

PUBLIC HEARING

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2023

6:30 P.M.

Roll Call Walt Sackinsky presiding. Board members Ed Snee and Brian Lucot were present. Also in attendance were Karen Fosbaugh, Township Manager; Dennis McDonough, Chief of Police; Aaron Laughlin, Director of Public Works; Irving Firman, Solicitor; and Tom Bonidie, Code Enforcement Officer.

Purpose of Hearing The purpose of the Public Hearing is to take oral or written testimony on the following ordinance:

ORDINANCE NO. 715: AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE TOWNSHIP OF SOUTH PARK, COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY, COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, ORDINANCE NO. 556 (“ZONING ORDINANCE”), AS AMENDED, ARTICLE II: DEFINITIONS, ARTICLE IV, R-1 LOW DENSITY SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, ARTICLE V: R-2 MEDIUM-DENSITY SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, ARTICLE VII: R-4 MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, AND TO AMEND ARTICLE XVIII: PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (PRD) TO MAINTAIN CONSISTENCY WITH SAID UPDATES.

Testimony **Walt Mager, 6710 Hilldale Dr.** – Mr. Major asked if the ordinance was in reference to the proposed Sleepy Hollow Development, and Mr. Sackinsky replied that it is not. He explained that the ordinance was amended relative to various residential areas and PRD’s and addresses access and other issues.

Danielle Strimlan, 1540 Truman Ave. – Ms. Strimlan inquired about the dimensional criteria assessment that was done in the spring. Mrs. Fosbaugh mentioned for the record that two emails and two Right-to-Know requests were received. One was from Ms. Strimlan and the other from Ms. Vodzak, and both were received on November 9th. Both requests have been referred to the Township Planning Consultant, Carolyn Yagle, for response. The Township is exercising its right for an Extension of Time under the Open Records Act for a 30-day response. Ms. Strimlan asked if the ordinance realigned with the Allegheny County Greenway Plan. Ms. Yagle asked if Ms. Strimlan’s question is in reference to the Greenway Plan which was composed many years ago or the RSP that the County just released for an update to its Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Strimlan replied that she was referring

to the RSP, and Ms. Yagle explained that it has a 3-year timeframe identified within the RSP. Ms. Strimlan asked if the ordinance refers to fossil fuels, and Ms. Yagle explained that the natural resources referred to in the ordinance is the topography, watershed, and natural landscape. Ms. Strimlan inquired about Sleepy Hollow Road, and Mrs. Fosbaugh explained that it is not an arterial or collector street. Ms. Strimlan asked about the R-1 District, and Ms. Yagle replied that the amendment does not change the R-1 District land uses. Ms. Strimlan inquired about the lot width size in the R-2 and R-3 Districts. Ms. Yagle explained that as a matter of existing conditions within the Township's ordinance for PRD's, there are no minimum dimensional criteria. The existing base zoning district dimensional standards are in the proposed ordinance assigning new dimensional criteria to the PRD. There are no dimensional standards associated with PRD in the existing Township Zoning Ordinance. There are no lot sizes or setback lot width as Ms. Strimlan has read in terms of the proposed. There is actually no size to compare to the present. Ms. Strimlan asked if there were any parties currently interested in any of the R-2 District areas. Mrs. Fosbaugh replied that the Township has received no submittals.

Michael Wetzel, Victor-Wetzel Associates – Mr. Wetzel commented that in the proposed ordinance, PRD has been removed from R-1 and R-4 Zoning Districts, and they are only permitted in R-2 and R-3 Zoning Districts that are located on Arterial and/or Collector streets. He inquired as to how many parcels are available to develop a PRD in the R-2 and R-3 Zoning Districts, based on the current zoning map. Ms. Yagle replied that we can make a note as there would be the need to withhold that information out from things that were done earlier this year and as part of this analysis. She added that she does not have those items with her this evening. Mr. Wetzel commented that the proposed ordinance has removed single-family attached dwelling units as a permitted use in the R-2 PRD; therefore, these units are only permitted in a R-3 PRD and the R-4 District. He inquired about how many R-3 parcels are available where single-family attached dwelling units are permitted. In regard to R-2 area regulations, there is not much being reduced. In the previous PRD, there were no standards for lot size and lot width setback. Mr. Wetzel added that there is not much of a reduction in the minimum lot sizes, lot width and yard setbacks. The minimum lot size was only reduced 83% from the base zoning requirement, and there is a PRD open space requirement to provide 25% of the site in open space. It doesn't become a relatively fair change in regard to the requirements. Lot coverage still remains the same even though you have reduced the minimum lot size. Mr. Wetzel asked how the 26.25 ft. minimum front yard requirement and the 22.5 ft. minimum rear yard

requirement numbers were determined in the new PRD Ordinance, and why the odd numbers. He questioned why not just 25 and 25, which makes it more restrictive when you add up the 2 areas. 7.5' side yard seems very reasonable, as well as the 2.5 story maximum height. Mr. Wetzel remarked that the R-3 PRD has the same requirements as the R-2 PRD, which he finds very uncharacteristic, since the R-3 Zoning District is a high density single-family residential district. He inquired as to why the R-3 does not have a different standard than the R-2 district. He recommended allowing 3 story townhouse units, since many townhouse communities have 3-story townhomes. Mr. Wetzel believes that the Township has stifled some of the PRD requirements by not providing more creativity or reductions within the PRD to provide some innovative design as outlined in the Township ordinance. Mr. Wetzel commented that in the proposed ordinance, Retirement Community has been removed. He recommended an overlay within the PRD to have an age-restricted community within the R-2 and R-3 Zoning Districts. The advantages of these communities are no maintenance for lawn care and no snow removal by the residents for sidewalks and driveways. All of the low-maintenance work would be completed by the HOA. Mr. Wetzel commented that he hoped his suggestions will be considered, as outlined in his letter to the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Yagle – Ms. Yagle stated that there were many comments brought up this evening that she will review.

Walt Mager – Mr. Mager reminded the Board of Supervisors that when Grace Lutheran Church was to be built on the property located on Hilldale Drive, they were granted a conditional use for a church. Mr. Mager remarked that the property is currently up for sale, and he hopes the conditional use remains the same.

Mr. Sackinsky – Mr. Sackinsky mentioned that because the Township offices were closed on Friday, Mr. Wetzel's letter was only received today. The Board has not had enough time to review the letter but will give the items addressed consideration.

Close Public Hearing

Motion by Mr. Snee and seconded by Mr. Lucot to close the public hearing. All members voted aye. Motion carried.

Adjournment

Motion by Mr. Snee and seconded by Mr. Lucot to adjourn the public hearing. All members voted aye. Motion carried.

Time: 6:54 p.m.