH: Just to -- just to the
9 public, there's been no engineering documents submitted
10 for review. This is a rezoning hearing. So I've had
11 nothing to review in terms of engineering documents.

12 MR. BRACKER: There -- okay.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Nobody can hear back
14 here. There's a lot of people back there. We can't
15 hear.

16 MR. DEISEROTH: I'm the township engineer,
17 and my opinion to the Planning Commission tonight was
18 that I don't have any engineering comments because
19 there's been no engineering documents submitted for me to
20 review. If a project was proposed -- if a project was
21 proposed here tonight that would have roads and sewers
22 and storm water management and those types of things,
23 that's where I would review those documents. So that's
24 the reason for me not having an opinion. Again, rezoning
25 is not the engineer -- for the engineer to decide. So

1 I'm not copping out. I just don't have an opinion.
2 Okay. Thank you.

3 MR. BRACKER: You have to -- ladies and
4 gentlemen, you have to remember, this -- there is no plan
5 before us. This is strictly for rezoning, do -- does the
6 township want to change the zoning for this development.

7 So ladies and gentlemen, there will be a
8 time for you to comment. Please let us finish with our
9 consultants. They may answer some of the questions that
10 you have.

11 Ms. Yagle, as planning consultant, do you
12 have comments that you would like to share or can share
13 with us?

14 MS. YAGLE: Yes. My name is Carolyn Yagle,
15 and I am the planning consultant for the township. I
16 have been provided information as part of the submission
17 to review and prepared the technical points as it relates
18 specifically to rezoning request of R-2 to R-4.

19 I would request before I identify any
20 points in this review -- and a copy of it will be then
21 transmitted for the purpose of the written record -- that
22 there is no comment from the audience while I am
23 speaking. The reason for that request is there is a
24 significant amount of information that we have been
25 evaluating as what is presented in the existing township

1 zoning ordinance as adopted and the application items
2 that are relevant to the rezoning.

3 I would request that if anyone has
4 comments, that they retain them for the next available
5 point in the agenda; and if there is a back-and-forth, I
6 will stop speaking until there is a moment in which I can
7 then speak again. Thank you.

8 As part of my technical review, I have
9 been assigned to identify the request, and I received it
10 in full, as the township did, on the 26th of January. I
11 was requested to examine the application and to opine as
12 to its consistency with the township's community planning
13 measures. There are a series of things that are
14 considered as part of this document.

15 Before I go any further, is there anyone
16 that cannot hear me?

17 (No response.)

18 MS. YAGLE: Thank you.

19 I summarized a series of facts as it
20 related to these various planning documents, the rezoning
21 application package, the provisions of the Pennsylvania
22 Municipalities Planning Zoning Code, and the professional
23 input that is reflected here as part of our technical
24 review.

25 For the reasons set forth in this report,

1 we believe that the Red Rocks Group's R-4 rezoning
2 application is not consistent with the township's
3 community planning measures.

4 There are a series of criteria that we had
5 to look at as part of this document. We did look at the
6 2018 Comprehensive Plan that the township Board of
7 Supervisors adopted. We looked at the future land use
8 map within that 2018 Comprehensive Plan. We looked at
9 Allegheny County's Comprehensive Plan, and we looked at
10 the County's future land use map, which is also an item
11 within their overall Comprehensive Plan. We did look at
12 the South Park Township's existing zoning ordinance, and
13 we also looked at Exhibits A through K, as submitted by
14 the applicant for the request to rezone to R-4.

15 In terms of the time frame of items to
16 date relevant to getting to this public meeting with the
17 Planning Commission, there are two -- again, two items
18 that are from a published documentation standpoint that
19 the municipality -- any municipality within the
20 Commonwealth of Pennsylvania that has zoning needs to
21 consider. The first item of that is within the
22 Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code and Section
23 609, which is related to enactment of zoning ordinance
24 amendments. While this request is specifically to a
25 zoning map amendment, it does fall within the guide of

1 that section within the Municipality Planning Code. It
2 is a form of an amendment to the zoning ordinance.

3 The second item is we're looking at the
4 community's zoning ordinance, Section 2505, which again
5 identifies a process associated with the actual rezoning
6 request.

7 So the township received the application
8 requesting the rezoning 30 days prior to a
9 regularly-scheduled Planning Commission meeting, and that
10 complete application was -- as based upon our records
11 from the township, was received on January 26, 2023.

12 The township advertised the February 22nd
13 Planning Commission meeting agenda items in the Park News
14 and made the application information available for public
15 review. The advertisement deadline for the February
16 Planning Commission meeting was the 27th of January, of
17 which it abided by that date.

18 Thirdly, the township transmitted the
19 rezoning application on 1/27/23 to Allegheny County for a
20 45-day public review prior to a Board of Supervisors
21 public hearing. And that's stipulated -- again, I'm
22 referencing points in time that are within either of
23 those two planning documents. All this information is
24 taking us through this process. Thank you.

25 So the county comments referenced a

1 mixture of current and past relevant planning documents.
2 I did have follow-up phone and email correspondence with
3 the county post-review delivery.

4 The township Planning Commission received
5 the rezoning application 2 -- sorry -- for the 2/22/23
6 for the 3/23, for this March 22, '23 Planning Commission
7 Agenda discussion. So, again, it received it within that
8 30-day time frame referenced.

9 Secondly -- or excuse me --5: The
10 township mailed the public hearing notice on 3/3 to
11 property owners within 200 feet of the property. And
12 there are approximately -- based on records, 39 of those
13 notices were submitted.

14 The township mailed project Notice on
15 March 7 to the municipality of Bethel Park.

16 The township posted the public meeting
17 notice for this evening's session in the township
18 municipal building lobby and on the subject parcel on
19 March 14th of 2023.

20 The township Planning Commission at the
21 time I prepared this prior to the meeting -- I'm
22 identifying that you were scheduled to review this
23 rezoning application and this technical review as part of
24 this evening's meeting and to take public comments.

25 The township Board of Supervisors are

1 scheduling a Public Hearing on the Rezoning Application
2 and placing the item on the Board of Supervisor's Agenda
3 for consideration and public hearing for the April
4 meeting at their March 13th regular meeting. The
5 advertisement deadline for that public hearing notice was
6 the 23rd -- excuse me, coming up to be the 23rd of March
7 and the 30th of March, so within the required time frame
8 for that public hearing.

9 It is our understanding, also, that the
10 township is scheduled to transmit the public hearing
11 notice on the 24th of March to the Park News for the
12 April 1 Park News edition.

13 The township is scheduled to post the
14 April 10th public hearing notice in the township
15 municipal lobby and on the subject parcel on March 31st
16 of 2023.

17 The township Board of Supervisors also
18 scheduled to hold an April 10th Public Hearing; and upon
19 the Public Hearing closing, the Board of Supervisors may
20 vote to amend or not amend the official zoning map based
21 upon the request for the rezoning.

22 So that sequence is something, again,
23 relevant to their two documents, the Municipality's
24 Planning Code and the township zoning ordinance that are
25 again relevant to this process in which we are here for

1 this evening. So many things have happened prior to this
2 evening and things are scheduled to happen after this
3 meeting.

4 All right. As part of our review, we did
5 identify those six documents; and if anyone needs me to
6 repeat them, I can. Please raise your hand.

7 (No response.)

8 MS. YAGLE: All right. I don't see anyone's
9 hand raised, so I'm going to continue on. And I'm going
10 to wait.

11 All right. South Park Township's future
12 land use plan classified areas within the boundaries of
13 this subject parcel as low intensity residential. We
14 compared the Township's future residential land use
15 classifications to the Township's official zoning map.
16 The pattern of that comparison is that the low intensity
17 residential areas identified within the future land use
18 map of the Comprehensive Plan identified as R-1 low
19 density single family residential, and also within that
20 same future land use color of low intensity residential
21 is the R-2 medium density single family residential
22 district. So that is pertaining to our subject parcel's
23 existing zone.

24 Secondly, there is an identification of
25 moderate intensity residential on the future land use

1 plan, and this is equivalent as it is in comparing the
2 existing zoning map to the R-3 high density single family
3 residential district.

4 The other classification as it pertains to
5 residential land use within the future land use map of
6 the Comprehensive Plan is that there is a high intensity
7 residential color, and that is equivalent to the zoning
8 map area having a general relationship to R-4,
9 multifamily residential, as well as R-5, mobile home park
10 district. So in this comparison of what is on the future
11 land use map and what is the zoning district map, various
12 congruence to those different categories.

13 within the vicinity of this subject
14 parcel, Allegheny County's future land use map identifies
15 two future land use categories, conservation and infill.
16 The County's map classifies areas within the boundary of
17 the subject parcel as conservation. There is a map of
18 that both within the County Future Land Use Plan and
19 within the copy of our technical review.

20 So when we look at the R-4 district
21 regulations -- and we have an overview of those and
22 highlighting some items of the R-4 Base District -- there
23 are a series of comparisons between the Township's
24 existing R-2 and R-4 zoning districts.

25 So I'm going to identify some things that

1 are pertinent to the R-4 request. So the R-4 Base
2 District has a purpose statement, and the purpose of the
3 R-4 District is to reserve areas for the development of
4 higher density multifamily housing in the township in
5 appropriate locations which are served by public water
6 and sewage and are located on arterial or collector roads
7 close to shopping and community services and to provide
8 for compatible public, semi-public and accessory uses as
9 conditional uses or uses by special exception.

10 So this is section 700, and there are two
11 main goals again within this district. Goal A is to
12 reserve areas for the development of higher density
13 multifamily housing in the township. And the second part
14 of that goal is to provide for compatible public and
15 semi-public and accessory uses as conditional uses or
16 uses by special exception. So what we are saying here is
17 there are sort of two general land use points that are
18 called out within the purpose statement of section 700,
19 the R-4 based district highlight there.

20 Now, in reality, Goal B is not part of
21 anything that has been contemplated as we understand
22 specifically called out within the application, but we do
23 have a particular focus here on Goal A.

24 So there is a consideration that it is
25 served by public water and sewage, and we believe that

1 based upon our understanding of the mapping and the
2 discussions to date, that those two items are available
3 in the vicinity to the subject parcel.

4 The second part of that is also
5 considering the text that identifies if it's located on
6 an arterial or collector road close to shopping and
7 community services. For a point of reference, there is
8 R-4 zoning within the vicinity of the requested parcel.
9 So in the context of arterial or collector roads, that
10 the district is not immediately adjacent to it but it has
11 been established. So what we needed to consider is the
12 criteria here for arterial and collector and what that
13 vicinity is to those commercial -- to the shopping and
14 community services, excuse me.

15 So in the township of South Park's zoning
16 ordinance in Article II, Section 202, Sleepy Hollow Road
17 is identified as a collector street under the definition
18 for collector street. We do have measurements that we
19 took, a generalized measurement, from the intersection of
20 Stoltz and Sleepy Hollow. It's about 2 and a half miles
21 driving distance, not as the crow flies but from the
22 roads that are constructed -- about 2 and a half miles of
23 a driving distance from the closest set of shopping
24 establishments and community services. It does not say
25 "or." It says "and." So we looked for the locations

1 where both of those things were in proximity to one
2 another and what their -- what that closeness is. So in
3 three different routes, they were all within about that
4 same distance. That was about 500 feet from one another.
5 So in that analysis, we've identified that all of those
6 types of services are within that same distance from the
7 nearby R-4 property.

8 All right. So we said that there is no
9 other relationship or analysis associated with the
10 public, semipublic uses, whether that's public recreation
11 or commercial recreation, as we do have a park right next
12 door to the subject parcel.

13 All right. Now, after we considered those
14 things, we also looked at in the base district of R-2 and
15 R-4 what the land uses that are permitted are. Now, in
16 reality, there are three ways in which development can be
17 proposed in both R-2 and R-4 as it is currently written
18 in the existing zoning ordinance, this document. The
19 first way in which land uses can be approached within the
20 ordinance are through those base district
21 classifications. Within those base districts, both R-2
22 and R-4, there is also a consideration for a second and a
23 third type of development application which is related to
24 the Planned Residential Development. So that's something
25 to consider because it is one of the uses. I'm going to

1 go down through the uses for these two districts, and
2 this will be a list as part of what I read.

3 All right. In the R-2 base zoning
4 district, section 501, permitted by right you have single
5 family dwellings, we have group homes, we have essential
6 services, we have conditional uses -- which are also
7 permissible so long as they go through a conditional use
8 process in front of you, as Planning Commission, and then
9 to the Board for their consideration -- public
10 recreation, public buildings, firehouses, schools,
11 churches and places of worship, public utility buildings,
12 Planned Residential Development, including a retirement
13 community.

14 There is also a set of uses that are
15 permissible in your R-2 zoning district today which are
16 by special exception; and when they are done by special
17 exception, that means they are not going in front of the
18 Planning Commission and the Board for review and
19 decision. They are going in front of the Zoning Hearing
20 Board for their determination as to if they are approved
21 or not. Those uses that are currently called out in your
22 zoning ordinance include a family day care home as a home
23 occupation, a day care center or nursery school in a
24 church or school, private stables, and a temporary use or
25 structure.

1 So all of the things that I have just gone
2 through are items that are currently permissible in the
3 R-2 district as it stands today. So that is one part of
4 it.

5 In comparison, we have also a set of land
6 uses that are currently permissible within the base
7 zoning classification of R-4. They include townhouses
8 but by right -- permitted by right. And the other two
9 things permitted by right are garden apartments and
10 essential services. Things that are permitted by
11 conditional use within the R-4 district include public
12 recreation, noncommercial recreation, public buildings,
13 public utility building, group care facility to -- or
14 transitional dwelling, personal care boarding homes,
15 planned residential, which again is something that I read
16 over on R-2. There are two special exceptions within
17 R-4, and they are called out in the ordinance as day care
18 center and the temporary use or structure.

19 So what does that mean, if you did not
20 have a chance to write everything down that I identified
21 or follow along because those lists are quite lengthy? I
22 will let you know that this is the following of what is a
23 net change between R-2 and R-4. So the land uses
24 currently not -- excuse me. The land uses currently
25 allowed in R-2 that would no longer be permitted if this

1 parcel were rezoned as R-4 by a base district standard
2 non-Planned Residential Development include a single
3 family dwelling, a group home, a firehouse, a school, a
4 church, a family day care home as a home occupation, a
5 day care center or nursery school in a church or school,
6 or private stables. If we took that the other direction,
7 land uses permitted in R-4 that are not currently
8 permitted today in R-2, according to a conventional
9 development non PRD, are townhouses, garden apartments,
10 noncommercial recreation, group care facility or
11 transitional dwelling, personal care boarding home, or a
12 day care center. Okay?

13 Now, if we are comparing then in this non
14 PRD approach of R-2 and R-4, we have the ability then to
15 consider sort of minimum lot sizes as well as if in the
16 case of a number of units per building. So the minimum
17 lot size within a non PRD situation or approach in R-2 is
18 12,000 square feet, and the permitted density in R-4 as
19 it's called out within the zoning ordinance is then in
20 terms of the number of units, and it's called out as
21 12 units per acre for a townhouse and 12 units per acre
22 for a garden apartment. And in the R-4, there is a
23 maximum of eight units per building for a townhouse and a
24 maximum of 36 units per building for a garden apartment.
25 And I would like to again identify again we are still

1 talking about a non PRD comparison.

2 when we look at the maximum permissible
3 dwelling unit calculation comparison of this non PRD
4 situation -- and I do know that I'm talking about quite a
5 number of technical things, but that is this comparison
6 -- that the maximum unit calculation on the subject
7 parcel as it's zoned R-2 for 54 acres in a non PRD type
8 of calculation would be 196 single family dwellings. If
9 we are looking at a maximum unit calculation of the
10 subject parcel if it were zoned for R-4 at that 54 acres
11 in a non PRD type of application, later on if that were
12 to occur, it would be 648 units for a townhouse and
13 garden apartments. That is -- I'm going to stop talking.
14 We still have more to review.

15 There are a maximum number of permitted
16 residential buildings and townhouses. There would be 81
17 buildings using that maximum calculation that we
18 identified above, and there would be a maximum of 18
19 apartment buildings, and that -- again, we use the
20 maximum permitted number of dwelling units per building
21 called out in our previous point.

22 Okay. So all of the items in that first
23 part of the listings again are based upon what would be
24 permissible as part of a non PRD type of item as part of
25 both of those districts.

1 The second thing that we evaluated as part
2 of this comparison is actually if we were to look at the
3 Planned Residential Development, which is both
4 permissible presently within R-2 and it is permissible
5 presently within R-4, so this next part is a comparison
6 of that approach. The way in which PRD -- again, Planned
7 Residential Development -- can be applied within R-2 and
8 R-4 is the first part of this focuses on the permissions
9 for a Retirement Community PRD, and the second part is
10 for a Non Retirement Community PRD.

11 Presently within zoning ordinance, if we
12 were to have an application for again R-2 as it's
13 currently zoned, for a Retirement Community Planned
14 Residential Development, that is permitted as identified.
15 The maximum dwelling unit density of this in R-2 is eight
16 dwelling units per net buildable acre. A net billable
17 acre is one that means a portion of the PRD site which is
18 buildable, excluding steep slopes of 25 percent or
19 greater, flood plain and wetlands that would need to be
20 taken off that calculation. There is a minimum parking
21 requirement of one space per dwelling unit and one space
22 for each employee on peak shift, again because in either
23 of those, you may have something that is nonresidential
24 as in the complimenting point of the residential piece.
25 Single family dwellings are permissible within the R-2

1 Retirement Community Planned Residential Development.
2 Two family dwellings are permissible within the
3 Retirement Community Planned Residential Development.
4 Townhouse buildings containing no more than five dwelling
5 units per building are permissible within the R-2
6 Retirement Community Planned Residential Development.
7 Garden apartment buildings containing no more than 50
8 dwelling units per building are permissible within the
9 R-2 Retirement Community Planned Residential Development.
10 A postal station is permitted. A banking facility is
11 permitted. A pharmacy is permitted. Personal services
12 are permitted. An ice cream and/or florist or gift shop
13 is permitted. A personal care -- all right. A personal
14 care boarding home is permitted, a nursing home is
15 permitted. A taxi, van, or similar transportation
16 service is permitted.

17 If we were to then look at that as a
18 column as it relates to an R-4 Retirement Community
19 Planned Residential Development, it is the exact same
20 list as it relates to maximum dwelling unit densities of
21 eight dwelling units per net buildable area, the parking
22 requirement and each of the land uses that we identified
23 just a moment ago. So the net change between an R-2
24 Retirement Community Planned Residential Development and
25 an R-4 Retirement Community for Planned Residential

1 Development is none. There is no change between those
2 two levels of permission. Again, that is based on net
3 buildable area, not gross acreage.

4 So if we then look at any other type of
5 Planned Residential Development, meaning one that is not
6 focused on a Retirement Community PRD, and compare what
7 is part of an R-2 and an R-4 -- we did a side-by-side
8 comparison of those -- and in R-2 for any other PRD,
9 there are four dwelling units per net buildable acre.
10 The minimum parking requirement in an R-2 PRD that's not
11 tied to retirement community are two off-street parking
12 spaces for each dwelling unit as well as one off-street
13 parking space for every four dwelling units for visitor
14 parking. Single family dwellings are permitted in an R-2
15 PRD that's not a retirement community, and two family
16 dwellings are permitted within that R-2 PRD, again non
17 retirement community. There is common open space that is
18 required, actually a minimum percentage of 25 percent.
19 There are recreational facilities as well as then a
20 community center which are permitted.

21 If we were to look at the R-4 PRD
22 calculations as outlined within the existing zoning
23 ordinance, the maximum dwelling density is 18 units per
24 acre, and the parking is the same. Single family
25 dwellings are permitted within the PRD approach non

1 retirement community -- remember, we identified that
2 would be something in the base district that would
3 change; but when a PRD is applied, that is permissible --
4 as well as two family dwellings is permissible in R-4,
5 townhouses are permissible within R-4, and garden
6 apartments are permissible within R-4. So there is a
7 difference in the types of permission between -- of land
8 uses between what is a Retirement Community PRD and what
9 is a Non Retirement Community PRD. However, in both
10 cases, there is that full range of dwellings in the R-2
11 PRD Retirement Community to have the single family
12 dwellings, the two family dwellings, the townhouse
13 dwelling, and the garden apartment so long as it's
14 fulfilled in that 8 DUs per acre and the building
15 requirements. The open space calculation that is
16 necessary for an R-4 PRD Non Retirement is the same as
17 the R-2 PRD.

18 So we have one other thing as it relates
19 similarly with what we did in the other calculation, and
20 that is the number of dwelling units that are permissible
21 based upon the calculation. This is not talking about
22 the land use or the housing types. This is talking about
23 just the calculation for the dwellings.

24 A retirement community maximum number of
25 dwelling units based upon the information that was

1 provided as part of the application if it were to be
2 maintained as R-2 in the subject parcel, the number of
3 dwelling units maximum within a retirement community is
4 357. And based upon that, the number of parking spaces
5 that are necessary are at least 357, plus one per
6 employee for any types of things that would be relevant
7 to that.

8 If we were to then have that same
9 calculation for the Retirement Community PRD in R-4, we
10 would have the same number of dwelling units because that
11 is 357, as the requirement there is 8 dwelling units,
12 right, as our maximum based on the net buildable area.

13 Now, we considered that based upon
14 information that we had from both the slopes and types of
15 things as part of the County mapping and information that
16 we had as part of I believe the L.I.D.A.R. -- that's all
17 part of the exhibits -- is we created a slope map. The
18 number of parking spaces again for that Retirement
19 Community PRD are also at least 357, plus one per
20 employee. So there is no net change in that maximum
21 permissible number of dwelling units for the R-2 or the
22 R-4 in the retirement community situation. All other
23 PRDs based upon our identification here, because those
24 dwelling densities do have a difference in the other Non
25 Retirement Community PRD of 4 versus 18 -- the number of

1 dwelling units permissible within a PRD non retirement
2 community at R-2 are 178 dwelling units. The subject
3 parcel, if it were zoned R-4, the maximum number of
4 dwelling units at 18 units per acre -- again, when we're
5 talking about this category of non retirement community,
6 we do use the gross acreage of 54 -- that is 972, so it's
7 a net change of 794.

8 As part of the next part of our
9 comparison, we identified using the trip generation
10 Exhibit E that was included within the application. We
11 used those calculations for -- as presented by Wooster
12 and Associates. And we did a comparison where in the
13 analysis that was presented in the application, it was
14 based upon 123 dwelling units classified as single family
15 detached housing and 294 units calculated -- or
16 classified, excuse me, as multifamily housing, low-rise,
17 not close to rail transit. We used these equations to
18 calculate the trip generation based upon the base zoning
19 requirements, things that we've gone over previously, and
20 then we also looked at what those PRD calculations were
21 based upon the acreages and the densities presented.

22 So as part of the comparison in a non PRD,
23 so just that base set of dwelling types or any of those
24 other types, we did not look at things like places of
25 worship and things like that but we had -- our base

1 comparison was based upon housing types. So in R-2, our
2 single family maximum, 196 units, using the calculation
3 presented in the application would produce an average
4 daily trip of 1,874. Our a.m. peak hour was 137, and the
5 p.m. peak hour calculation totaled to 187. And again, we
6 were using the single family units and the rate, excuse
7 me, for the single family units as presented within the
8 application.

9 R-4 was identified as -- we applied a
10 multifamily there as that's permissible, and there were a
11 maximum number of 648 units, and that using the
12 calculations in Exhibit E of the application calculated
13 4,229. The a.m. peak hour would calculate to be 224 and
14 the p.m. peak hour calculated using that baseline
15 application information to be 299. So there is a net
16 change between R-2 and R-4 and the a.m. peak hour of 87
17 trips and a p.m. peak hour of 112 trips. We then used
18 those same equations to apply to the PRD -- I've still
19 got some more.

20 we also calculated from a standpoint of
21 what the PRD does permit and how those units then related
22 to Exhibit E within the calculation -- or the
23 application, excuse me, of the comparison again of R-2
24 single family PRD of 178 units, the current R-2 zoning at
25 multifamily of 357 units. We also did the current R-2

1 zoning of single family, again, at PRD of 357 units, and
2 the R-4 multifamily PRD, which would be 972 units.

3 when we look at the a.m. and the p.m. peak
4 hour ranges across the board between those PRDs different
5 equations -- again, this is all based upon what's the
6 maximum permissible because that's the way in which this
7 is all calculated and presented with -- and permissible
8 within the ordinance -- it's a range of 87 to 199 a.m.
9 peak hour trips and 110 to 268 p.m. peak hour trips.

10 As part of this analysis and our process
11 going through, we also did coordinate, and in the way in
12 which we were applying the equation presented within
13 Exhibit E is one that was logical and a one-for-one of
14 what was presented in the application. We did that with
15 the staff at Gateway Engineers, and they identified that
16 we were consistent in applying that equation to the way
17 in which we calculated our number of dwelling units.

18 So we have examination beyond all of those
19 calculations of where there are existing residential
20 zones and the sort of parcel sizes throughout the
21 township. We did evaluate; and based upon collector and
22 arterial roads, we looked at where the R-4 proposed
23 rezoning is, and we identified that there are other areas
24 of existing R-4 zoned parcels within the township. We
25 did conduct a slope analysis again based upon available

1 county information and L.I.D.A.R. and then sort of its
2 relationship to things.

3 So we have four findings in our summary,
4 and we identified that the proposed rezoning of the
5 subject parcel does not conform to the goals of the South
6 Park Township Future Land Use Plan where the future land
7 use on the subject parcel is designated as low intensity
8 residential, and we interpret this classification to be
9 the equivalent of either the R-1 or the R-2 zoning
10 districts as it is identified within your zoning
11 ordinance.

12 I do have more to say, please.

13 The second finding is that Allegheny
14 County's Future Land Use Plan designates areas within the
15 subject parcel as conservation rather than infill
16 development. Our understanding of the subject parcel and
17 its existing conditions aligns with the County's future
18 land use designation given the parcel's high percentage
19 of steep slope coverage and its existing character. As
20 such, the rezoning of the subject parcel to R-4 does not
21 align with the county-wide planning recommendations, and
22 the county's designation of land use areas for infill
23 orients new development toward places already developed
24 where existing road networks and infrastructure are
25 already accommodating more intense vehicular and

1 pedestrian activity -- and I'll have one other thing to
2 say about that in a moment -- based upon information
3 presented this evening.

4 Based upon the comparison of R-2 and R-4
5 of the zoning district's permissible land uses and the
6 dwelling unit densities, we observe that an R-4 rezoning
7 of the subject parcel would permit a density increase
8 greater than five times what is permitted under the
9 provisions of the R-2 medium density single family
10 dwelling -- excuse me -- single family residential
11 district.

12 I am aware that I identified in our
13 analysis there are scenarios between R-2 and R-4 such as
14 the non- -- excuse me -- such as the Retirement Community
15 PRD where that five times type of statement does not
16 apply because those two calculations are exactly the
17 same. However, we were looking at what the range is
18 between what is within the base zoning district of each
19 and then what the maximum dwelling units are in terms of
20 if a PRD were part of the application because that is a
21 permissible land use in both categories as a conditional
22 use. So we needed to look at that type of scale.

23 we have no particular points of reference
24 for any type of land development application, as that is
25 not the subject, is our understanding, of what this

1 rezoning is. It's specifically a
2 re-designation of the district boundary, nothing
3 associated with an application for land development
4 within the application request. The request was
5 specifically for, as we interpreted, the rezoning on the
6 map. So from that standpoint, we do have that range.
7 Right?

8 The fourth one is that we have observed
9 that the -- again, using the information with the
10 equations that were in Exhibit E for the daily trips, the
11 a.m. and p.m. peak hour, that based upon those
12 permissible dwellings, calculations and those traffic
13 equations, that there would also be a wide range of
14 potential outcomes with that application of those
15 equations.

16 Now, we are also fully aware that we are
17 not having again any specific land development associated
18 with this rezoning. This is specifically for the
19 boundary of the districts. So we also are aware that if
20 there were to be any land application -- land development
21 application in the future, that anything that would be an
22 impact to infrastructure or to roads, to any sorts of
23 things of that nature, that that would need to be an
24 element that was addressed specifically then.

25 So that we have quite a number of things

1 that we took a look at. We recognized that the zoning
2 ordinance, as it presents itself today for both R-2 and
3 R-4, do have some differences between the two districts.
4 When it comes to land uses, depending upon what is
5 approached as a base application in this district by
6 right, if there is something by conditional use within a
7 PRD for a retirement community or a PRD, that is all
8 types of other PRD, there are quite a number of ways in
9 which the land uses can be applied. So there is the
10 possibility within both districts, depending upon the
11 approach, to have various dwelling units that can be put
12 forth as part of any application ranging from single
13 family dwellings, two family dwellings, and townhouses,
14 and garden apartments.

15 So that is the conclusion of our
16 observations and comparisons as it relates to the two
17 districts. Thank you.

18 MR. BRACKER: Thank you very much, Ms.
19 Yagle.

20 MS. YAGLE: You're welcome.

21 MR. BRACKER: Mr. Bonidie, as code
22 enforcement officer, do you have any comments that you
23 would like to share with us and with the audience?

24 MR. BONIDIE: Mr. Chairman, I would just
25 like to enter into the record neighbor letters that were

1 submitted to the Planning Commission for this evening.

2 we had letters that were delivered on
3 March 17th. A letter from Valerie Shafer dated 3/13
4 consisted of general comments in opposition to storm
5 water and too many people in traffic in R-4 district.
6 Need to reserve what we have, our South Park, or we will
7 lose appeal in the future, and it will create a snowball
8 effect.

9 we also received a letter from Jason
10 Sobek, received March 15th. His concerns were increased
11 cost to township and residents for future maintenance if
12 rezoning was to move forward.

13 we also received a letter from Anne Oyler
14 on March 16th, revised on the 17th. Her concerns were
15 the noise, health of the wildlife, and wanted South Park
16 to do its own studies and not rely on developers that
17 would clearly show in their favor.

18 we received an email from Caroline Vodzak
19 on March 17th that cited the lack of proximity of
20 shopping or community services and arterial collector
21 road requirements that are not being met by definition
22 and ordinance.

23 Today you were all hand-delivered
24 additional letters and an email that was received today
25 in our office. We received a second letter from Anne

1 Oyler concerning the increased vehicle traffic and the
2 problem of light pollution along with diminishing space
3 for animals.

4 We also received a letter from Julia Gunn
5 concerning storm water, flooding concerns, and massive
6 tree removal. Additional email from Anne Oyler received
7 today. Comments from the online petition.

8 All these were made available to the
9 members prior to 7 p.m., the start of this hearing; and I
10 just wanted to make that part of the record.

11 MR. BRACKER: Thank you, Mr. Bonidie.

12 So ladies and gentlemen, just a reminder
13 of something that we would like to try to follow. Please
14 come forward, sign in, state your name, state your
15 address so that it can be recorded properly and so that
16 staff can properly document the information. Please
17 respect everyone if somebody has something that is --
18 that they're stating that is a little bit different than
19 your opinion.

20 Please limit redundant comments. If we
21 hear storm water management and more people have storm
22 water management questions or comments, but we can try to
23 limit those, and we do want to limit comments to three
24 minutes. I realize that there is -- people have put
25 forth a lot of effort and time to put together a

1 presentation for us.

2 (Discussion off record.)

3 (Brief recess.)

4 MR. BRACKER: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen,
5 we would like to get started again. Can you please state
6 your name and --

7 MR. FOSTER: Tim Foster, 1046 Westchester.
8 And I would like to present -- as the group, we collected
9 320 signatures that were signed in person. The only
10 comment I will make on these -- as you can see, my family
11 collected just over a hundred of these. And we've done
12 this from time to time. I have never had the occasion
13 where every person that I asked, every house that I asked
14 to sign this signed it in opposition of the rezoning. So
15 I just wanted to present this to you guys.

16 MR. BRACKER: Okay. Thank you. Did you
17 have more? Did you have more comment?

18 MR. FOSTER: I do have more. I just wanted
19 to give you the online, too, so...

20 MR. BRACKER: Okay.

21 MR. SOBEK: My name is Jason Sobek, 1750
22 Stoltz Road. We just wanted to present you with a copy
23 of the online Change.org petition. As of approximately
24 11 a.m. today, there were 3,233 signatures. Many people
25 that had formerly lived in South Park or in surrounding

1 neighborhoods signed, but at least 383 of those
2 signatures are in South Park zip codes 15129 and 15236.

3 MR. BRACKER: Thank you.

4 MR. FOSTER: Thank you, guys. I appreciate
5 -- I appreciate the time. I'm going to be -- try to be
6 as brief as possible, but I just think there's some
7 important matters that the township and the board
8 certainly has to be aware of.

9 Now, I'm an attorney. I worked for Consol
10 Energy for 12 years, and I think a point that was just
11 glazed over very quickly most unfortunately by the
12 developer was the fact of the mine subsidence issue. And
13 I know there's a lot of confusion. You know, in my days
14 at Consol, I saw a lot of legal summaries of mine
15 subsidence issues, costs, you know, repairs, all the
16 things. So in the -- in the report by ACA Engineering --
17 and this is a group that the Red Rocks group hired, and
18 I'm sure you have seen this -- but it says: The risk of
19 mine subsidence for the portion adjacent -- the site
20 adjacent to Sleepy Hollow Road is high based on a scale
21 of low, medium, to high.

22 Now, I hope this jumps out at everybody
23 because -- and I'll just give a little bit of background
24 because there's some confusion on this. Mine
25 subsidence -- now, you know, Consol Energy has been

1 around since 1860, very innovative, successful company,
2 operates the largest underground coal mine North America.
3 They have for a long time. The Bailey Mine complex in
4 Washington and Greene County does 25 million tons of coal
5 a year, and so there's obviously a lots of issues. But
6 what Consol does in those type of mines is a long-wall
7 mining machine. I've been underground a number of times,
8 and what that machine does -- and it's a high-tech
9 laser-driven machine, very few men. It has its own roof
10 support, so as it mines the coal, and it can be get
11 nearly all the coal out of the seam, there's
12 instantaneous subsidence behind it. So that roof falls
13 immediately. So the company knows exactly where they are
14 mining that day, so immediately in real time the company
15 can, you know, address those issues. Now, we have a huge
16 difference. I worked with the DEP the last couple of
17 weeks, and I just wanted to share the most detailed maps
18 that they had of the area, and I'm just going to submit
19 these so you guys can look at those. But what you'll see
20 with those mines -- and it's -- obviously, it's a very
21 heavily-mined area, the Sleepy Hollow-South Park area.
22 They were done room and pillar. Now, I've seen some of
23 these mines. And if you can understand, they were mining
24 coal, and they were leaving pillars of rock and coal.
25 The problem with those types of mines is decades or even

1 now a hundred years later, you can get just regular, you,
2 know, loosening of those, and you're going to get
3 subsidence at the top. What can contribute to that is
4 vibration, roads, construction. Building above that
5 can -- you know, can produce that subsidence pretty --
6 you know, pretty quickly and at that time.

7 So I noticed that -- and we walk quite a
8 bit on Sleepy Hollow Road. We walk our dog, ride bikes,
9 drive back there to get to the trails. While they were
10 working on that Academy building at the 2200 Sleepy
11 Hollow Road and had those crane trucks and heavy
12 equipment back there, that road after those trucks were
13 on that road, you could see the deterioration of that
14 road. And what it's called, it's called pothole
15 subsidence. And I just wanted to share some of these
16 pictures with you if you haven't seen it. You know,
17 these are pretty substantial -- pretty substantial pieces
18 of evidence of that type of subsidence. And I -- and I
19 also -- I also have a report about that subsidence, also,
20 so we can -- so you can see that.

21 So I think what we're already seeing just
22 with that type of process to repair and replace that
23 bridge, we're already seeing this type of subsidence. So
24 I think the township has really got to take a look at
25 that and says does this -- is this really appropriate to

1 do any type of redevelopment of that road and all of the
2 traffic --

3 MR. WEIL: I mean, but that's not -- that's
4 not what is on the agenda. The agenda is on rezoning
5 here.

6 MR. FOSTER: That's what -- that's what I'm
7 addressing.

8 MR. WEIL: You're talking about development.

9 MR. FOSTER: This -- this is --

10 MR. WEIL: You -- you're talking about
11 development. We're not talking about development.

12 MR. FOSTER: I'm talking a transition to
13 R-4 --

14 MR. WEIL: We're talking about rezoning.
15 That is what the topic is.

16 MR. FOSTER: -- and the additional traffic
17 and --

18 MR. WEIL: what you're talking about is not
19 the topic of the meeting.

20 MR. FOSTER: I'm sorry?

21 MR. WEIL: what you're talking about is not
22 really the topic of the meeting. The meeting is about
23 rezoning.

24 (Crosstalk)

25 (Reporter clarification.)

1 MR. FOSTER: I'm just trying to point out --
2 I'll -- let me summarize this because I think the
3 additional concern that we should have -- I think we have
4 as residents and we should have as a township is -- is
5 the language that's in this ACA report because it is our
6 understanding that test borings are being requested to
7 further evaluate the mining conditions at the site and
8 the quality of the overburdened rock. While ACA agrees
9 that further evaluation may be necessary, we would
10 recommend that evaluation occurs during the land
11 development process instead of at the rezoning
12 application.

13 Now, what they're asking you to do -- and
14 the reason is pure economics. It is to reduce the cost
15 of the project. They're asking you to make a decision
16 whether this property can even sustain that type of
17 development, that type of high density, without even
18 getting core samples. So where -- where does that
19 responsibility lie? Whose responsibility is it -- is it
20 to make sure that that is not going to be an issue,
21 because if you see --

22 MR. SABLE: Tim, your points are well-taken
23 and -- but I think they're for another type of a meeting.
24 We're strictly trying to determine whether we're going to
25 approve an R-2 to R-4 or not. What you're -- what you're

1 discussing is very important but not to this part of the
2 decision. I don't mean to be disrespectful because it's
3 a lot of good information, but this is all about whether
4 it R-2 or R-4.

5 MR. FOSTER: Why was this submitted to you?

6 MR. SABLE: It was submitted for the idea of
7 do we want to rezone it from R-2 to R-4. That's --
8 that's -- that's the major purpose of the session.
9 That's what this gentleman is trying to say to you. And
10 we understand -- look, that's important data. You all
11 have important data. But remember, our decision is
12 focused on whether we're going to approve or not approve
13 a recommendation to go from R-2 to R-4. All of that --
14 it's already zoned R-2, so that kind of discussion talks
15 about when you're doing a development. We're not to that
16 point yet. We're not to that point yet. We're simply to
17 the point of whether it would be rezoned from R-2 to R-4.
18 And I don't mean to be mean or disrespectful, but that
19 conversation is more pertinent to when the development
20 would occur, if it would occur.

21 MR. FOSTER: I just -- I just -- I'm just
22 going to wrap this up. I'll wrap it up real quick
23 because if you look at the language of this report that
24 was submitted, this -- this statement doesn't move any
25 warranties, express or denied. So they're completely

1 walking away from this. This is -- this is going to lead
2 to the township taking on these responsibilities.

3 And I just -- I'm going to make one last
4 point, okay, because normally you can't sue a city or a
5 town, right, because of solvent immunity. Well, when you
6 can -- and this goes right to the point because when you
7 can sue is when you have a duty, right, a duty of care to
8 somebody who is injured. So any type of development on
9 this road, any type of change in this road, any type of
10 increase of the size or the traffic on this road, you do
11 have a duty of care. So it's -- the duty is to ensure
12 there are no dangerous conditions in public places such
13 as roads, parks, schools. So this goes directly to that.
14 So this is where South Park Township -- we've all read
15 the jury awards that are tens of millions of dollars,
16 right? This is where South Park can overstep their
17 bounds, approve any type of development in this area, and
18 to delay any type of bore samples and, you know, in this
19 process and serve it until later. That serves the
20 township no purpose, and I hope you realize that. That
21 serves the developers' purpose, not our purpose as
22 residents, as township people --

23 MR. SABLE: And we don't -- Tim, we disagree
24 with any of that. All I'm trying to say is we're focused
25 on this decision of either going from R-2 to R-4 or not

1 go from R-2 to R-4. That's simply what we're saying.

2 MR. FOSTER: Well, I'm hoping everything I
3 presented clearly demonstrates why we should not ever
4 consider R-4, and then we'll get to the point later --

5 MR. SABLE: That's a good point for you
6 right there. I understand. Thank you.

7 MS. GUNN: Hi, my name is Julia Gunn,
8 G-U-N-N, 1840 Stoltz Road in South Park. And our
9 neighborhood on Stoltz Road -- and you should have a
10 flier on this from me --

11 MR. BRACKER: Yes.

12 MS. GUNN: -- I think he handed out to you.

13 We are requesting you vote no to a zoning
14 change from R-1 and 2 to R-4 for the 59 acres on Sleepy
15 Hollow Road. Residents and business owners local to that
16 area have many concerns on the issue of storm water
17 management.

18 well, first of all, the question belies
19 itself will the area be totally deforested for an R-4
20 versus an R-2. Will there be less impervious surfaces
21 with an R-2 versus an R-4, less parking spaces with an
22 R-2 versus an R-4? So there's a lot of questions that we
23 of have in the neighborhood because if you go back to
24 2018, everybody on Sleepy Hollow Run got flooded. You
25 know, that creek is the recipient of all of the waters on

1 Stoltz Road, all the Bethel Park properties on Stoltz
2 Road, the Saddlebrook plan on Stoltz Road -- all dump
3 into Sleepy Hollow Run. Sleepy Hollow Run needs some
4 work. It needs some stream stabilization. The sewer
5 line for South Park runs right through Sleepy Hollow Run.
6 Below the 59 acres that's the subject of tonight, the
7 Bethel Park sewer blew up in 2018. That had to be
8 replaced. A road had to be brought down to the stream to
9 actually repair that site.

10 Now, my question is -- I just found out
11 Bethel Park sewers run on one side of Stoltz Road. South
12 Park sewer runs through the stream through Sleepy Hollow
13 Run. Where do they meet? Do they meet down below this
14 parcel? Will they have to dig under the sewer, the
15 Bethel Park sewer to get to South -- I mean, I don't
16 know. I've asked the question. Nobody seems to know.

17 So -- and I listed on this paper all of
18 the damages that the neighborhood suffered in 2018.
19 Below the stream was a \$500,000 bridge that Allegheny
20 County had to replace. The horse arena above me flooded.
21 Don Bick, the business building beside me -- the trees
22 are all falling because the storm water. It's higher
23 than my head. It's over 15 feet. It's a river behind my
24 barn when we get heavy rains. A new home in Saddlebrook
25 plan was sliding off the hill. All the construction

1 vehicles were there. There's a lot of water in this
2 area. And the Maripat plan that's at the intersection of
3 Maripat and Stoltz was built before storm water
4 management. All of that water from Maripat, from
5 Patricia from Edwards goes down Maripat through my
6 property into Sleepy Hollow Run. There's no other --
7 there's supposed to be a diversion channel behind
8 Patricia, but that I guess is overgrown. So all of that
9 water runs basically through Don Bick's property and my
10 property back to the creek. So what I'm saying is if you
11 put an R-4 high density development back there, all the
12 impervious surfaces, all the water running off there,
13 it's all going to the same creek. And the water is just
14 not going to flow to the left. It's going to sit there
15 and swirl around and slow all the water that's coming
16 down Sleepy Hollow.

17 Every -- every heavy rain, Sleepy Hollow
18 and McConkey flood, that intersection. Every rain,
19 Sleepy Hollow and Stoltz flood right there at the same
20 intersection. You only have one road out of this
21 proposed development. What happens when that floods?

22 And that begs the other question: why
23 isn't there another access road to this development?
24 Shouldn't there be another way out for these people? I
25 mean, what is the number you have to get to to have

1 another access road?

2 One more question begs itself: The
3 bridge -- the road will have to be widened, so the bridge
4 on Sleepy Hollow will have to be widened. Where's the
5 temporary bridge going to go? How will the people that
6 live on Sleepy Hollow get out while this is happening,
7 period?

8 So those are some of my comments. The
9 other thing I hope we all keep in mind is that Bethel
10 Park is building a new elementary center just over the
11 hill behind Saddlebrook. Twenty-five acres of land is
12 being deforested there. Is that water going to go down
13 the hill this way or down the hill that way? I don't
14 know. But I'm at the bottom. So -- so that's my
15 concern. And the Comprehensive Plan must have taken this
16 into consideration in 2018. So when designating this
17 area R-1 and R-2, I think that was probably part of the
18 rationale, and I hope that we adhere to that plan and
19 keep it as R-2. Thank you.

20 MR. BRACKER: Thank you.

21 MS. S. OLIPHANT: Good evening. My name is
22 Sara Summer Oliphant. This is Keil Oliphant and Elliot
23 Oliphant. We're at 3572 Falmouth Drive in South Park.
24 I'm not going to say a whole lot. My girls prepared
25 something to say. I know you guys commented it's not

1 about development, it's about rezoning. Rezoning opens
2 the door for the development we're talking about.

3 I want to say he spoke on affordable
4 housing by putting townhouses in. I don't consider like
5 the townhouses at Summit Station -- I don't consider that
6 affordable housing. There's affordable housing in South
7 Park. I can't afford one of those town homes. I have I
8 have a beautiful house in South Park.

9 And, also, you were talking about the
10 buffalo and the history of the buffalo. Yes, the area
11 has built up and the buffalo are still there, but there
12 has not been development across the street from the
13 buffalo. They are a major part of South Park. My
14 daughter busted her butt reforming -- trying to make
15 improvements at South Park Game Preserve, and I just ask
16 that if we're going talk about the buffalo, that we take
17 time to visit the South Park Game Preserve and see how
18 the buffalo live, see the babies that are born every year
19 and really take in South Park Game Preserve. But I'm
20 going to hand it over my daughters because they speak
21 better than I do.

22 MR. BRACKER: Thank you.

23 MS. K. OLIPHANT: Hello, everybody. My name
24 is Keil Oliphant. I am nine years old, and I am a
25 third-grader at South Park Elementary Center. I have

1 lived in South Park throughout my whole life. I want to
2 start and end tonight with a quote from one of my
3 favorite movies, the Lorax. "I speak for the trees for
4 the trees have no tongues."

5 My thought about this decision to cut down
6 the trees for housing is that you shouldn't cut them
7 down. Animals need homes, too. They also need food. If
8 they don't have the trees for home, they will be in the
9 streets and in people's backyards. Some people might not
10 like having animals in their yards. Also, having animals
11 in the streets will make accidents happen. People could
12 be hurt and animals will lose their lives. Also, trees
13 are beautiful and they do good things for the ecosystem,
14 so why cut them down? When I am older, I don't want to
15 grow up with no trees. If we keep cutting down trees in
16 South Park, what's next, all the trees in South Park, all
17 the trees in Pittsburgh, all the trees in the state?
18 Please don't just think about right now. Think about the
19 future for me, my friends, and our whole community.

20 Again, from the Lorax. "Unless someone
21 like you cares a whole awful lot, nothing is going to get
22 better, it's not."

23 Thank you for listening to what I have to
24 say. Please keep the trees.

25 MS. E. OLIPHANT: Hello, everyone. My name

1 is Ellie Oliphant. I'm 18 years old, and I'm a senior at
2 South Park High School. Please note what that I've
3 prepared to say tonight are my own thoughts and feelings
4 regarding this matter. I'm not here representing my
5 mother but representing myself.

6 Once I heard about the development
7 proposed for Sleepy Hollow, I knew that I wanted to
8 speak. One of the things I love about South Park is all
9 of the wildlife and interesting spots in the community.
10 Sesqui Drive, for example is one of my favorite spots in
11 the park. As a teenager, that's where I liked to spend
12 my time running, watching sunsets, and eating with my
13 friends and so on. That stretch of land alone holds so
14 many specific memories for me just from the past few
15 years. All of the time I've been in high school, I've
16 gone up and spent countless hours in that part of the
17 park. I believe that putting these town homes here
18 destroys a significant and beautiful part of our
19 township. At what point do we as a community draw the
20 line with the amount of nature we destroy? Honestly, it
21 seem as those there is a new housing development popping
22 up every month, and I've heard firsthand than many have
23 had structural issues and even been deemed unfit for
24 living. To put it plainly, we're taking more and more
25 physical park out of South Park every day. This

1 continuous changing of my community, which I've lived in
2 since I was a baby, makes me not want to come back after
3 I graduate from college. Am I not a future resident here
4 expressing my opinion? I believe that our community's
5 biggest definable trait is the wildlife and greenery, so
6 what are we anymore if we continue to tear down and
7 destroy it?

8 I could say a lot more about all of the
9 points I've made tonight, but I know our time is limited.
10 Please don't take my brevity as a lack of passion. Thank
11 you for your time and consideration and, please, let's
12 leave the park in South Park.

13 MR. DONNELLAN: I'm Walt Donnellan, 180
14 Meadowbrook Drive. I'm against rezoning of the property
15 located primarily between Sleepy Hollow Road and the game
16 reserve section of South Park from R-2 to R-4. This
17 undeveloped parcel supports a mature forest, habitat for
18 wildlife, and serves as a natural buffer to the park for
19 potential outdoor recreation. Records show this property
20 conveyed to Veca Land Development on August 1979 for
21 \$375,000. At that time and to now, it's been R-2. A
22 compelling reason to change that zoning might be for some
23 larger benefit to the community, but let's think what
24 would that be. Taking away the parklike environment that
25 many of us moved here to enjoy is not a benefit. Raising

1 taxes to pay for expansion of roads, schools, and
2 required utilities to handle the increase in population
3 is not a benefit. Displacing wildlife so that they have
4 nowhere to go such that we have to hire hunters in our
5 communities to cull the deer herd is not a benefit. The
6 financial gain of the seller and the developer are not
7 justifications. If the owners or developers want to
8 develop this parcel of wooded land, then develop it as it
9 is currently zoned. If that's not profitable, there are
10 other options such as to sell it to an organization that
11 will keep it as a green space, for example, the Allegheny
12 Land Trust. Such a sale could yield three to four times
13 the original purchase price of this property and maintain
14 the property in the way it has been for many years. I
15 think that would be a win-win for all involved. In any
16 case, please leave this property zoned R-2.

17 MR. BRACKER: Thank you.

18 MS. SHAFER: My good evening. My name is
19 Valerie Shafer, and I'm a lifelong resident of South Park
20 Township. My parents moved here with my sister and I
21 back in 1971 when I was five years old, and I grew up in
22 the house that I now own. I purchased it from my parents
23 when my father passed away. I graduated from South Park
24 Township High School in 1983 -- go Eagles -- and like
25 everybody behind me, I am a proud resident of this

1 community. We're very proud of the community that we
2 live in.

3 I sent a letter about my feelings to all
4 of you. I thank you for your time in reading that. I'm
5 not going to rehash it tonight, but I did have a few more
6 comments I wanted to make about the traffic because at
7 the time I wrote that letter to all of you, I really
8 wasn't thinking about the new school development over in
9 the Armstrong way by -- which the traffic is going to
10 spill onto Kings School Road and Stoltz Road. And, you
11 know, we don't have a lot of traffic signaling and
12 signage on Stoltz right now or Sleepy Hollow. It's a
13 single-lane road. With the amount of people that are
14 going to be spilling out there with the type of R-4
15 development if that zoning goes through, it means,
16 according to Ms. Yagle's very detailed report, almost a
17 thousand people and over 600 automobiles into that little
18 Sleepy Hollow corner. So, you know, our taxes are
19 definitely going to be increased to pay for widening the
20 road, installing traffic signaling and signage.

21 In addition, once that -- all of those
22 people commuting back and forth from work and then we
23 have the new elementary school coming in, you know, we're
24 going to have a lot of traffic, cars idling, a lot of
25 exhaust in the air. And it's a very similar situation to

1 what you have now up by Al's Cafe and Brentwood Bank
2 where at rush hour everyday when St. Louise de Marillac
3 is out, there's a single lane of cars that goes all the
4 way from the traffic light in front of Al's all the way
5 down to Johnston Road, past St. Louis de Marillac and
6 then down to 19. And it's just a single lane of cars.

7 And our children do get out of school
8 before rush hour is over. There's not one sidewalk
9 available in any of our neighborhoods, and the kids are
10 going to be out walking around, trying to visit their
11 friends in the neighborhood, and it's just not going to
12 be safe with the increased traffic. So, you know, we
13 don't want that.

14 And, you know, at the end of the day, I
15 guesstimated with the U.S. Census information in my
16 letter to all of you that there would be about four times
17 the amount of people concentrated in the area. With Ms.
18 Yagle's very detailed report, she came to the conclusion
19 that there would be five times the amount of people in
20 that area.

21 So I just want to again reiterate that,
22 you know, I understand that the landowner is a real
23 estate developer, but so is everyone behind me. Everyone
24 behind me is a real estate investor. We've all invested
25 in South Park. We love it here. We care. That's why

1 we're here. And we ask that you please consider before
2 you vote that you vote no to the rezoning because it will
3 negatively impact our real estate investments as
4 homeowners, the quality of our life, the air quality in
5 the area, the aesthetic of our neighborhoods, the traffic
6 congestion that we'll have to deal with, the population
7 density in our neighborhoods and that you vote no to
8 rezoning Sleepy Hollow. Thank you.

9 MR. BRACKER: Thank you.

10 MS. GREEN: Hi, Michele Green, 1908 Stoltz
11 Road, and I apologize if this is a little scattered. I
12 was not prepared to give any remarks today. For those
13 that do not know where my exact location is, I'm almost
14 directly across from the entrance of Sleepy Hollow.

15 To further elaborate on some other points
16 that have already been spoken, in 2018 when Sleepy Hollow
17 did flood, I could not leave my house for three days.
18 Traffic was frequently turning around in my driveway,
19 which was a really great surprise for me immediately
20 returning from my honeymoon. So that was really great.

21 In addition to that, I was a first-time
22 home buyer in 2015 whenever we decided to purchase in
23 South Park. We chose South Park for a reason over Mt.
24 Lebanon or Bethel Park or those surrounding areas. South
25 Park is a great community to start a family in, which we

1 have recently been able to do. My son will be two in two
2 weeks. That being said, since we've moved to Stoltz
3 Road, we have seen traffic increase exponentially
4 already. In addition to the Summit Station, a lot of
5 traffic reroutes to Stoltz to avoid traffic on 88, as I'm
6 sure some of you might know.

7 My son will be two, and I will not let him
8 get out of the car in the driveway. He cannot play in my
9 front yard currently because of the traffic. When it is
10 evening time, as others have noted, there are no stop
11 signs. There are not even street lights near my house.

12 And in addition to that, the
13 infrastructure with the bridge -- I have a dog. We
14 utilize Sleepy Hollow quite often. The bridge is
15 crumbling. So that is definitely something to take into
16 consideration with the addition of high volume of
17 traffic.

18 Unfortunately, I think in a situation like
19 this with the target of the demographics for developers,
20 you know, I would not have chosen the location of my
21 home. I'm a young professional. If I was looking to
22 reside in South Park, the average rent costs are higher
23 than my mortgage. I have a four-bedroom lovely home in
24 this area; and if I were a young professional looking to
25 move to a great neighborhood that allows more green space

1 than the surrounding neighborhoods, a good school
2 district, more one-on-one student activity and teacher
3 ratio, I would not be living in an apartment or in a
4 condo or in a town home where it would further limit the
5 availability that I would have.

6 We moved to South Park for a reason and
7 it's so we could have that balance between city
8 accessibility and the wonderful green space that this
9 neighborhood has to offer. So as a young professional in
10 the target demographic that the developer is targeting, I
11 would highly encourage you to reconsider zone 2 to zone
12 4. Thank you.

13 MR. BRACKER: Thank you.

14 MS. FOSTER: Hi, my name is Allison Foster.
15 I live at 1912 Stoltz Road. Right next door to Michele,
16 as she said, we get flooding right before the bridge.
17 That happens with not even a heavy rainfall, so I can't
18 imagine if we lost more trees due to that, that that
19 wouldn't get even worse. I've lived there since 2001. I
20 know the road. I know the creek. I've seen how the
21 creek keeps rising.

22 I also want to point out we love our
23 horses and our stables. We like seeing the horses walk
24 up and down the street, even the donkeys when we hear
25 them. It's something that would completely change if we

1 get so developed back there. Where are the horses going
2 to walk when they take that short little jaunt just to go
3 down Sleepy Hollow?

4 We've also had a lot of construction in
5 South Park over the past years with Summit, with Riggs
6 Road, Ridge Road. It's a lot of new construction
7 happening at once in our little township. I don't think
8 we need to be rezoned from 2 to 4. I ask you to consider
9 that. Thank you.

10 MR. BRACKER: Thank you.

11 MR. EICHENLAUB: Good evening. My name is
12 Ed Eichenlaub, and I live at 5500 Kings School Road in
13 Bethel Park, and I am going to ask you to just seriously
14 look at what lies ahead, to keep this zoned R-2 versus
15 R-4 primarily because of just the volume of traffic which
16 affects the residents of Stoltz and Kings School
17 especially with the proposed new elementary school that
18 is going to be my new neighbor across the street. That
19 is going to add a tremendous amount of traffic.

20 For 22 years since I've lived there, I've
21 fought to try and get a secondary stop sign at Stoltz and
22 Kings School to slow traffic. You know, there's nothing
23 better than the summer events when all the guys pour out
24 of South Park and do that quarter mile drag strip up
25 Stoltz Road. And I can't imagine if we add more vehicles

1 because of a large -- or a large complex down there on
2 Sleepy Hollow.

3 Now, Red Rocks has pretty well stated
4 they're looking at this as cash cow. They want something
5 there to get maximum benefit, maximum income, so that
6 they can change the zoning to justify that. I'm saying
7 please reconsider and keep this R-2 versus R-4 just
8 because of what lies ahead and how complex this is going
9 to become with the new elementary school that's already
10 happening. So thank you.

11 MR. BRACKER: Thank you.

12 MR. GASTMEYER: He didn't say anything about
13 the fact that he lives a few houses away from the woman
14 who used to star with Maxwell Smart in Get Smart. I'm
15 surprised he didn't do that.

16 Jim, how are you doing, sir?

17 MR. WAYCHOFF: I'm well. Thank you.

18 MR. GASTMEYER: My name is Andy Gastmeyer.
19 I live at 962 Westchester Road. And if I might take a
20 personal moment, it's nice to say after 40 years in
21 television news that I can talk now without being
22 concerned about straddling objectivity and commentary.

23 But I will say, you know, you are trying
24 to put 10 pounds of sand in a 5-pound bag. At least
25 that's what the developer from Philadelphia is proposing.

1 Jim waychoff, an old family friend and a builder, can
2 probably add to that in terms of what he can say about
3 some of these building plans and the kind of imposition
4 that they will ultimately create.

5 And Ms. Yagle, is it? You have my utter
6 sympathy. You had to make a presentation based on
7 statistics. My last year of college I had to take six
8 hours of math, of statistics, in one semester, and I know
9 how boring that can be. And in all deference to you,
10 your hands were tied making your presentation. I was out
11 there in the back, and I know people were getting antsy.

12 My recommendation to you guys -- Tom has
13 already made -- Tim rather has already made -- Tim has
14 already made the comments about the impact, so I'm not
15 going to bother with that, but this is a big deal. I'm
16 not telling you anything you don't know. But what you
17 have to do is change the venue. This is a terrible
18 setting for something as big as this. There's nothing in
19 the way of creature comforts and worse in terms of the
20 presentation you're trying to make. The acoustics are
21 just terrible. And I'm a guy with one eardrum. The
22 other people in the back who have two working pretty
23 well, I suspect, were having just as difficult a time
24 hearing things. I think next time you ought to go for
25 the auditorium at the high school for the April 10th

1 meeting. You've got a big stage to work with there. Ms.
2 Yagle can have visual aids to demonstrate her point if
3 she were to be called upon to testify before that
4 particular group.

5 One of the things that's missing in this
6 and her presentation is the relevance. I stood back
7 there, and I'm trying to figure out where the hell is
8 this in relationship to the Montour Trail, which I hit
9 probably two or three times a week between Planet
10 Fitness. And that part of Montour Trail comes right up
11 against the tennis courts. I can't visualize how close
12 this development is to the tennis courts, to where the
13 Montour Trail ends there, that section you go into off of
14 Stewart Road, and how close it comes up behind those
15 tennis courts. People are hearing numbers, but they're
16 not seeing what they're up against.

17 And talk about the Montour Trail, this
18 really is a quality-of-life issue. There's all kinds of
19 wildlife in Montour Trail. Don't tell me that will not
20 been affected.

21 I grew up 85 miles north of New York City
22 on the northern reach of the Delaware River. I still go
23 back there to both canoe and kayak. When that area
24 became a part of the National Park Service and they
25 preserved it -- beautiful area -- we had more and more

1 people coming up from New York City than we could handle
2 in one weekend. You can't get on the river on Saturday,
3 Sunday, or Monday of any week during the summertime.

4 I have no idea and neither do most of
5 these people here have any idea how this is going to
6 impact an already busy area in terms of how many
7 additional people are going to be using what is a
8 treasure out there, and that's the wooded area alongside
9 of the Montour Trail. Thank you all.

10 MR. BRACKER: Thank you.

11 MS. DUNN: Good evening. My name is
12 Michelle Dunn. I am a former resident of South Park. I
13 currently live in Pleasant Hills at 469 Temona Road. I
14 am in the park, South Park, the park itself or the
15 township, almost every day. One of the things that I've
16 noticed that I don't think anybody has really talked
17 about -- we've talked about storm water management --
18 but, also, how is that sewage going to be treated at the
19 small sewage plant down there on Piney Fork Road. And,
20 also, all the other developments that are going on.
21 There's a huge housing development on Gill Hall Road that
22 that water, that storm water, and all that sewage has to
23 be treated and getting down to Clairton. The same with
24 the new town homes over at the -- I think it's the
25 Scarmuzzi or Scarmazzi development. That all drains down

1 there. That sewage has to be treated. The same with
2 Summit Station.

3 And along with that, it's the flooding.
4 We live in this area because we love the Montour Trail.
5 We market South Park. We look -- you can connect to the
6 trail and this and that. That trail is going to get
7 flooded with all this storm water from all these
8 community developments. So my suggestion just for the
9 sewage issue is vote no to change that to R-4. R-2,
10 leave it there. Thank you.

11 MR. BRACKER: Thank you.

12 MS. SOUKUP: Hi, good evening. My name is
13 Lilas Soukup. I live at 2680 Brownsville Road. Mine is
14 just more on a personal note regarding a change for the
15 zoning, okay? As many statements have already been
16 previously been stated here this evening, I would just
17 like to reiterate a few and expand on my opinion
18 regarding the proposed rezoning request.

19 My family has been lifelong residents of
20 South Park when it truly was a parklike setting. That is
21 one of the reasons why my great grandparents purchased
22 the land for their family farm here. I was born in South
23 Park and have been a resident to this day. I have seen
24 what development does to the area surrounding my home.
25 While growing up, it was woods to pick berries, take a

1 leisurely walk to see the animals. But when construction
2 of homes took place behind ours, those woods were gone,
3 and they were now gone forever.

4 The additional water runoff that came from
5 construction onto my ground caused numerous floods over
6 the course of years due to the deforestation that has
7 gone through. When you turn ground and trees into
8 blacktop, the water has nowhere to go except for the
9 neighboring area.

10 The property in question is currently
11 zoned R-2. A reason that could be considered a positive
12 to change, it would be okay, we're going to expand our
13 population, let South Park grow. But, unfortunately,
14 that change would really not have a long-term benefit to
15 us. Items to consider obviously, as they have all been
16 previously stated, we know about the traffic, we know
17 about the schools, we know about the "increase-ment" of
18 the maintenance and the cost that is going to be involved
19 for the maintenance piece. But some of those items, they
20 don't really compare to also the effect on climate change
21 and on the CO2 rates that will be coming now into our
22 community.

23 we do not want to become a Clairton. We
24 do not have to have those CO2 rates be increased. I
25 previously worked for the Department of Energy. I'm very

1 well-versed in carbon capture, carbon sequestration, new
2 energy development, use of electric vehicles. So I look
3 at this from how it's going to be impacting our
4 neighborhood and then also enticing those individuals to
5 come into the community. When they see that we're
6 comparing to Clairton and we're going to have a poor air
7 quality day because they concentrated area where we are
8 now removing any of the forestation that can adapt and
9 take advantage of the CO2, it's not going to look good
10 for us.

11 I understand obviously the developer, they
12 want to make a profit on the purchase of the land over
13 the expenses that they're going to need in order to go
14 forward with construction. I understand we all want to
15 make money in this world, okay, but we also need to take
16 into consideration the residents and the rezoning that
17 will take place. If the developer wants to continue with
18 housing, I strongly feel that enough homes could be put
19 in to both increase our revenue as an R-2. I do not see
20 the additional revenue coming in compared to the
21 additional cost that it's going to cost the residents in
22 order to perform the maintenance and the upkeep as we go
23 forward.

24 Additionally, as it was previously stated,
25 if the developer -- sorry -- doesn't feel that going

1 forward that he's not going to make enough money or the
2 profit versus the revenue from the expenses would be
3 appropriate, obviously, you can go to one of the
4 conservation organizations.

5 Some of the things that we have worked
6 with in the past on the federal side is that there are so
7 many grants available through the Pennsylvania Department
8 of Conservation and Forestry in order to keep it as a
9 conservative amount of space to promote the forestry, to
10 increase the effects the climate change and the carbon
11 dioxide rates going forward.

12 So in summation, I would just propose
13 leaving the current R-2 zoning as it is with the limited
14 amount of the effect both population-wise and the
15 degradation of our environment and let everyone be more
16 -- more in tune and happy both as residents, as our
17 neighbors, and as our visitors.

18 And I also would like to make a comment
19 regarding Ms. Yagle. I know that coming from on the
20 federal government side there is nothing worse than
21 reading regulations and trying to reiterate them to
22 individuals in a monotone way. So thank you so much for
23 your persistence in getting through with the information
24 to us, and I take your consideration of changing from an
25 R-2 to an R-4, but for our residents and also for our

1 neighbors and enticing the new population coming into
2 South Park Township. Thank you again.

3 MR. BRACKER: Thank you, too.

4 MS. SAVIKAS: Hello. I am Carolyn Savikas.
5 I live at 6947 Hilldale Drive. I am also the chair of
6 the Friends of South Park.

7 I did submit a letter to you guys.
8 Hopefully, you did receive a copy of it, but I just want
9 to read a little bit.

10 This is the Allegheny County Master Plan.
11 It was done in January of 2002. The comprehensive master
12 plan lists the Sleepy Hollow area as a biological zone.
13 It's stated, and I quote: Sleepy Hollow is the largest
14 and most intact area in South Park from a natural
15 resource standpoint. Most of the woodland in this area
16 are in various stages of succession resulting from a
17 variety of past agricultural and cultural practices.

18 The report also goes on to recommend that
19 they formally designate the Sleepy Hollow area -- I'm
20 sorry -- the Sleepy Hollow biological zone as an open
21 space reserve.

22 When the master plan was redone in 2012,
23 again Sleepy Hollow was deigned -- they made a request
24 that the Sleepy Hollow biological zone be required -- be
25 designated as an open space reserve.

1 In 2017, Allegheny -- Western Pennsylvania
2 Conservancy did a report for South Park. It was an
3 ecological report. Sleepy Hollow was mentioned 16 times
4 in this report, 16 times. The most -- here's a quote
5 from them. It says: The most ecologically-intact
6 portions of the park are centered around the largest
7 block of forest that pre-dates the formation of the park.
8 The area is centered around Sleepy Hollow.

9 It goes on to say: The forest communities
10 on the flood plain of Sleepy Hollow and the nearby slopes
11 are some of the most diverse and intact found within the
12 park.

13 Finally, the report also lists several
14 populations of plant species that are rare in our state
15 and our region, and they described the wetlands that are
16 located in Sleepy Hollow, all of which extend to the 59
17 acres that we are being considered under development.

18 The South Park Township Comprehensive Plan
19 that was passed in 2017 has as its number one goal --
20 number one goal -- to balance development with
21 conservation to maintain the appeal and the quality of
22 the community's existing landscapes. I believe the
23 statements from the group spoken tonight will reflect the
24 community still believes this. If you remember, the
25 Comprehensive Plan was done with a significant influence

1 from the people in the township.

2 Also, as you know, I'm sure, the township
3 has previously requested 10 acres of ground from South
4 Park, our county park, to help with storm water
5 management for another development. One of our concerns
6 is how much ground are you going to ask from South Park.
7 If we do this development, are we going need more ground
8 taken from South Park, our county park, to manage the
9 storm water in this development?

10 In 2021, a group of citizens paid for an
11 appraisal of this particular 59 acres of Sleepy Hollow
12 because of its uniqueness. The assessed valuation by DPO
13 Real Estate Valuation Services of Pittsburgh came back at
14 1,015,000. Working with the county on local land trust,
15 our goal would be to render the landowner a fair price
16 for his land but then to preserve that land for future
17 generations.

18 At a March 14th meeting of the Friends of
19 South Park, we passed the following motion: We recommend
20 that the South Park Township Planning Commission reject
21 the request to rezone Sleepy Hollow property from R-2 to
22 R-4 due to the negative effect this development will have
23 as a result of its close proximity to the park. In
24 addition to adversely affecting the natural beauty of the
25 park and the surrounding forest, such development and

1 resulting population increase could also create potential
2 problems for park operations, including excessive
3 littering, possible vandalism given that the park is open
4 until midnight. So we request that you deny the zoning
5 request from R-2 to R-4.

6 And just one more thing, as a personal
7 request from Big Guy. Big Guy is the buffalo that is
8 responsible for 20 of our baby buffaloes over in South
9 Park, and he asked you please don't do it because it's
10 going to interfere with his love life.

11 MR. BRACKER: Thank you.

12 MR. FULTON: Evening. My name is Clay
13 Fulton, 2005 Alberta Drive, South Park. I've been a
14 resident here for 13 years. And I know you guys have all
15 been getting beat up and it's been a long night, so three
16 very short points and I promise I'll be out of here and
17 I'm going take a little different take on what everybody
18 else has been doing.

19 But first, Ms. Yagle, I know it was a
20 boring, tedious job. Thanks for putting that all out
21 there the way you did.

22 But one thing I do want to ask everybody
23 here in reconsideration of this and keeping it R-2 is
24 right -- we're here with the Democratic process. You're
25 here to represent us, the residents of the township. The

1 consultants we have here are here to be an objective
2 voice to keep developers from coming in and just taking
3 everything over and from us to not being welcoming
4 neighbors and welcoming people, and we need to control
5 our growth. And the one thing -- that's the job that we
6 ask you to do is just keep a -- you know, keep the hands
7 on the wheel for this so it doesn't get out of hand and
8 off the rails. But when we count votes for people when
9 we vote for president or a board of supervisors or
10 anything, we count the people that are present, people
11 that came out and cast a vote, not the people that -- you
12 know, there's how many thousands of people that didn't
13 show up today. We care about our township. We care
14 about the quality of life. And we come out, and we're
15 asking you, we -- we're asking you to represent those
16 that come out. Just like when the votes are counted,
17 those are the people that are elected. Eighty percent of
18 the people don't vote. Well, they obviously don't care.
19 They could go either way. But there are the 20 percent
20 that do care. So we're just asking that consideration of
21 you.

22 And I know it's been a very long night and
23 I do appreciate all of you actually looking and paying
24 attention, being very attentive to this, too.

25 The other thing I want to bring up is the

1 Consol site. If you look at that site and look at the
2 wall of town homes, it's not exactly aesthetically
3 pleasing. Down there, it's okay. It's kind of out of
4 the way. They did a nice job down there. But in this
5 area next to the park when you're going through a walk in
6 the park, seeing that, I don't -- that's something that
7 none of us really care to see, and there's a point where
8 something -- it's just too much. It's just too much.

9 And then finally and the other last point
10 is -- and I know to the developer, you're coming in here
11 in an adversarial position. I -- I give you credit for
12 coming in because you've got to take -- you've got to
13 take the blows, but a couple of the comments that you
14 made, if we want to be welcoming -- if you want to have
15 welcoming happy people that welcome you in, the comments
16 that were made saying that you don't represent the people
17 from South Park, you represent the outside interest and
18 this is kind of coming in here trying to put a square peg
19 in a round hole doesn't make us warm up to -- doesn't
20 make us warm up to you. And I think that's something
21 that, you know, as you come in, you're going to look for
22 things -- there's going to be change orders. There's
23 going to be things that happen. There's -- the project
24 is going to move. And things are going to go through
25 during the project where you're going to need our help

1 time. Thank you.

2 MR. BRACKER: No, not at all. Thank you.

3 MS. FOSTER: Good evening. My name is Diane
4 Foster. I'm from 1046 Westchester Road, South Park. I'm
5 here today to speak for the buffalo. My concern is what
6 impact will this proposed development have on the buffalo
7 in South Park.

8 The South Park buffalo preserve is very
9 well known and rather unique to our township and deserves
10 our consideration. South Park has been a caretaker of
11 the buffalo since 1927. Almost a hundred years ago, the
12 first director of Allegheny Park, Paul Riis, purchased
13 the first 18 buffalo. They are the centerpiece of the
14 park; and in 2001, the Allegheny County Council adopted a
15 measure to secure the herd's future in South Park.

16 We know the history of the impact of the
17 fireworks on these precious animals. What will the
18 impact of this nearby construction, especially of this
19 magnitude, be?

20 Yesterday morning, my family had the
21 privilege -- we met up with the buffalos' handler,
22 "Buffalo" Bob Kudzma, who has been the caretaker for the
23 buffalo for more than a decade. And if you know Bob, you
24 know that he loves these beautiful animals. He was proud
25 to share with us that the latest grade by the U.S.

1 Department of Agriculture -- this is an annual inspection
2 that he receives -- it was both based on the health and
3 the facility for a buffalo preserve. The grade was an A
4 plus. Bob said this proposed development really scares
5 him because he knows it won't be good for the buffalo.

6 He shared a story with us of a car alarm
7 that was going off in one of the groves just above the
8 preserve on Sesqui Drive. The sound of the car's alarm
9 sent the buffalo into a panic, and they were running in
10 circles.

11 My family and I were there for about an
12 hour yesterday feeding the buffalo. They really love
13 apples, potatoes, pumpkins. We had a great time. We had
14 the entire herd at the open fence area feeding them.
15 And as if by a sign of God, the rat-a-tat-tat sound of a
16 woodpecker on a nearby tree spooked them and sent the
17 entire herd running into the woods. Buffalo Bob said,
18 you won't get better evidence than that. And so what's
19 the impact of the nearby construction noise will have on
20 the health and being -- well-being of these buffalo?

21 The developer was here today showing the
22 population maps. It's not the population. It's the
23 proximity of this development to these poor buffalo that
24 are in this area.

25 As a resident told me -- as many residents

1 told me, it would be a sad story and a black mark on
2 South Park if overdevelopment drives the buffalo away.
3 They've thrived there for a hundred years. Please, think
4 of the buffalo.

5 And I just have a few pictures. I know
6 we're late on time, but they're -- they're amazing, these
7 buffalo. I mean, their faces. It just -- I mean, look
8 at them. I mean, they're beautiful. I mean, they really
9 are. Please think of them when you make your decision.

10 MR. BRACKER: Thank you.

11 MR. MAGER: Hi, I'm Walt Mager. I'm at 6710
12 Hilldale Drive, so I'm a distance from there, but I have
13 about 15 acres behind my house between the Wilson farm,
14 the town of South Park behind me, Sunny Slopes. It's
15 gorgeous. I see wildlife, deer. It's there.

16 And I commend the three engineers that
17 were here -- the township engineer. I've been a
18 professional engineer for over 50 years, but I just
19 wanted to say that -- actually, he didn't have any
20 information to make his determination what you are going
21 to do with this property. That was a great answer. He
22 knew nothing except -- but I'll tell you the downside. I
23 worked on one of the first buildings down at Summit
24 Station. It was an apartment building. Do you know what
25 I got? A box saying it was an apartment -- the drawing

1 on the development showed nothing on that drawing that I
2 was given that there was a plumbing system in that
3 building, nothing. And because they got a mobility grant
4 from the federal government, that's how it was built. I
5 was thinking you might have had not a lot to say about
6 that because of that.

7 And here -- I think she's from Gateway --
8 to put that together like she did. What I would like to
9 say is stay R-2 but propose changing it to a conservation
10 district instead of R-2 -- (inaudible) -- when I say the
11 old Wilson farm behind me, people come to my house, say
12 do I own it. And it's just sort of part of the property
13 up there and everybody likes it.

14 MR. BRACKER: Yeah, I think -- I think our
15 stenographer missed some of your comment during the
16 applause.

17 MR. MAGER: Oh. Well, I was just saying
18 that I live in the 15 acres up there and -- between the
19 Wilson farm, that's where I live, and the Sunny Slopes,
20 the park beside me.

21 And the other thing is, once I did Summit
22 Station -- when I moved there almost 40 years ago, if I
23 heard a siren once a day coming across Brownsville Road
24 and between Maple Springs and Hilldale -- now I hear it
25 every day, sometimes three or four times a day during the

1 weekend between the fire trucks, the county police or the
2 South Park Township police. And with Summit Station down
3 there, you look at what was built down there. They can
4 come up Brownsville and get a few lights and get out of
5 there or go on 88. And after they do 88 a few times,
6 they're coming up Brownsville. And the people over there
7 on Stoltz don't need that traffic because you go left and
8 go down there, you can buy beer, stuff for your pool --
9 is about what you got down there on 88. Not a much more
10 down there. Not a whole lot around there.

11 So that's enough. So conservation
12 district, going the other way, but not an R-4. And if
13 the developer bought it -- for all you people in here, if
14 he already owns the property, he will be back.

15 MR. BRACKER: Thank you.

16 MR. SELF: Good evening. My name is Rick
17 Self. I live at 2709 Gould Drive. I lived there for
18 over 22 years. I was an earth science major at Cal
19 State. That was a long time ago. But I spent the
20 greater part of the last 35 years doing zoning and
21 permits and variances, and I've walked that area, that
22 Sleepy Hollow way, back and forth. There was things that
23 I noticed -- and it was mentioned by our planner -- that
24 the slope is undevelop-able when it's 25 percent or more.
25 There has to be a third of this property that doesn't

1 meet the standard for development, so it's going to be
2 very expensive that they would do it. My major concern
3 is that once they've got an R-4, there's nothing stopping
4 them from coming back and making apartment buildings.
5 And if you check out Red Rocks, they do a lot of
6 apartments buildings. I didn't see much in the nature of
7 townhouses.

8 And, also, I'm real familiar like with the
9 road and the dips in the road. That doesn't meet state
10 standards, and it needs to be expanded significantly on
11 both sides. We had an estimate from somebody that works
12 in that business, and it probably cost a million dollars
13 just to bring it up to standard with the sidewalk access
14 all the way out to Stoltz Road. It's -- to me,
15 two-thirds of the property is all that they can develop.
16 They would obviously look -- obviously look for a new
17 remedy that would hurt us even further. It's
18 inappropriate.

19 The character and the nature of this
20 entire area is single family homes. You can see the
21 entrance to the property coming over the hill, and every
22 one of them is a single family home. There's no other
23 development like this anywhere similar to this. So I
24 strongly urge, like with the majority of people in South
25 Park, I believe, that we let them develop it as an R-2,

1 it's appropriate, but not as an R-4. Thank you.

2 MR. BRACKER: Thank you.

3 MS. GILDEA: Hi, Bonnie Gildea, 1971 Sleepy
4 Hollow Road. It's been an honor and a privilege to be
5 part of the Friends of Sleepy Hollow. This unique group
6 of people have joined forces to do everything in their
7 power to inform the community about changes that will
8 significantly impact all of us for many years to come.

9 Sleepy Hollow is very special and unique,
10 as you have heard countless times tonight by many people,
11 but to me, Sleepy Hollow is home. My family lives at
12 1971 Sleepy Hollow Road on a small farm with our horses.
13 My small farm is one of a kind, has been in existence for
14 over seventy years. To find another place like this will
15 be impossible. So, of course, we are furious having
16 houses built in our backyards, heavy machinery, traffic,
17 workers in and out all day. The noise alone will cause
18 undue stress on the horses, not to mention storm water,
19 surface run-off. How is this going to be retained or
20 channeled to minimize the impact during heavy rain, snow,
21 et cetera? Surface run-off has the potential to contain
22 hazardous chemicals when flowing across the construction
23 site, water used as painters wash water or water used for
24 cleaning of cement mixers and machinery, just to name a
25 few. How is this going to be disposed of? This water is

1 considered hazardous due to the toxin and the chemicals
2 in it. Is this going to run through my pastures and put
3 my horses in danger?

4 My farm has never taken water on in the
5 past 70 years. Now Red Rocks wants to build hundreds of
6 houses directly behind me. The land is higher than my
7 property, and I'm sure they will state that the engineers
8 will re-route the rain, the snow, the ice, but I'm not
9 buying it. There is no way you can control Mother
10 Nature.

11 The rain storms that we have been having
12 the last few years have been devastating. It is a known
13 fact that land development have increased the number of
14 landslides. Mass movements of soil, rocks falling,
15 sliding, flowing, will be unavoidable once you remove the
16 dense forest behind me. Backyard landslides are usually
17 repaired incompletely or not at all. Cost estimates of
18 several hundred thousands of dollars to secure and repair
19 landslides affecting one ore more properties are typical.
20 with repair estimates exceeding the value of the
21 properties, abandoned is a frequent solution. This
22 statement is taken from the PA Department of Conservation
23 and Natural Resources. I'm not going to become a
24 statistic. I am prepared to do everything in my power to
25 protect our home.

1 I contacted FEMA with my concerns, and
2 they informed me that our community has a local flood
3 plan ordinance and make sure developments comply with
4 national flood insurance programs. Their records
5 indicate that for South Park our flood plan administrator
6 is Glenn Prokopovitch. How can this be? He hasn't even
7 worked for South Park for over four years.

8 On Red Rocks website, they state they
9 operate their business directed by God and family, treat
10 others the way you want to be treated. How they develop
11 building is just as important as how they treat people in
12 communities they invest in. If this is really what they
13 claim, then clearly they can see this community does not
14 want this development.

15 I am going on record today asking who is
16 going to be responsible to keep my farm and my horses
17 safe? Is it going to be South Park Township, Gateway
18 Engineering, or Red Rocks? That's all. I didn't email
19 mine.

20 MR. BRACKER: Thank you.

21 MR. BEACH: Hi, my name is Drummond Beach,
22 1000 Ajay Drive, which is the other end, far away from
23 Sleepy Hollow. It's past my bedtime. I'll be brief.

24 I don't know if you recall, but about
25 maybe 10, 15 years ago a developer came in and wanted to

1 strip mine Sleepy Hollow. There was a big meeting up at
2 the new high school auditorium, and the plan was going to
3 go nowhere for several reasons. First of all, there was
4 some federal investigation going on of his business
5 practices. Secondly, there was a question of whether the
6 land was county or township or private property. The
7 third argument made by several people -- and I heard it
8 here tonight, too -- was that that part of Sleepy Hollow,
9 including not just the county property but stretching
10 into the land in question for development, is one of the
11 last remaining stands of old growth timber. Now, what
12 that means -- I've walked up through there several times,
13 the connector trail, plus on that property in question.
14 But I also walked up on what was the Consol property,
15 which is now Summit Station. And old growth timber is
16 what existed in the back part of Summit Station. Those
17 are trees that are 3 to 4 to 5 to 6 feet at the base,
18 which were around long before any of us came along. Now,
19 part of Sleepy Hollow, it's never been timbered. If it
20 has been, it's been so long ago no one is left that
21 remembers it. But it has been mined. Now, despite what
22 the Bureau of Mines say or whatever, there are a lot of
23 mines that nobody knows about around here. There are
24 several mine streets that go back into the hillside.
25 People went out their garages and basements and went and

1 got coal for the furnace.

2 Be that as it a may, Summit Station, in
3 fact, was strip mined. They cleared that land out big
4 time. I see it every morning. I come down Sebolt Road,
5 and there it is, rows of townhouses. There's nothing
6 else. There is piles of dirt. There's heavy equipment.
7 There's supposed to be several phases of that
8 development, but they seem to have stopped. So that's
9 what you're looking -- in essence, it's an eyesore.

10 So you get R-4 over here at Sleepy Hollow.
11 You come down Stewart up to Stoltz, you hang a right, you
12 look over the tennis courts, and in the fall, you're not
13 going to see foliage. You're going to see rows of
14 townhouses like you see in Summit Station.

15 The other thing is I want to talk to you,
16 Pat. You're on the school board. You should change the
17 name from South Park Eagles to South Park Coyotes because
18 that's what's taking over Summit Station. All the
19 wildlife is gone.

20 MR. SABLE: I'm thinking it should be South
21 Park Buffalos, John.

22 MR. BEACH: Now, the last -- I've lived in
23 the township more than 45 years. Since Summit Station
24 was developed, I have seen more deer than I've ever seen
25 before. They drove them out. They're in my neighborhood

1 now. Now, to be fair, the developer -- had the developer
2 of Summit Station just redid what Consol had built, that
3 would be -- that's fine. The land was already cleared.
4 There were structures on it. But they didn't. They just
5 went way back in. Once that's cleared out, it ain't
6 coming back.

7 I'm going to bed.

8 MS. HOUGH: Hi, I'm Kelly Hough. I have
9 lived in South Park my whole life. I purchased two homes
10 since becoming an adult here, and I've gone through two
11 newcomer's taxes, which are great. And I still -- I'm
12 still here. I still want to live here. But my daughter
13 is five. She started kindergarten this year. And the
14 bussing that the school district has -- there's a
15 shortage of drivers. So my daughter had to go all the
16 way up our street -- I live at 2030 Suzanne Drive --
17 sorry, forgot to say that -- all the way up our street
18 and down Alberta to the end of the -- to the end of the
19 hill. So her bus stop was at the intersection of Stoltz
20 and Alberta. And it -- I had to fight tooth and nail and
21 it took a truck almost hitting the four kids that were
22 standing there for that bus stop to be moved. And I was
23 given the reason, you know, there are shortages in bus
24 drivers, we don't have enough buses, we can't stop at
25 every home -- which fine, I understand that. But if you

1 rezone from R-2 to R-4 and you bring that many new kids
2 into our school district, there's not enough buses to
3 even accommodate those children. And I live on a street
4 where my daughter is one of the only -- I think she's one
5 of four kids that live in that neighborhood. So there's
6 a small amount of children, and we still can't get the
7 bussing that we need. So my concern would be, you know,
8 how -- how would that work with that many new children
9 and new families coming in? So that's all. Sorry.

10 Thank you.

11 MR. BRACKER: Thank you.

12 MR. CARMEN: Hi, my name is Gary Carmen.
13 I'm partial landowner with five other shareholders with
14 the property. We aren't developers like someone stated
15 we are. I did do some development with my dad right out
16 of high school, but I was not old enough to really be
17 involved in it. But there are other -- there are five
18 shareholders. And I've owned -- this property has been
19 in my family for 44 years. And we bought it zoned R-2;
20 and if it can't be zoned R-4 -- and there, you know, is a
21 lot of problems. I understand it. But to take it away
22 and say that it can't even be zoned R-2 is like -- like,
23 you know, people own their homes. If somebody feels
24 that, you know, you shouldn't be in your home and we're
25 going to rezone it or we're going to take it, tear it down

1 and put trees up -- this is not the park. This property
2 is not the park like the people call it. The people have
3 been using it for 44 years since I've owned it,
4 trespassing, taking their horses through it, hunting on
5 it. We've had the police down there plenty of times. I
6 mean, it's been trouble. And we have 44 years of school
7 taxes paid into this place. We bought it as an
8 investment. I thought that my father and I would develop
9 it. He passed away, and things have changed, and we
10 can't -- you know, I can't really afford to do, you know,
11 something that large.

12 I have -- the same people that complained
13 when we were developing the 15 acres which was a
14 continuation of Stoltz Road and Old Post Road, some of
15 them are here. Some of them actually live in the homes
16 we developed. We have a gentleman here in the audience
17 Jim Converse, he owns a piece of land prior to the
18 development. It's a pie-shaped piece of land that goes
19 all the way to the park. In 2007, we were going to
20 develop it. He sat down with us and wanted four lots out
21 of the development, because we were continuing Maripat
22 and Patricia Street, but we got around not having to do
23 that. And now he's actually fighting -- fighting us
24 that, you know, you shouldn't sell it, you shouldn't
25 develop it.

1 You know, I understand the thing about the
2 buffalo. I know a lot about them. And to be honest with
3 you, if you are a buffalo and wildlife lover, they should
4 not be in captivity, period. That land, it's not that
5 close to it. There's thousands of acres they roam down
6 in New Mexico, and there's still wildlife that runs.
7 I've been to the game preserve with my grand kids.
8 There's hardly anything there in terms of birds and that
9 like there used to be. I'm not saying that we should do
10 away with it. I'm saying they should better it, you
11 know. It's not like it used to be.

12 There's 138 homes that are on Old Post,
13 Westchester, and Patricia. And those homes -- people are
14 complaining they don't want to look at these homes.
15 Those homes were built -- I have the blueprints for all
16 of them. They were built in the mid '70s, upper '70s.
17 The townhouses that they wanted to put in, which it
18 doesn't seem like they'll get them in, were running about
19 2,000 square feet -- some of them were over -- which is
20 actually larger than the houses that were built in the
21 early '70s and mid '70s in those plans, and people were
22 complaining they don't want to look at that. Well, you
23 know what? Maybe the people that lived in the townhouses
24 that probably were going pay a lot more than what some of
25 those homes on the hills are worth, maybe they don't want

1 to look at your homes. I mean, people are trying to
2 control what goes there.

3 These houses -- that land is zoned R-2,
4 and people are trying to put a stop to it. We've had the
5 conservation, you know, give us a -- they wanted to buy
6 it. They gave us such a low bid, it was ridiculous. I
7 want to know who here owns a \$200,000 house and if a --
8 if a company came up to you and said, I'll give you 100
9 for it -- and that's what it -- we feel it's valued at.
10 You wouldn't sell it, and we didn't sell it to them.
11 They have 3,200 people. They all have to pitch in \$700,
12 they could buy it. You know, they didn't pay taxes on it
13 for 44 years. They would rather it stay the way it is,
14 we'll keep paying our taxes, our umbrella policy so when
15 the trespassers go on it, if someone gets hurt, they'll
16 be covered with it. And we'll just keep doing that, make
17 it -- you know, live for free down there.

18 There's people here telling about the slope
19 of the land. They don't know where that land starts and
20 where it ends. The topo and everything that the
21 developer would be doing, he would be changing the grade,
22 you know, whether it would be R-2 or R-4. And -- and the
23 water, the retention water, that's all done by you guys
24 and engineers. We know the ponds would be deep enough to
25 hold the water before they pour it into the creek.

1 I mean, the retention water that --
2 they're talking about 2018. I talked to an engineer and
3 said I thought that was the worst flood in a hundred
4 years and it would be in on the flood study. He said
5 that was the worst flood they ever had, our area ever
6 had. There was PAT -- cars, you know, that were parked
7 at PAT Authority down behind The Trolley Bar, they were
8 turned upside down, floating around. People got killed.
9 I mean, that wasn't a normal flood. And the water that's
10 coming prior from Bethel and that, that's prior. That
11 stream flows the opposite way of these homes, and the
12 retention ponds would be deep enough I'm sure to take it
13 on to hold it before it goes.

14 There's people putting -- just a few
15 people putting their needs in front of what would be the
16 best for the community. You have it -- you have it zoned
17 R-2. If you put 120 homes in there and you figure out
18 how much taxes, you're talking millions a year. And
19 people are saying, oh, you know, you have to hire a salt
20 truck, the salt truck, we're going to have to make the
21 schools bigger. 2010 the school graduated close to 300.
22 2020 -- 2022 they did 120. How much bigger does the
23 school have to get? People feel that, you know, whether
24 it would be 294 townhouses or 120 homes, that there's
25 going to be 120 kids all starting kindergarten the same

1 day, the same year, and it doesn't work out that way.
2 You know, it just doesn't. The school has room. They're
3 expanding the middle school now, and it has room to take
4 the few more people that these houses will provide.

5 I just hope you take into consideration,
6 you know, keeping this thing green space -- I don't know
7 who it would benefit. I know it wouldn't benefit me
8 because I keep paying the taxes on it. And, you know,
9 everyone can laugh because they're not paying the bills,
10 you know, for 44 years. It is (inaudible). And that's
11 about all I have to say, you know, and I just -- you
12 know, I don't know what else to say. I really don't.
13 I'm just shocked people can come in here and control --
14 I'm not saying you guys -- but have your destiny, that
15 they can control my retirement. You know, I planned to
16 use a little bit of that for retirement, and they're
17 going to put a stop to everything. I don't know if they
18 would appreciate it if I would stop and try to take care
19 of their retirement. You know, it was investment that
20 obviously I can see doesn't seem to be a good one.

21 And just take into consideration they
22 probably are going to come back with an R-2 drawing and,
23 you know, I just can't see saying, oh, we have to put a
24 stop because that's some sacred ground down there that
25 everyone wants to use because that's what about what it

1 amounts to.

2 MR. BRACKER: Thank you. Gary, did you take
3 the sign-in sheet accidentally?

4 MR. SEKURA: Yeah. My name is Joe Sekura.
5 I live over at 1754 Stoltz Road. Most of you probably
6 know me because I'm the crazy guy with all the Christmas
7 decorations.

8 So one thing I have not heard here all
9 night, which I'm kind of surprised -- I'm a former first
10 responder. You build these over there, it's going to
11 increase call volume for your fire departments, which are
12 already short-staffed, and your police departments that
13 are already short-staffed. You need to think about that.
14 The number of volunteer firefighters in this state has
15 dropped considerably since the '70s, and that could cause
16 some serious problems.

17 I know. I've seen a lot of bad stuff.
18 And you're going to get a lot more people over there, and
19 response times may drop. You just don't know. I mean, I
20 know the chief at Library. I've talked to him. I know
21 what the response times are. I mean, during the day if
22 you have a structure fire, you're going to get three
23 trucks and four guys. And that could be bad if you're
24 deciding to build apartments or town homes because Lord
25 knows who's home during the day now because everybody

1 works from home. That's just something you need to think
2 about, and I'm thinking about the first responders.

3 Thank you for your time.

4 MR. BRACKER: Thank you.

5 MR. SMITH: Hi, my name is Timothy Smith. I
6 live at 1839 -- I'm writing this down as I say it --
7 Edward Drive. And just to endear me to the crowd, I
8 think my house is the closest neighbor to the buffalo.

9 Just to add on, I heard someone comment a
10 few comments ago about conservation zoning and districts,
11 and I heard him not only say he's against R-4 but he
12 would like you to go the other way. I'm against R-4. If
13 you're going to leave it at R-2, fine. If I'm allowed,
14 I'll second the motion to make it conservation. What I
15 was surprised about because I'm an engineer and I go to
16 township meetings, is that the township engineer hasn't
17 gotten anything, any engineering drawings to support
18 this.

19 So I'm just saying that being up there
20 right next to the property, I would like you to keep it
21 at R-2 if you're not going to go the other way. Thank
22 you.

23 MR. BRACKER: Thank you.

24 MR. SELF: Rick Self again. I just want to
25 point out -- he mentioned the property -- Rick Self, okay

1 20- -- you got that?

2 when you go down Sleepy Hollow on the
3 left-hand side, there's a drain, a sewage system, that's
4 marked, and there's a tree about 5 foot back up the road
5 that's marked, and I believe that's the actual mark of
6 the South Park property. That's the line of demarcation.
7 So I knew where that was at. Never said that I wouldn't
8 want development on R-1.

9 And there's another thing. If the board
10 so decides that this might not be a good idea at this
11 time, maybe -- and I know that the property owner got
12 offered half as much by the county compared to the new
13 developer. So there was quite a few people that
14 mentioned maybe we could of a funder to try to offset the
15 cost. You know, he -- he mentioned it himself, mentioned
16 3,200 people or whatever. And this was unsolicited. I
17 just had a lot of people that told me that, that they
18 would consider that. So I just want to let the property
19 owner know I don't want to stick him, but I don't want
20 townhouses or the eventual apartment buildings. Thank
21 you.

22 MR. BRACKER: Thank you. This -- you will
23 be our last comment here.

24 MR. BROWN: Thirty seconds, maybe 45.

25 My name is Alex Brown. I live at 134

1 Sylvania Drive. And I just want to start by saying Gary
2 Carmen is a good guy. I'm not here to villainize Mr.
3 Victor. I have no idea what I would do if somebody
4 offered me a ton of money for that property, so I don't
5 think it's fair for any of us to put ourself in his
6 shoes.

7 But I love South Park. I recently moved
8 back here from Virginia, and I was saddened to see so
9 much of it developed mostly because I'm a history buff.
10 If you've every been on South Park's Facebook pages, you
11 might see my history posts from time to time.

12 I'd prefer to see it go to conservation if
13 I could see a third motion for that. But like I said, I
14 am not in Mr. Carmen's shoes. I'm not judging him for
15 his decision.

16 That area though is historic. If you look
17 back on some property -- early property maps -- I'm
18 talking like right after the Revolutionary War -- that
19 property was bought by a family. And the entire -- what
20 I would say the equestrian heritage of that area comes
21 from a farm that was there originally.

22 So my only really kind of new comment to
23 maybe the developer is to do some kind of history thing
24 there. There are -- I've not been on the property
25 myself. I totally respect private property. But I

1 understand there are historic foundations that probably
2 could be found under it. At least document those before
3 you develop anything.

4 I'm opposed to R-4. Keep it at R-2.
5 That's all I have to say.

6 MR. BRACKER: Thank you.

7 MR. BROWN: Oh, one more thing, okay, if --
8 this is just my future because I'm 31 years old. I live
9 in South Park. If this gets rezoned, everything across
10 from the middle school, all of those woods is going to
11 get developed. That's the future. I moved out of
12 Overbrook in the early '90s to get away from that because
13 I don't want to hear my neighbors snoring. And I love
14 South Park for what it is. All of that -- all of those
15 woods are going to get developed if we don't put our foot
16 down. I'm sorry, last comment.

17 MR. BERNISH: My name is Tom Bernish. I
18 live at 2003 Rachel Drive. I could only say that I've
19 been on Stoltz Road today trying to coming up here and
20 going home 12 times. So you have to do the figures
21 there. If it's just me alone 12 times, how many people
22 would be on this road if you build down there?

23 Another thing is more people, more
24 troubles. And that's really all I have to say.

25 MR. BRACKER: Thank you.

1 MR. SABLE: Mr. Chairman, I just have a
2 quick question for Carolyn before we consider the action.

3 I'm not sure I heard exactly the
4 explanation between the housing-type comparisons and the
5 concerns regarding that. Can you explain that quickly
6 again for me?

7 MS. YAGLE: Within -- Carolyn Yagle,
8 environmental planning and design.

9 within the current R-2 zoning, there is
10 land permitted -- excuse me, land use dwelling types
11 permitted by right, which is generally adhered to a
12 single family -- I can pull up the specific pages again
13 if we get into that level of detail -- that is just from
14 a base district calculation, not considering anything as
15 part of a PRD.

16 PRD is permissible within R-2 in two
17 forms, one as a retirement community PRD, and one as a
18 non retirement community PRD.

19 MR. SABLE: Right.

20 MS. YAGLE: Those two PRD types of
21 calculations do have different densities that are
22 permissible again as that conditional use that are
23 greater than what is just the base zoning single family
24 dwelling permitted by right.

25 There is a land use assignment to the non

1 retirement community PRD, which is single family dwelling
2 and two family dwelling at the eight units per acre net.
3 And then there is a retirement community PRD which
4 permits a full range of dwelling types from single family
5 through the multi.

6 Now, I believe I just misspoke, and I can
7 go back and get my sheet in terms of the densities. But
8 you asked a question about land uses. So there is a sort
9 of a series depending on any application in PRD no matter
10 where R-2 is in the township, could do something in the
11 base district format, could do something in a retirement
12 community PRD or a non retirement community PRD. So...

13 MR. SABLE: Thank you.

14 MR. BRACKER: So does anyone on the Planning
15 Commission have any questions or comments that you would
16 like to share before we vote?

17 MR. SABLE: I'm ready to vote.

18 MR. BRACKER: Okay. Just as a reminder for
19 everyone, regardless of our vote, the Board of
20 Supervisors will meet on Monday, April 10th, here at
21 about board room -- at least that's where it's scheduled
22 as of now -- at 7 p.m., and there is a public hearing
23 that will happen the same night at 6 p.m., so 6 p.m. on
24 April 10th at this time here.

25 MR. DEPRETIS: If I can make one comment,

1 too. One of the speakers made the comment about putting
2 it in a different venue. I would ask Tom what's the
3 process for that? Is that something that they should
4 bring up to the township manager or something --

5 MR. BONIDIE: They can always make that
6 request.

7 MR. DEPRETIS: Okay. So if someone --
8 someone in the audience wants to take the opportunity to
9 call the township and remind them that we filled the room
10 and to be able to hear it properly was not maybe the most
11 coherent for everybody -- I would suggest you call the
12 township and ask them to look at another venue. And I
13 would do it sooner than later because there's not --
14 there's no other venue in this building. They'd have to
15 secure a venue at another location and make sure there's
16 no -- you know, it's easy to say the school, but the
17 school is going to have a play, and I'm not exactly sure
18 of the dates. And so you just want to make sure that you
19 give them enough time to secure another venue.

20 MS. YAGLE: The advertising requirements are
21 this week --

22 MR. DEPRETIS: This week.

23 MS. YAGLE: -- for the first -- for the
24 first advertisement would be -- I could pull it from the
25 sheet, but to your point.

1 MR. DEPRETIS: Yeah, so if you heard that,
2 there is an advertising requirement that will have to
3 give the location and the time, so the sooner you do
4 that, the sooner the venue is confirmed.

5 MR. BRACKER: Okay. So before us is Red
6 Rocks Group zoning amendment application to change zoning
7 from R-2 to R-4. We need a motion to recommend or not
8 recommend this application to the Board of Supervisors
9 for consideration to allow for the rezoning of a portion
10 of the property located along Sleepy Hollow Road,
11 Lot/Block No. 771-F-75 to be rezoned from R-2 to R-4.

12 MR. SABLE: Mr. Chairman, I would move based
13 upon the comprehensive report of the planning consultant
14 and the findings of that report from Mrs. Yagle to not
15 recommend -- and let me say not recommend so everyone can
16 hear -- this application to the Board of Supervisors for
17 their consideration to allow the rezoning of a portion of
18 the property located along Sleepy Hollow Road from R-2 to
19 R-4. So what this motion is saying is no.

20 MR. WEIL: I second that.

21 MR. BRACKER: All those in favor?

22 (All responded aye.)

23 MR. BRACKER: All those opposed?

24 (No response.)

25 MR. BRACKER: Motion is carried.

1 The next -- the next regular meeting is
2 wednesday, April 26, 2023 at 7 p.m.

3 Do we have a motion to adjourn?

4 MR. SABLE: I make that motion.

5 MR. BRACKER: All those in favor?

6 (All responded aye.)

7 MR. BRACKER: All those opposed?

8 (No response.)

9 MR. BRACKER: Motion is carried.

10 - - - - -

11 (Hearing concluded at 10:04 p.m.)

12 - - - - -

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25