

Minutes of the Regular Meeting
Of the South Park Township Planning Commission
South Park, PA 15129

April 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, James Waychoff, Rob Devine, Bill Matyger and Mark Depretis. Also present were Derek Parker, Code Enforcement Officer, and Irv Firman, Township Solicitor.

Absent: John Papinchak, Joseph Sites, Township Engineer and Carolyn Yagle, Planning Consultant.

Approval of Minutes

Motion was made by Mr. Depretis, seconded by Mr. Matyger to approve the minutes from the February 25, 2026 Reorganization Planning Commission Meeting. All members voted aye. The motion was unanimously carried.

Motion was made by Mr. Sable, seconded by Mr. Waychoff to approve the minutes from the February 25, 2026 Regular Planning Commission Meeting. All members voted aye. The motion was unanimously carried.

**SALDO Ordinance
Amendment**

Mr. Bracker: New business is the Saldo ordinance amendment to consider recommendation regarding a proposed ordinance amending the Subdivision and Land Development ordinance, chapter 118, section 44 of the code of the Township of South Park as it pertains to requiring multiple vehicular entrance points for subdivisions and land developments meeting certain criteria. Mr. Firman, can you give us a brief overview of what we're talking about just so it's officially read into the record?

Mr. Firman, Township Solicitor: Sure. At the Supervisors' meeting the Supervisors made a motion to authorize the solicitor's office to prepare an amendment to the subdivision and land development ordinance requiring that lots in excess of 25 lots have two access points in the middle of 150 feet apart. So, now again, I don't think that they actually said the 150 feet apart, but they said the material

difference in space, you know, something like that. and that was the purpose of this ordinance. It was prepared it was introduced by the supervisors at the last township meeting. They reviewed it in public and it was recommended to send it to a scheduled public hearing. A scheduled public hearing, triggered sending this ordinance to Allegheny County Planning Commission and also to this planning commission for review and comments for a recommendation or thoughts on the proposed amendment to the ordinance. So that's how we got here today.

Mr. Bracker: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Parker, as our code enforcement officer, any comments, questions that you would like to share with at this point?

Mr. Parker: I have no comments at this point.

Mr. Bracker: Okay, fair enough. So let it be known there's nobody in the audience, so we will ask the Planning Commission to express our thoughts, concerns, questions.

Mr. Depretis: We'll start at one end or another?

Mr. Bracker: Doesn't matter.

Mr. Devine: Okay, I have some concerns about the proposed amendment. Number one, I believe it's contrary to the character of the township as it existed, always has existed. I just don't see that it's actually necessary. I'm not aware of any studies or any information that shows that there's an imminent safety threat. And when I think of these types of situations as far as access points for subdivisions and land developments can be dealt with on a case by case basis. That some discretion is necessary, every piece of property is different. So, for that reason, that's my concern about this proposed amendment. I would recommend not to; my recommendation would be to not recommend.

Mr. Depretis: Okay yeah, I'd like to add a few thoughts also. I've lived in the Township for 44 years and I live off of Ridge Road where the real majority of home development that has happened there since 1980 -1990's and now as recent as 2010's with Maria's Way addition, are almost exclusively one entrance plans. Some, like the Piney Ridge plan, have probably estimated 150 homes. As far as I'm aware, I've never heard of a problem with egress or ingress being a problem during any kind of emergency. I live on Hertford Drive, which has 66 homes. Once again, 44 years of residence there. I have never once had the street blocked or not able to bypass due to any kind of accident or construction. It's always been set up where we've been able to enter and exit our road. I also worry about how, and I know this is to address residents, but when I think of the limited number of businesses we have and some recent, like Park Social. Park Social certainly has more than 250 cars that exit and enter that one and only one entrance a day. So how far is this going to go from currently 25 homes of residential or 250 traffic passes a day, trips a day, when we have businesses that of course have one and you would hope that they'd get as many visitors a day as they possibly could. Maria's way is a perfect example, it's 28 homes it's the street that is parallel to me it hasn't been, since 2016 I think, was the new, is when it was developed so it's, it's only a 10 year old development there. There are, like most new plans, they attract young new families. Maria's way is a perfect example of that. If any of you have not been up on Maria's way it is a, the bus stop is loaded, there's kids on the street playing at all times, a thought that that would have an additional exit out of it, maybe on the cul-de-sac side, would cause havoc for that street and I would question whether some of those new families would have purchased a home there if not given the option of a place where they felt was safe for their kids to play. So, I think cul-de-sacs and dead-end

streets have always been desirable and this ordinance will take away something that is always, as far as when I was growing up, dead end streets were a desirable location to locate a home and a family.

Mr. Bracker: Thank you Mark. Bill, any thoughts?

Mr. Matyger: Yeah, I think that if there was a lot of additional lands in the Township where there could be a lot of construction of newer homes going on, then that might, this amendment might be something to seriously consider, but I think that, what, 55% of the larger developments only have one and we've never had a problem. So, I don't really see the need for doing this particular, adding it on at this particular time. I mean, that's how I feel about it.

Mr. Sable: Not to be redundant, I just simply believe this ordinance is not in the best interest of the township, its citizens, and especially its taxpayers. We need growth. This is a deterrent to growth from my perspective and I cannot support it.

Mr. Waychoff: I have one comment I'd like to make about section 118-44-L access points. As a developer would look at this, he would see that there is a possibility of making an access point one way. And that would comply with the law, but it would not comply with ingress and egress, which would be absolutely necessary in the intent of the ordinance to allow traffic to flow correctly in and out. So that's a very minor change, but I also see that it is a very restrictive arrangement for future development, so I would like to vote against it.

Mr. Bracker: I know in my case, I have to agree with some of what Mark was talking about. Remembering many years ago when we had small kids, moving into our home, that was always a concern in the back of my mind of traffic on a road. Luckily, the development that I'm in, while it does have multiple entrances, it's not heavily traveled, it's not considered a shortcut to get somewhere else but that was always a concern and having and knowing that and thinking back to that I would agree, I would as a person purchasing a piece of property for my family with young kids, I would prefer a dead end or cul-de-sac just because the kids would be less likely to be hurt potentially. And this really seems to me to be sort of a knee-jerk reaction to some of our recent developments that have come before us. So, I guess any other comments, questions before we vote?

Mr. Depretis: Yeah, the only thing I'm going to say is this seems to be a solution to a problem that simply just historically does not exist.

Mr. Bracker: Okay. Okay, we need a motion to recommend, not recommend, or table this amendment to chapter 118, Section 44 of the Subdivision and Land Development ordinance requiring multiple vehicular entrance points for subdivisions and land developments meeting certain criteria. Do we have a motion?

Motion made by Mr. Sable, seconded by Mr. Devine to not recommend this amendment to Chapter 118, Section 44 of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance requiring multiple vehicular entrance points for subdivisions and land developments meeting certain criteria. *All members voted aye. The motion was unanimously carried.*

Next Regular

Wednesday, May 27, 2026 at 7:00 p.m.

**Meeting
Adjournment**

Motion was made by Mr. Depretis seconded by Mr. Matyger to adjourn the meeting. All members voted aye. The motion was unanimously carried.

Time: 7:17 P.M.