Minutes of the Regular Meeting

Of the South Park Township Planning Commission

South Park, PA 15129

July 22, 2026

Pledge of Allegiance

Notice to Attendees Notice was read by Russ Bracker.

Roll Call The meeting was called to order by H. Russell Bracker.

Present: H. Russell Bracker, Patrick Sable, John Papinchak, Rob Devine, Bill Matyger, and Mark Depretis. Also present was Irv Forman, Township Solicitor

Absent: James Waychoff
Also not in attendance: Carolyn Yagle, Planning Consultant, Derek Parker, Code Enforcement Officer and Joseph Sites, Township Engineer

Approval of Minutes

Motion was made by Mr. Depretis, seconded by Mr. Matyger to approve the minutes from the June 24, 2026 Regular Planning Commission Meeting. *All members voted aye. The motion was unanimously carried.*

SALDO Ordinance Amendment

Mr. Bracker: For tonight's meeting, we have the Saldo Ordinance Amendment: to consider recommendations regarding a proposed ordinance amendment to Chapter 118 Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance of the Township of South Park to impose requirements and standards for multiple vehicular entrance points for subject developments, provide relevant definitions, amend the requirements for sidewalks, add standards for block length and configuration, and set standards for waivers and modifications. Mr. Firman, would you like to give us a summary of what we're talking about?

Mr. Firman: Sure. So, what you know on the agenda tonight is this is an ordinance that was discussed informally with this Planning Commission in May, the May meeting. There were public comments at that time on it. The Board of Supervisors took that ordinance and made a motion to advertise for a public hearing. And as you said, the public hearing on that motion would be August 10, the second Monday,

August 10, before the Board of Supervisors. So, tonight is the night where this Board is being asked to formally make a recommendation in favor of it, opposed of it, in favor of it with conditions, or however you would like to address it. That ordinance was also sent to Allegheny County for their review. Followed up with them, Sue from the office followed up with them today. They have not yet provided a response. They apologized, but they've been very tied up with numerous ordinances coming from all over the place. So, ideally they'll have one by the Supervisors' meeting, but they do not have it this evening. So again, this is the same ordinance that we had discussed a couple of months ago. I think we don't have to go over it too much, but it incorporates the definitions. It really took a lot of the comments that were raised by the public in a couple of documents. I see Mr. Foster and Mr. Sobek are here. I'm really tried to incorporate those things along with some other comments from the public to create an ordinance that just sets forth clear standards, so people understand. Including the ideas of confirming where sidewalks are going to be required and confirming the vehicular points of access. So that's really the only request and you have the public to hear from, and then after that, it's up to the Board to take any action tonight. And again, so I think everybody in this room is aware of it, certainly this Board knows. Just a recommending body. Whatever you do, it goes to the Board of Supervisors for their determination of whether the ordinance is approved or not after a public hearing.

Mr. Bracker: Okay. Thank you. We do not have Township Engineer or Planning Consultant here this evening, so we'll go right down to does anyone in the audience have any questions or comments that you would like to share? Please step forward. If you haven't already, please sign in and state your name for the record.

Mr. Jason Sobek, 1750 Stoltz: Okay. I'll be brief. One of the takeaways from the last meeting was to benchmark other municipalities, what their ordinances look like compared to the draft. And I actually found something very interesting in Jefferson Hill's ordinance when I looked at it. The draft ordinance does not expressly prevent larger developments from being divided into separate phases or applications below the 25-lot threshold. For example, a track that could accommodate 48 homes might be submitted as two separate 24-lot plans. The traffic threshold may address some situations, but a cleaner approach is to prohibit this type of segmentation directly. Jefferson Hill's addresses the problem. Its ordinance states that a landowner shall not divide the property into separate subdivision plans of 24 or fewer lots to avoid the secondary access requirement. Jefferson Hills also requires the applicant to show the proposed street system for the entire tract, even when only part of the property is included in the immediate application. South Park, I don't want to hold this up, but maybe a future amendment, similar language, an applicant or landowner shall not divide, phase, segment, or submit separate applications for a larger tract, adjoining land, or property under common ownership or control for the purpose or effect of avoiding the requirements of this section. Applicability should be determined cumulatively based on all existing approved, proposed, pending, and reasonably anticipated phases of the entire development. So again, I'm guessing that situations come up before since Jefferson Hills added that language to their ordinance. I didn't see that before, but when I read that, that kind of jumped out. Also, while our ordinance does mention culverts, or the draft ordinance does mention culverts in the definitions, it has definitions culvert. It defines a culvert. However, if you look at page 3 of the draft ordinance and the definition of single point of failure, a critical bridge, tunnel, or corridor, I think culvert should be added to there. I can't count how many times we were corrected for saying bridge rather than culvert. So just simply adding culvert to that single point of failure definition seems to be a very easy addition. As far as modification language, any waiver or modification from the multiple access point requirement should require written findings supported by competent engineering evidence and recommendations from the Township Engineer, Emergency Services Agency, and the proposed alternative provides equal or greater

public safety or protection. I think that might be addressed somewhere else in our SALDO, but my biggest comment was just future, that the phase loophole, and just simply adding culvert to the single point of failure definition. Thanks.

Mr. Bracker: Thank you. Anyone else? Okay. So, for the Planning Commission, any questions, comments?

Mr. Devine: Yeah. If I could go first. I'll try to be brief. I think everybody's concerned about safety. I'm not sure this is necessary, and I have some questions actually on the draft as it's written, specific questions. And my first one is it's on page 4, I believe. It's section 3L1 sub A, and it says, "Access points must be located on separate, non-adjoining sides of the development." My question with that is, or my comment on that is, I think that's going to promote through traffic. I think if you think of a square like this, so you're either going to have a road running down this way or a road's running this way. I don't see what the problem of having two separate access points on adjoining sides is. I'm not quite sure that that is necessary. The second question and comment I have is, if you go down to the same section and its sub 3, and I'll read it here. "Single access developments where only one primary vehicle access point is permitted under the section, the development shall provide a separate emergency access route." Now, my question here is, when it comes to interpreting this, it's I think under any section, only one primary vehicle access point is permitted when there's less than 24 or less lots. That's my as I understand this. Maybe I'm wrong. Tell me if I'm wrong. But if it's that's what is permitted. But as I read this, it's still required to have a separate emergency access route. To me, that doesn't make sense. Maybe I'm reading it wrong. Tell me I'm wrong. But I have a question with that. The third point I have, and it's just kind of a general thing, it's like I'm having this problem kind of trying to differentiate what is the difference between an access point and an emergency access route. I mean, they seem like they're the same. So, when you say it's like, "Well, if it's only feasible to have one, but then you need to have the emergency access route," really, you're saying you need to have two in all instances. Because I really don't see a big distinction here. So, those are my comments, and I don't know if anybody can tell me I'm wrong or misinterpreting this.

Mr. Firman: I don't think I mean, you're reading a lot of the I mean, the purpose of the you're reading it correctly, I guess, right? Well, two of the three points, I think. On the access on different points, it was to avoid the situation where picture a square a lot, right, and you just have two on the same side. And so, then you have a failure, and then it doesn't really solve the problem that some people want to create. You're right. It could create through traffic, right? And certainly, that's an issue that would be created when you have two access points on opposite ends. In theory, is that a problem? Is it connectivity? But you're reading it correctly. That's certainly a possibility. The second issue that you raised was the issue of the under the 24 lots. I'm sorry, was that the your second issue was the access route.

Mr. Devine: It's sub 3, single access developments.

Mr. Firman: And that's right. I mean, so the idea is if you have a 24 lot or less, you're right. So, the question you had is, does that apply for the 24 or less? And the answer is yes, right? Would an emergency access route be required? Right. So, it wouldn't necessarily be a vehicular street that would need to be there, but it could be one of those things. We have a gravel access way or some other way for emergency vehicles to get in and out. Of course, if it is a small development and there were no other way to do it, okay, well, then they'd request a modification saying, "Look, it's not necessary. There's no way to do it." Topographically, we're challenged, but we use it with the Planning Commission and the Board to evaluate that on a case-by-case basis. It's the purpose of the ordinance, right? So that's where it

comes from. The difference between access point is access point is a vehicular access point. So that's why it's a road. A vehicular ingress and egress is what the access point is. An emergency access route acts as a secondary point for that. Maybe it's not a full-blown, that's the point of it. Maybe it's not a full-blown street, but it's a way to get an emergency vehicle in there if it's possible. But you're not wrong with your interpretation. It's just, that was the rationale behind it.

Mr. Sobek: Yeah. That emergency access route, if you're going from Nativity Church to Lowe's, you get on Horning Road, that development Bethel Park just put in there, you can clearly see it. There's grass on it, but it's flat and there's some blockers. So, if there was an emergency, vehicles could get in and out that way. I've seen some other examples in Bethel, but that one, when I drove by it, I'm like, "Oh, that's an emergency access route."

Mr. Devine: Is that emergency access route structurally capable of supporting emergency vehicles? You think that route actually meets that definition?

Ms. Adams: What if there's 48 entrances?

Mr. Firman: I'm sorry, which definition?

Mr. Depretis: Well, you certainly wouldn't buy a fire truck, you certainly wouldn't drive a fire truck through a grassy access without sinking into it. I grasped what you said.

Mr. Firman: Well, maybe it's like pressed aggregate or some other version.

Mr. Depretis: That I understand.

Mr. Firman: But not necessarily to a road standard.

Mr. Depretis: Yeah. But Jason, I think Jason's pointed out, I drive by there all the time. It's funny. I've never noticed what you were referring to. I will next time I go down there. But if that is meant to be an emergency access and they left it as grass, I think they would need to.
Mr. Sobek; It's like some gravel and some grass.

Mr. Depretis: Yeah. Because I mean, I certainly wouldn't.

Mr. Sobek: I mean. there's townhouses on each side of it; it was clearly left there for a reason.

Mr. Depretis: Yeah. I mean, I know the site. I drive by there a fair amount, but I guess I'd never it hit me about checking for access point. But you certainly wouldn't drive a fire truck or anything like that through anything that wasn't at least established as gravel or some kind of base on it, or you'd sink in and have two ways blocked.

Mr. Firman: Yeah. And that's what this talks about. Anything that any emergency, when they're using this as a secondary route, it's got to get reviewed and approved by the Township Engineer, the Fire and Police Department, and EMS.

Mr. Depretis: I think the way I think of these access roads is like what we had when I was on the school Board at the school district in the elementary center where going and coming out is two lanes

bidirectional traffic. But down at the end of the high school, there's a simple one-lane access road, but it's paved with a gate on the end. So, it's not meant for normal road traffic. It's meant for emergency vehicles. I think of that as an emergency access point.

Mr. Firman: I think that would fit this.

Mr. Devine: Okay. But still, that would apply. Even a development of only 24 residences has to have one of these emergency access routes?

Mr. Firman: As the ordinance is written, they would or they'd have to justify why they don't need it. And it could be smaller than 24. It could be ten. Yeah. Right? Correct. So yeah, I mean, that's certainly you're reading it correctly.

Mr. Devine: That's all I have. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Sobek: As far as through traffic, I think that's why the Supervisors had the sidewalks added.

Mr. Depretis: Okay. Yeah. We've always had an ordinance that referred to sidewalks, and there's been numerous occasions where roads have been expanded, Bideford, I think of. And when Park Social was built, they were required to have a sidewalk in front. And they would have had a sidewalk that went to nowhere. A sidewalk that just would have been in front of their business and nowhere else. So, I mean, we've considered our ordinances that address sidewalks already.

Mr. Firman: Just to point out, right, we have an existing sidewalk ordinance, right, and this just modified it. Just to be clear on which would have had to go in.

Mr. Depretis: Yeah. It seems like over the last couple of years, we've had a lot of plan expansions. Cul-de-sacs expanded on, like I said, Bideford's a good example. And I don't know, Watchfield, they built in the cul-de-sac. Well, of course, you're not going to make them put a three-home sidewalk in when the first 40 homes don't have a sidewalk. Well, I shouldn't say automatically. We would review that and decide, I guess. But we've made those decisions in the past.

Mr. Firman: That's right. I mean, before, what your ordinance said is you would not put in sidewalks unless it was proposed to be more than 50 multifamily dwelling units. This just narrowed it to bringing back to smaller dwellings.

Mr. Depretis: Yeah. In hindsight, I think a lot of our streets would prefer to have sidewalks. And I wish that ordinance would have been in there years and years ago because a lot of people street walk.

Mr. Sobek: Especially on Stoltz. On Stoltz, I would love to be able to walk to the park instead of driving the whole half mile.

Mr. Depretis: Well, everywhere, right? Where do we have sidewalks really? Anywhere.

Ms. Unknown: Right. Like on Brownsville Road.

Mr. Depretis: Okay. I guess if we're going to maybe go down the line, Russ, I have comments. I have a little concern about the restrictiveness of this. I live in, the part of South Park for 44 years up by the

Italian village and the Kinder Care. And boy, when I look around my area of homes there, Piney Ridge, Piney Bluff, Hertford, Maria's Way, Dara, Kirkby, they all have more than 25 homes, and not one of them would have ability to have access, whether it was due to topography. Every single one of those would have had to ask, oh, Bonnie Dell's another example. They would have had to ask for either some kind of variances. And I guarantee that if you asked, I know I talked to people on my street. If you ever told them that my street on Hertford would go through, and boy, that would be great because we could either have a shortcut or we'd have greater access in order to get out in case of emergency, I can't imagine that there'd be one person that said, "But we have 44 years of history here. And is this a problem that we're looking for a solution to or a solution we're looking for a problem for?" And I think that the way it reads now is, in my opinion, is somewhat restrictive. And in the history of South Park, I just think one of our greatest advantages is being able to walk on dead-end streets, being able to live in a cul-de-sac. I mean, my house why I bought it because it was a dead-end street. And if it wasn't a dead-end street or changed, I would think twice about whether I would continue to live there. So that's my opinion on the restrictiveness of this.

Mr. Foster: Can I just make a comment real quick?

Mr. Bracker: Please come forward and yes, you can. But please come forward, sign in, just so that it's on the record officially.

Mr. Timothy Foster, 1046 Westchester: Yes. Thank you. Tim Foster, 1046 Westchester. I just want to address this because I think we're getting off track here. I think what the concern was is why this ordinance was important is because when they had a dangerous situation that the County pointed out to us was Sleepy Hollow at the end of it with the Culvert Bridge, we had no ability, according to our current ordinances, to reject that. Correct Irv? There was nothing that the Board of Supervisors could hang their hat on. So that's why now this is in litigation. All we're asking for with this, this puts 100% pure ability on you and the Board to say yes or no. Clearly, if it's a cul-de-sac street where there's no danger of the end of the road collapsing, I would say South Park is just going to say, "No need for emergency access." If there's something in between 108 homes and the only road out of there, which is Stoltz, right? Because if something happens to the Culvert Bridge, that's the safety disaster we're trying to avoid. We're not saying that every cul-de-sac, 10-home, 24, 30-home cul-de-sac is going to have to have an emergency access. Because what could possibly happen on that road to prevent emergency vehicles getting out? What could happen on a road like Sleepy Hollow or any other one? But the concern is the Board had nothing to hang their hat on when the County warned us that there was a danger, there was a problem because our ordinances weren't up to date. All we're trying to do is update this ordinance to allow.

Mr. Depretis: But that's not all. It's a lot more than that. I mean, I think if this would have in my opinion, I'm not speaking for anyone else. If this would have addressed cul-de-sacs or, I'm sorry, cauldrons bridges, like I think of the one that crosses into St. Jones Parking Lot, as I know is an ongoing issue now. I could see those being addressed in an ordinance. But the two-way exit and all that, I think, is overkill.

Mr. Foster: But it gives the Board the ability to say, "We're going to grant a variance. We're going to allow the variance." That's all it does.

Mr. Depretis: To me, variance should be the exception. And most times, people should fall underneath your ordinances. And it seems like now that the exception would be that it falls under the ordinance and the norm would be that they have to ask for variances every single time.

Note—Variance is the incorrect word usage—it would be a waiver/modification request—it would not got before the Zoning Hearing Board, which is the only Board that deals with Variance requests for Zoning, not Saldo.

Mr. Foster: I would just argue from a litigation perspective, you want to have as stern as rules as possible because then you have the ability to walk away from them when you don't need to. The problem right now is Sleepy Hollow is the perfect example. If a disaster strikes there, I think the Township has some huge liability. It's a Township-owned road, a Township-owned bridge. The only purpose of this ordinance was to try to give the Board the ability to say yes or no. That's all it's for. Irv do you concur with that? I mean, I know you may not be in favor of it, but let's be realistic.

Mr. Firman: Inaudible, in preparing an ordinance. I'm not, you know it's not, whatever the Planning Commission recommends, that's not the point. You made a lot of statements, and I can't say that I concur with all of them. Like you expressed your opinion to the Board, and I heard you because inaudible.

Mr. Depretis: Yeah and I respected you.

Mr. Foster: Can you just give me an example of what you don't agree with? I mean, this ordinance gives the Board the ability to say yes or no.

Mr. Firman: I'd like, look, I'd used what you said, I'm not going to argue with you. You made your point and that's fine.

Mr. Bracker: Thanks. Mr. Papinchak, any questions, comments?

Mr. Papinchak: No questions. No comments.

Mr. Bracker: Mr. Matyger?

Mr. Matyger: No, I don't.

Mr. Bracker: Mr. Sable?

Mr. Sable: I'll just repeat that I don't think this ordinance is necessary. I think, based upon the fact that 55% of our neighborhoods have single egresses and would not have safety or security issues regarding emergency access issues, that I don't think this ordinance is necessary. It's just my opinion.

Mr. Firman: I did want to make one more point, but just to be clear, right? This is not a retroactive ordinance, right? So, this is not going to affect anything that exists now. This is only on new development that's coming in now. It's not on anything that so to the extent that you had an existing cul-de-sac or something, you always come in and say, "Oh, we can put in emergency access," or anything like that. This is just new development that would fall.

Mr. Depretis: Yeah. And Mr. Chairman, the only other comment I would make is, well, you know what? I don't want to keep repeating myself. I'm sorry. You can move ahead.

Mr. Bracker: Okay. Anything else, Mr. Sable?

Mr. Sable: No, sir.

Mr. Depretis: Oh, wait. Now that I thought something. The County, from my understanding and from the information we got from our code enforcement officer's secretary today, we got a notice that the County, although it was very backed up when it came to being able to respond, I know from a lot of the previous discussions we've had with the public and in our hearings that the County's input we felt was pretty important on this because of the seriousness of it. And my understanding is that they are hoping to respond shortly. I don't know what that means exactly.

Mr. Firman: Yeah. It was sent to them they had a time to respond. And again, there have certainly been circumstances in my career where I've sent an ordinance that was scheduled for a public hearing and the County did not respond in time. And the Board is not restricted. This Board isn't. And the Board of Supervisors, they are not required to wait for it. My obligation was to get it to them.

Mr. Depretis: I understand. Yeah. I understand that. I just think since we went back and forth with the county's input, the county had a suggestion, the county this, that I would kind of like, it's a shame that we didn't have the opportunity to get that. But I understand it with all the other things they have going on that we see here on the news that I'm sure they're not goofing off.

Mr. Firman: Right, and I'll say, we were not back and forth with them on this because if you remember, we brought it here initially before we sent it to them, right? And then it went to the Supervisors. Then it was sent to them. Yes, they had opinions on the developments that have been through, but the first they've seen this ordinance is after the Board of Supervisors recommended it. So, they've not said anything about it. They just have not said anything, right? It just hasn't happened.

Mr. Sobek: And the county does have their own ordinance requiring two access points with the same threshold.

Ms. Unknown: When was it submitted?

Mr. Firman: I'm not really, I don't know if the code enforcement officer *inaudible* with it after the last meeting. So, the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Bracker: If I may, there is a note here. The draft was sent to the County on June 23rd.

Mr. Fiman: So that's in advance of the, June 23rd is in advance of the hearing that we have August 10, thank you for having me.

Ms. Debby Duncan, 2451 Stewart Road: Debby Duncan, 2451 Stewart Road. As a resident, this is my concern. The areas that we have left to develop in South Park can be very troublesome. There's a lot of hills. There's a lot of valleys. We have creeks running through the different areas. We have railroad tracks running through. We have different things like that. Developers come in. They're looking to make money. I understand your concern that smaller developments coming in and they want to put in a small

group in a cul-de-sac. That wouldn't be an issue. My concern is the more restrictive we are, the more control we have over the areas that Might be an issue or a problem. Safety should be our primary concern. If one time we're able to stop something that is dangerous or that could harm someone if the plan goes in, I think it's well worth whatever restrictive ordinances we put in. Again, we're not trying to stop development. South Park's a bedroom community. That's all we have is houses. We're never going to have businesses. That's pretty much a given. But we just want to make sure that when we have areas, you look at Stewart Road, I don't know how well, I don't know, I'm not an engineer. I'm not a builder. I don't know. I just know that I look at the hills that we have and the areas that we have that might be developed, the flood areas that we have. I just think the more restrictive we are with making sure that any resident in a home built is safe, is worth the effort.

Mr. Depretis: Yeah. I don't disagree with that. I think when it comes to bridges, culverts, and things like that, that's definitely a, like I said, I live on Hertford Drive. I mean, unless there's a mine subsidence or something, there's nothing there to really interfere with us. And we don't seem to; we live high enough that we don't have a problem. I just think in the big picture, like I said, I have 44 years of experience there and around there. I just haven't seen it. But I'm not saying that certain things in the ordinance aren't fine and sensible, but.

Ms. Duncan: I look at when they put in Summit Station and I think of how many hills we have similar to Summit Station. The next developer coming in might not be as conscientious looking for two egresses, two entrances, two this, two that. That's my concern. I just don't want to see something going in on a hillside that's going to cause a landslide. We're on the bottom. We're in a flood zone. You can't get out. And I just think that if we can look at it on a case-by-case basis, it's a lot safer for everybody concerned. That's all. Thank you.

Mr. Firman: And that, and that was the purpose of this ordinance, was to put things in place. And this was worked on with the engineer and the planner to come up with something that made sense that would give the protections. And then again, as topography or reality doesn't make sense, then it just puts the justification on removing it from the *inaudible*, as opposed to putting it on the Board to try to add a condition that's not in the ordinance. It allows that to happen. And that allows that real communication to go back and forth. And without it, you don't have it. So that's why I think.

Mr. Depretis: Yeah. I mean, you can't read people's minds. I hope, let's leave it at that. I hope that this won't be a deterrent from any developer coming in to say, "I'd like to build here, but after reading this, maybe we won't." I hope they would come to us and say, "This is a good enough plan that I think we can still be safe and develop too." And then the planning commission and the Supervisors would agree with that and move forward. Because I am a little concerned that if we really do too much to stifle development, then it's not like we're a business where we said, "Well, we'll expand into another product." We have no more products. Building and taxes are our product. And I don't think we as a Township live extravagantly. I was on the school Board. I don't think they live extravagantly. I know what the teacher's salary and our superintendent's salary was. So, I don't worry about taxes being over safety or anything like that. I just think of my experience from being a Township resident for a long time. And Sleepy Hollow I look at as a different thing. I mean, if I had one way in and one way out, if the cul-de-sac collapsed, I'd be very concerned about that. The other streets, I'm not quite as concerned about it. Now, could someone get hurt and you not have access? Listen, a meteor could fall and hit us too, and you can't put a dome over us. So, you have to be reasonable with your safety concerns, but.

Ms. Duncan: Can I make one last comment about that? We never thought Sleepy Hollow would be an issue or be developed, but now we know it is. I don't want that to happen again and have somebody come in to develop an area and we say, "Oh, geez. Guess what? We never thought about this area either." That's all. That was the intent of this. We wanted to protect the residents. That's all.

Mr. Depretis: I understand.

Mr. Sobek: Can I make one more comment too? Jefferson Hills and Bethel have similar ordinances, and it certainly hasn't deterred development there.

Ms. Duncan: Makes you guys work more. We apologize, but.

Mr. Depretis: Yeah. Bethel has its own problems, but. Bethel has a whole other set of problems. Jefferson, I am not as familiar with. They have a lot more land to develop than we do too in Jefferson currently too.

Ms. Duncan: I would rather have a little bit more work upfront on our part than to have to deal with the, the result later if we have it done our due diligence. That's all.

Mr. Depretis: Okay. I can respect that

Mr. Sable: I would want to think that a developer coming in would work with the Township to make accommodations that the Township Supervisors and planning commission members want to have happen and work with them in a manner that said, "Okay. Yeah. We can do this. We can do that. We can make that happen." Sleepy Hollow is unique, and I don't want to go back to that. But I think prospectively, new companies coming in or new developers coming in would work in conjunction with the Township to make things the way that it should be to avoid any concerns of safety and risk. But as I look at this and I look at the history of our community, like I said, the 55% that only have one egress, I don't see any valid security or safety issues that have come forward to say, "Oh, my God. We got to fix this." So that's why I'm saying what I'm saying to you. Again, it's just my observation.

Ms. Sharon Adams, 6528 Ventura Drive: Hello, Sharon Adams, 6528 Ventura Drive. Mark, you were saying about variances. You don't want it to be a norm. We're trying to do, cross every T, dot every I. And if we have to do a variance, we do. But we have to be so cautious of where we're going in the future. This is for your grandkids, your kids, and that's where we are. It's not right now. We don't know what's coming down. And another thing, Pat, I don't think developers are that nice. I do not think that they're going to want to talk to the Supervisors and say, "Hey, let's work a deal." No. I don't think they're going to do that.

Mr. Sable: I disagree with you, but.

Ms. Adams: They're pretty ruthless. Their answers for Sleepy Hollow. Well, they're pretty ruthless.

Mr. Foster interrupting from the audience.

Ms. Adams: Well, let me continue, please. There was a tree that was down on Riggs, and Debbie took me there, and I was never over there. And it blocked the road. And yes, there was a way to go, but I personally didn't know how to get there. And if I had to go to the hospital, I would be quite upset if that

was the only way in or out. And as for a cul-de-sac, nobody's kids are playing on a cul-de-sac. Nobody's out playing anymore. So, you're saying about people wanting to come here, I'm sorry. I'm writing and talking at the same time. People want to come here and have a private road or a cul-de-sac, Mark, because.

Mr. Depretis: Oh, please, drive on Maria's Way. Drive on Hertford Drive. You weren't there at a good time of the day then because it's constant.. Now, with that said, we haven't seen a, when I moved into South Park, I moved in in '82, there were 26 kids at the bus stop every morning. Now there's three kids, four kids, five kids. And I know the school district. When my daughter graduated in 2000, there were 115, 118. Now there's not much more. So, we're not really seeing any more development for little kids.

Ms. Adams: I see them. I'm not anti-cul-de-sac. I'm not anti-development. I just want you to know that we have to be very careful in the future on what we allow. I think we have to be so strict right now because of litigations, because of developers. They're not trustworthy. And if we need to do a variance, we will. We will look at every opportunity, every development, and analyze each one. Okay?

Mr. Depretis: I'm okay with that. I would just hope that to the previous comment, if there's 28 homes, not your comment, 28 homes and there's only one outlet, and that's all that's possible because of the way either the topography is or it's landlocked because of other properties. And we would say, "Now there's that one chance that there something could happen where an access wouldn't get through there." So, we're not going to let that happen.

Ms. Adams: What if it was your kid?

Mr. Depretis: Wait a second. If I'm.

Ms. Adams: No. What if it was your family member? That one possibility that somebody couldn't get out.

Mr. Depretis: No. It sounds like then we'll never approve one. Now, you're saying we'll give a variance, and then in the next breath, you're saying we won't.

Ms. Adams: But there has to be an emergency access somehow for the future developments. There has to be.

Ms. Duncan: Well, then it's a different topography and a different area somewhere.

Mr. Depretis: Well, my street is the perfect example. There is no other way to get in and out of it. If something would happen at the beginning of my street, there is no other way to get in and out of it.

Ms. Adams: I would never move there. I wouldn't.

Mr. Depretis: Oh, my gosh. Okay. We have a difference of opinion.

Ms. Adams: We do. Let's agree to disagree. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Paul Smith, 1009 Old Post Road: Paul Smith, 1009 Old Post. This ordinance to me is trying to give back to the Township Supervisors and to this Board, obviously, too, the discretion to decide issues

of risk in this Township. When we had the last Sleepy Hollow debacle, so to speak, you were all here. We hear the contractor come in and say, "I gave you the number. You have to approve my bid right now." They refused to add and they explained why they didn't want to do some extra things that were being asked for. It would have added to the attractiveness of the neighborhood, the safety of the neighborhood, quelled some of the fears of the people who live there. You even got so pissed off at them, but you shouted at them and said, "Hey, this is terrible."

Mr. Sable: I didn't shout at anyone, Sir. I'm sorry. We didn't talk any louder than anybody else in this audience, but.

Mr. Smith: But you lost your temper with them too. And that was a contractor who claimed to have good records. At that time, members of this person, "Oh, they're doing great here in the Township." And

Mr. Depretis: We never approved to Sleepy Hollow once. This planning commission.

Mr. Smith: Supposedly, he has other developments. "Oh, he's doing fine here in those." *Inaudible*

Mr. Depretis: Sir, we've never approved, not once the planning commission approved Sleepy Hollow.

Mr. Smith: I'm not talking that he worked Sleepy Hollow. He worked another (*inaudible*). And the chairman at that time of the Board said, "Well, he's doing okay at his other places, isn't he?" And now we know it wasn't. So anyway, what the ordinance is. You'd have the impression, and this Board had the impression, or the Township had the impression of, "Okay. We'll take the minimum because we want development." And quite frankly, there's a lot of problems with those ordinances that probably should be fixed up. This happens to be one that was picked out because it's one of the most serious ones, the most obvious. And to all of you, that culvert is a problem. There's no other way out. No other way in.

Mr. Depretis: I think we are past the culvert part and the Sleepy Hollow part. I think we, Sleepy Hollow is its own animal here. And culverts and bridges and that are its own thing.

Mr. Smith: Yes, and without this ordinance we'd go through the same thing as Sleepy Hollow.

Mr. Depretis: My concern is more what Sharon just said, and that's that if a street has more than 28 homes, 25 homes, and it can't have another access point. They could ask for a variance. But from what I'm hearing, we would say no.

Mr. Smith: Well, you don't know that. You don't know that now.

Mr. Depretis: They just said it. If it had a possibility of one person getting injured, we wouldn't allow it.

Mr. Smith: Okay. I'm saying this in the reality, legally gives the Township back the authority to say, "We want to do what's right. We want to have a decision to make the risk-cost-benefit decision and not have it forced down our throat because we didn't address that strongly enough in our zoning ordinances." Okay. And clearly, to me, sitting through that, all that Sleepy Hollow, actually both proposals, it was very much the idea is, they meet the minimum, fine let's go home. And that's what this ordinance is trying to do, close one of those loopholes that existed there. Now, maybe you can't think of those instances right now. I certainly can't. I'm not that familiar with the Township, even though I've lived here for 38 years. So, I don't see that, "Well, maybe we're coming back too hard." The Township

Supervisors and this Board have the discretion, and surely have their discretion to decide, make the risk-reward decisions themselves, not have them forced down our throats because we've left something out. Thank you.

Mr. Firman: Can I just say one thing just to clarify right now? Again, this ordinance is being prepared, and it's not for today or tomorrow. And no one knows who the Supervisors will be when any development comes forward, right? But what it does, and I'm not just, but it gives you the opportunity. And if you have a situation where there truly is no other way to do it, right, and they can show that and the developer comes in and says, "Look, this is seven unit this is seven cul-de-sac. The distance, it's not necessary. Everything's blocked out. There's really nothing else we can do," it becomes a legal argument that would have to be evaluated first by you to make a recommendation, then by the Board of Supervisors to evaluate it. But no one could possibly make a blanket statement. We would never. We would always, right? It's always, I just did that. But it's case by case. That's how this is written, right? It's written with the idea that allows, the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance allow the safety valve of, and you're using the term variance, but it's the modification process, waivers, right, which is not as strict as a zoning variance, right? Waiver modifications are designed because just subdivisions and land development, it's almost required when you a lot of times just the way the topography is. So I just wanted to point out that it's really case by case. It's not an always or never, but this allows for this. And it's just a regulatory ordinance. It's not designed to stop anything. It's really just regulating development in the future. But I believe that's one of the, just wanted to clarify some things.

Mr. Bracker: Thank you. So, since everyone else has expressed their opinion, so I don't know how the Board will vote on this. I'm torn, personally. First of all, I appreciate greatly the desire for safety. And I think everybody here agrees that safety is paramount. However, I do go back to, in my opinion, cul-de-sacs are good for families. Thinking back when I was moving into the Township back in 2000, a cul-de-sac would have been preferable thinking of kids being able to play on the street, kids being able to ride their bicycles. Sidewalks, not a fan. And in my opinion, sidewalks are a burden to the homeowner. Thinking of I've got to clean snow off of a sidewalk now in addition to a driveway and my own walkways. The other two items that I'll mention before we do a vote, I do see this as being put in place so that basically to prevent anyone from developing Sleepy Hollow if it were to ever come back to us. A previous Supervisor, I'd been thinking about this today while I was driving. And a previous Supervisor had once said years ago, and the Supervisor has since passed away. So, he was talking about taking of property. And obviously, there's taking of physical property where the Township wants to build something for the public good. But he was also concerned about taking of property in which there is financial loss to the owner. And he felt that was more concerning because it's a little less conspicuous, if you will, because "Oh, are we taking, going back to Sleepy Hollow as the source of this, is it a way that we are taking property in terms of financial from that particular landowner?" That being said, though, I'm torn because I see both parts of this. So, I just wanted to share my opinion since everybody else in the Board gets to share theirs. And I know everyone in this room, whether homeowners or the Supervisors, the Board, everyone's concerned with safety and what's important for the Township. And we may just have different opinions on things, but I think that's where it comes down to. So, with that in mind, we need a motion to recommend, not recommend, or table this amendment to Chapter 118 of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance regarding definitions and requirements for multiple vehicular entrance points for subdivisions and land developments and meeting certain other criteria.

Mr. Depretis: Mr. Chairman, and that's a dramatic pause. I would like to recommend this, to the surprise of the audience, with the understanding, in my opinion, that our Supervisors will truly, truly look at

these and not stifle the development that this potentially allows for. So, I say I would like the motion to recommend.

Motion made by Mr. Depretis, seconded by Mr. Papinchak, to Recommend the amendment to Chapter 118 of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance regarding definitions and requirements for multiple vehicular entrance points for subdivisions and land developments and meeting certain other criteria.

Aye: Depretis, Papinchak and Matyger
No: Sable, Bracker, Devine

Mr. Bracker: So, we have a tie.

Mr. Firman: 3-3. So not recommended.

Mr. Sable: So yeah, failed.

Mr. Bracker: So not recommended. So just for the public record, Mark Depretis, John Papincak, and Bill Matyger voted to recommend. Rod Devine, Russ Bracker, and Patrick Sable voted against. So, it's a 3-3 tie. It is not recommended by the Board of the Planning Commission. So, this goes to the Supervisors for their final decision, which once again, for the audience, this is back in front of the Board of Supervisors on Monday, August 10th, for a public hearing specific for this before the regular Board of Supervisors meeting. Is that correct?

Mr. Firman: August 10th will be the public hearing, yes. I don't know the exact time, but yes. Well, I'm not sure if it was before the meeting because I would have said, So I thought it might be at 6:30 PM. Probably Monday at 6:30. Definitely on Monday night. And it's advertised appropriately.

Ms. Duncan: Thank you for giving us the opportunity to speak. And again, I did not speak as a supervisor. I spoke as a resident. Thank you. But because I'm a supervisor, I had to go around and do things because everybody calls me on there. And I'm seeing a lot of things that I didn't see before. A lot of problem areas, a lot of flooding, a lot of things that we need to be more concerned about. So just in the future.

Next Regular Wednesday, August 26, 2026 at 7:00 p.m.

Meeting Adjournment Motion was made by Mr. Papinchak, seconded by Mr. Matyger, to adjourn the meeting. *All members voted aye. The motion was unanimously carried*.

Time: 7:55 P.M.