

MUNICIPALITY OF MONROEVILLE

PLANNING COMMISSION

JULY 17, 2024

MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Chairman Leonard Bertoni.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND MOMENT OF SILENCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited and a moment of silence was observed.

ROLL CALL

The Recording Secretary, Sharon McIndoe, called roll and the following were present: Leonard Bertoni, Heidi Lawrence, Bruce Walker, Ronald Massung, P. Lorriane Lewis-Burke, Paul Montgomery, Paul Whealdon, Paul Hugus, Dan Deiseroth, Darren Meyer and Doug Beitko. Mr. Segelson was absent.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There being no corrections, additions or deletions to the minutes of the June 19, 2024 meeting, a motion was duly made by Mr. Massung to approve them, as submitted and Mr. Walker seconded it. Upon a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Bertoni explained everyone would have an opportunity to speak for five-minutes. He suggested a motion to take Applications Nos. 24-3-ST, 24-2-C and 24-5-SUB off the table was in order at this time.

Whereupon, Mr. Walker duly made a motion to take Applications Nos. 24-3-ST, 24-2-C and 24-5-SUB off the table and Mrs. Lawrence seconded it. Upon a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

SITE PLAN 24-3-ST

WILLOWCREST

The applicant, Primo Land Group, LLC, is requesting Site Plan approval pursuant to Article III of the Monroeville Zoning Ordinance, No. 2779, to construct a single-family residential development consisting of 95 units and associated site amenities. The property is vacant and used to be the airport located off of Logan's Ferry Road, identified as Tax Parcel 741-R-333 in the R-2, Single-Family Residential Zoning District and consists of 46.62 acres.

CONDITIONAL USE 24-2-C

WILLOWCREST

The applicant, Primo Land Group, LLC, is requesting Conditional Use approval pursuant to Section 504.VV, Major Excavation, of the Monroeville Zoning Ordinance, No. 2779 to permit a cut and fill operation totaling approximately 100,000 cubic yards of earth. The property is vacant and used to be the airport located off of Logan's Ferry Road, identified as Tax Parcel 741-R-333 in the R-2, Single-Family/Multi-Family Residential Zoning District and consists of 46.62 acres.

SUBDIVISION 24-5-SUB
WILLOWCREST

The applicant, Primo Land Group, LLC, is requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval to subdivide Tax Parcel 741-R-333 into 95 single-family lots and three open space parcels in the R-2, Single/Multi-Family Residential Zoning District. The property is vacant and used to be the airport located off Logan's Ferry Road and consists of 46.62 acres.

Mr. Ed Moore with Scheffler and Company came forward as the civil engineer for the project. He reported they presented their plans for the development at the last meeting and it has the same layout with 95 single-family lots. He stated they have resubmitted revised plans to address the municipal staff and engineering comments. He explained there were a lot of concerns expressed at the last meeting about the existing mines, strip mines and grouting. He reported GeoMechanics was again present to give a brief presentation and address some of the residents' comments and answer their questions.

Mr. Ryan Kossol from Geo-Mechanics Incorporated came forward to give a presentation. He was hopeful he could better explain the methods and give a more visual representation of what happens during the construction process.

Mr. Kossol pointed out a red and blue area and explained the red is the deep mine and the blue is strip mined. He reported they did test borings which are pretty accurate but he suggested there are quite a few geo-technical issues at the site. He asserted the purpose of their study was to try to find out what they can do make the land usable for this development and safe to build on with no issues for future homes.

Mr. Kossol started with the proposed remediation of the strip mine areas they will use a method called rapid impact compaction. He explained it is like taking a tamper that is pounded into the ground to solidify the ground underneath. He added this is a slightly larger scale and it is combined with undercut and backfill. He stated this method typically works on 10 to 15 feet of loose materials, the strip mine turnover and they go in and take 10 feet off, compact the lower 10 feet and replace the upper 10 feet with proper compaction control. He added when the houses are built with basements and foundations they will be on stable ground.

Mr. Kossol reported rapid impact compaction will not do a lot of damage or make a lot of noise. He explained it is just using an excavator and they provide vibration monitoring and construction surveys on pre-tamping and post-tamping to ensure all assurances are met. He added there have been studies done on rapid impact compaction for noise and vibrations and everything is shown within a certain extent and there have been no issues to construction. He reported it has been done in residential neighborhoods and everything has been within acceptable limits based on the codes and studies.

Mr. Kossol asserted the bigger issue is the deep mines. He explained it is a hole in the ground under the surface and at this site it ranges from 70 feet at the deepest point, right in the middle of the old airport runway and tapers down to 25-30 feet on the edges of the site where it is strip mined. He stated they use mine stabilization any time there is a deep mine that they want to build on which is putting grout in there through a series of injection holes. He showed a picture of the series of holes that get drilled where the grout is pumped in through the hole down to the bottom of the mine where it

forms a cone which helps to stabilize the roof of the mine. He explained most mines are done with the room and pillar method with existing coal pillars and the grout columns go in between the coal pillars that add additional stabilization to help avoid mine subsidence and prevent settlement cracking in any in the houses above. He added the grouting fills any of the voids in the rock that is above.

Mr. Bertoni stated that was discussed last month and he wanted to reassure the residents when the pillars are drilled, the grout and material used would not be hazardous or add any contamination to the earth. Mr. Kossol agreed and explained it is like putting in concrete for a foundation.

Mr. Kossol summarized they are drilling a series of rotary bore holes at 20-foot grid and he showed a small example of what two side by side lots look like on a 20-foot grid. He had a larger plan showing proposed holes across the entire site. He explained the borings are not just injection holes they give information about the quality of the rock above the mine and mine conditions whether it is wide open or collapsed, six or eight feet high and whether it has collapsed, has debris, rock, roof wood, gob or intact coal. He asserted it is an important part of the study and helps with the geo-technical study.

Mr. Kossol explained mine grouting not only helps the immediate area even though it forms pillars five to eight feet wide but it helps adjacent areas. He stated they would go 20 plus feet outside of each house and the grout can stabilize the areas outside the houses and adds additional support on the outside perimeter of the site. He showed a picture of the mine grouting process with the grout holes, columns of grouting between the coal pillars, the mines, the house above and how the grout is extended out beyond the house to provide stabilization for the area of influence. He stated if you start with the perimeter holes, it helps to form a perimeter wall of grout so as you move inside the more the grout gets contained and builds up rather than flows outwards. He added there is thick grout when there are open voids, which helps it to set more on a column and thinner grout is used when there is debris so it can flow in between all the wood, coal and gob. He mentioned the concerns for the water in the mines. He explained the mines have water but they did not encounter full standing water. He stated ground water tends to flow in through the cracks in the rock and lay in the bottom of the mine, and it may stay there or flow out but it is not that much water. He reported they use the trimming method by sticking a pipe down in the ground all the way through the water and pump it under water and it helps build up so the water does not just wash away the grout without any stabilization. He explained the grout would not force the water out of the mine or shoot it into peoples' homes and if there is water it will remain in there and work its way around the grout columns as it normally would.

Mr. Kossol showed the structural dip of the bedrock and explained water will follow the direction of the dip of the rock and if there is water it will flow northwest towards the Maplecrest Development. He mentioned there was concern about the mine water and the homes so someone did a site visit. He reported there appears to be some discoloration in the water or something corroding the storm sewer inlet. He pointed out the intersection of Valleyview and Greenleaf and stated it is outside the mining areas. He stated it is below the outcrop of the Pittsburgh Coal. He reported it was determined that the water there is not directly from the mine. He added water does tend to follow coal seams and there is a outcrop of a coal seam on the hillside behind Valleyview and below Blueberry. He explained coal seams could produce acidic water. He was uncertain whether that is what it is but those were their ideas when they reviewed the concerns.

Mr. Kossol pointed out the grout location plan for the overall site. He explained they have holes at a 20-foot grid pattern across all of the lots and grout holes going along the roadway spaces at 20 feet

and there will be two holes along each stretch of roadway side by side. He pointed out a corner where they identified the strip mine area so those lots would not likely need deep-mine grouting because the coal and the mining have already been removed. He also pointed out where they do the rapid impact compactions.

Dr. Javaid Alvi, President of Geo-Mechanics Incorporated, came forward to make comment. He explained there are usually major geo-technical issues in the greater Pittsburgh area. He stated one side of the topography is one issue, along with the presence of deep mines and the strip mine area. He explained their job was to delineate all the areas and make a recommendation to address the issues and remedy some of the concerns there might be. He stated stability of the cut and fill is no problem. He explained they do not have deep cuts or high embankments but the ones they do have, they have proper subgrade preparation criteria and proper design of the slope compatible with the sense of the material. He explained the strip mine area which is small compared to the overall site has different depths of the strip mine back. He stated they originally performed three different options and felt Deep Dynamic Compaction (DDC) was the most economical and rapid method of doing it. He added they have done it for a lot of sites in the Pittsburgh area. He stated to alleviate the concerns of the citizens the owner decided not to use DDC compaction and they will do undercutting and backfilling which will depend on the thickness of the material in the area. He addressed the concerns about what deep grouting would do to the adjacent properties. He reported the boring they did showed the mine is not flooded and the only ground water that will be found was at the bottom on the mine, and surface water trickles down and gathers in the opening at the bottom. He stated a large amount of garbage has been taken out and 60 to 70 percent of the coal has been removed but there is still some left in the coal pillars. He suggested they would recreate the situation by underpinning the roof so it does not collapse. He stated there are a series of grout injection holes where grout will be pumped in to develop a mass to support the roof. He added they are not suggesting saturation grouting which is pumping grout into 100 percent of the cavity region which would impact any water. He explained if there is a freestanding cavity they will underpin by constructing grout columns underneath. He mentioned the gob where they would try to impregnate and solidify it. He stated there is not a lot of material being pumped into the mine. He asserted in this area they are usually pumping four cubic yards to 15-16 cubic yards. He reported some of the holes may take more but they control it so it will stay underground and support it. He explained the ground water, if there is any, it will go to the syncline. He felt there was no ground water in the mine. He stated what they are doing to stabilize the area will have a positive impact on the adjacent area and will minimize the spreading of the mine subsidence in other areas. He asserted it is helping it not hurting it.

Mrs. Lewis-Burke was concerned with the traffic that will be generated on those streets that are currently dead-end streets.

Mr. Zack Stehle from Trans Associates came forward to explain the traffic study that was performed. He reported the development will not generate significant amounts of traffic. He explained Buttercup Drive, Quince Road or Hazelnut Drive will experience one car every two minutes and all the traffic will be distributed over the course of the day. He asserted there would be more during the peak hours than there would be at midnight or during the late evening.

Mr. Bertoni reported at the conclusion of the last meeting all concerned parties were to meet to discuss the issue. He inquired whether Mr. Beley was present and questioned whether they could

schedule a meeting. He stated the issue was tabled so the residents and developer could meet. He inquired whether the meeting took place and what was resolved. Mr. Beley reported no meeting took place and explained a couple meetings were attempted to be scheduled but it did not take place.

Mrs. Charlette Mlynar came forward to explain the developer indicated at the meeting he would meet with the residents but he went on vacation for three weeks during that time. She indicated he would have his representatives to meet with them but the night it was scheduled was the citizens' night meeting and the residents decided to attend that meeting to put their voices on record. She stated the meeting was never rescheduled and the developer was out of town for three weeks.

Mr. Beley felt there are a number of things that could be done with this plan and that meeting with the residents needs to take place. He stated the residents do not want this development due to traffic concerns. He referred to the drawings and suggested 90 percent of the traffic would go down Dahlia and up Hazelnut Drive. He mentioned the mailboxes are located near a house on Hazelnut so every resident will stop there every day. He added all the delivery trucks would also go there. He felt there are a lot of problems with the plan. He stated the retention ponds about Snowball Drive and all the houses will have to look at them. He pointed out the retention ponds with Maplecrest are directly behind Pugliano's house and it looks terrible. He suggested the plan could be simplified, the roads could be shortened, the number of homes could be reduced and if the roads were not all connected it would cut down on traffic. He stated there was never a meeting with the developer and he sent an email to Mr. Spanola but never had a response. Again, he stated if the plan is done there are a lot of changes that should be made and he would not recommend it as is. He pointed out the residents are not in favor of it at all.

Mr. Bertoni turned the meeting over to the experts so the residents' questions could be addressed.

Mrs. Charlotte Mlynar, a resident of Quince Drive, came forward to express her concerns. She briefly reviewed her history in Monroeville. She reported her parents were told when they bought their lot on Quince Road that it would be a dead-end street. She confirmed it because the former airport was established in 1948 and was fully functioning when Quince Road was being developed in 1955. She felt the statement that Quince, Buttercup and Hazelnut were designed to be open is false. She stated the airport was always private property and the address was always 3926 Logan's Ferry Road. She pointed out when it was recently sold, the description stated 57 acres at 3926 Logan's Ferry Road and did not mention access roads of Quince, Buttercup or Hazelnut because it was not part of the airport property. She suggested the planning commission caused this problem when they allowed the property to be rezoned in January of 2022 then the senior living apartment complex was allowed to be built in the front of the land causing the 47 acres in the back to be boxed in. She stated the planning commission is looking to disrupt the long-standing quiet and safe 69-year-old residential neighborhoods. She disagreed with the planning commission approving the deal with the Willowhedge residents to block future access to the 47 acres to Logan's Ferry Road. She suggested since the precedent has been set the planning commission will make a deal with Quince, Buttercup and Hazelnut to not open their dead-end streets. She felt the Primo Land Group did not do their due diligence because there are no established entry points on the 47 acres where they want to build.

Mrs. Mlynar referred to the January 2022 rezoning map of the former airport where Greenleaf Park has the same adjacent location to the 47 acres of property as those three streets. She reported

according the Allegheny County Property Assessments Greenleaf Park is owned by the Municipality of Monroeville. She suggested the municipality destroy, utilize or open its own property and not create major hardships for Quince, Buttercup and Hazelnut. She was adamant that the residents should not be forced to lose property footage to enlarge their roads that would make their neighborhoods congested and unsafe to live and exercise.

Mrs. Mlynar reported Garden City has been part of Monroeville for 69 years and the municipality has been collecting their tax dollars longer that some people have been alive. She questioned why the municipality is not supporting the residents and catering to a company that only benefits them. She suggested the members of the planning commission have the responsibility to do what is best for the tax paying citizens of Garden City. She again stated most of her neighbors bought their homes because of the dead-end streets. She mentioned real estate agents have been selling homes on these streets in good faith and when they were listed, the dead-end streets are included in their description.

Mrs. Mlynar mentioned a website E-Code 360.com under the Municipality of Monroeville, Part Two, General Legislation, Article 4, Street and Traffic Standards, Chapter 320-34, Street Standards, Provision B, Special Purpose Streets, No. 2D, "a temporary turnaround shall be provided at the end of a dead-end street which are intended to be extended as through-streets in the future". She stated when selling a home, it must be brought up to code. She suggested their roads should have been brought up to current code prior to a sale or proposed agenda if their roads were designed to be opened. She again stated those roads were not designed to be opened in the future.

Mrs. Mlynar reported a petition was circulated through her neighborhood and they have 326 signatures even though a lot of people were not home due to vacations that do not want the opening of Quince, Buttercup and Hazelnut Roads. She urged the planning commission to shut down this proposal to open their dead-end roads. She asserted Primo Land Group can build whatever it wants if they can enter the 47 acres in a different way but the municipality should not allow them to disrupt the lives of those residents for their financial benefit. She stressed the planning commission's loyalty should be with the taxpayers. She suggested they go through Greenleaf Park, extend Maplecrest or have the developer move on and forego developing the 20 acres of the 47-acre property.

Mrs. Mlynar reported the residents are not here to make concessions. She felt their prior approvals lack the in-sight needed to complete the development of this property. She urged the planning commission to vote negatively on approving the development if it includes opening Quince, Buttercup and Hazelnut.

Mrs. Mlynar stated she did not object to them developing and again suggested the municipality access it's own property through Greenleaf Park. She explained a development with a certain number of homes has to have more than one access and recommended the developer reduce the number of homes and access through Greenleaf Park.

Mr. John Akey, a resident of Garden City, came forward in favor of the development. He stated this development would provide 95 families homes and they would be the beneficiaries of the project. He reported their children would go to the Gateway Schools and patronize Monroeville businesses, pay taxes and be involved in the community. He suggested this development would benefit more than just those 95 families and it would benefit the entire community. He explained the developer will renovate

the park in Garden City which is good for the community and he disagreed that it should be removed. He suggested the benefits go beyond that and according an April Tribune article, Gateway lost \$68 million in property tax revenue since the pandemic which is the fourth largest non-Pittsburgh school in Allegheny County. He pointed out this development will add 95 properties to the tax rolls but it will not solve a pending budget crisis but will help. He reported it will pay for the teachers equipment and activities that the school provides. He added the taxes the municipality will collect will help pay for transportation improvements to the roads and parks and other community improvements. He felt unless everyone wants to pay a higher property tax rate, this development will be a huge benefit to the community. He reported according to the Pitt University Center for Social and Urban Research Monroeville's school age population is going down 4.7 percent in the last ten years.

Mr. Akey again stated this project represents 95 homes with families with children to attend Gateway Schools. He suggested the benefits go beyond Gateway because the residents will shop in Monroeville's businesses, have jobs in Monroeville and participate in community events. He stated this development is an easy bike ride to Garden City Pool, Evergreen Elementary School, the fire house, and three churches. He suggested this development is located close to everything in Monroeville and is accessible by E-bike. He stated the streets are safe and can handle an increase in traffic from this development.

Mr. Akey reported another benefit is housing costs and explained studies show that new housing construction lowers housing costs in the immediate area and it has been shown that not building new houses raises housing prices which keeps current residents from buying a home and making it a permanent home. He pointed out the homes in Garden City are getting old and he felt they are not built to withstand the work-from-home environment. He mentioned how these 95 homes will have the modern features and amenities of 2024 and help alleviate Monroeville's aging housing stock. He suggested Monroeville is a great place to live with their quality parks, pools, hospitals and schools with plenty of restaurants and shopping centers. He pointed out it has easy access to anywhere in the Pittsburgh metropolitan area by car and Pittsburgh regional transit. He suggested the residents should want the community to be affordable and be welcoming to their neighbors and everyone who wants to live here and not in Westmoreland County, Plum or Penn Hills.

Mrs. Carla Chianese, a resident of 413 Hazelnut Drive, came forward to express her concerns. She reported her house is the last one on the left and directly impacted by the development across from the Cappussio's. She pointed out the man that just spoke lives on Cottonwood and is not impacted by this development.

Mrs. Chianese reported she is the one that sounded the alarm regarding this development because no one on her street, Quince or Buttercup was aware of the development. She stated she only knew about it because she saw a planning commission member in front of her house. She explained how she filed a right to know and met with Mr. Whealdon and reviewed the plan and traffic study. She suggested the traffic study is flawed because no traffic was assessed coming off of Laurel Drive onto Garden City Drive. She pointed out he assessed the traffic coming up at Evergreen and Garden City Drive and Old William Penn and Garden City Drive. She pointed out he did not assess the traffic when schools were being let out. She explained when she travels from Penn Hills or Wilkins Township she travels up Laurel to go to Hazelnut Drive which was not assessed. She asserted he stated there will be a car every two minutes and currently there are maybe three a day that do not live there. She stated it is

a quiet neighborhood and the increased traffic is very concerning. She reported her road is 22 feet across and if her daughter parks out front and the Cappuccio's daughter parks out front no car, ambulance, truck or delivery truck can get through into the new development. She suggested the streets are not wide enough nor were they built to sustain the additional level of traffic proposed. She agreed with Mr. Beley that the traffic will go up Dahlia make the left on Hazelnut into the development not only increasing the traffic but the noise which is a problem. She pointed out the mailbox clusters will be located by the Cappuccio's house which will increase traffic, parking and noise at all hours of the day which is a concern.

Mrs. Chianese reported based on the feedback from Maplecrest residents and her research of the area, an environmental impact study needs to be done to include an analysis of the water. She stated according to the residents of Maplecrest their toxic water and soil was used as top soil once it was excavated and laid down which is a problem that needs to be addressed before any additional development is done. She also mentioned the impact on the wildlife and reported she has never seen so many snakes, foxes, coyotes and deer come through her yard since the senior citizen housing has been developed.

Mrs. Chianese mentioned the impact to Evergreen Elementary and pointed out the gentleman from Cottonwood mentioned the increase to schools. She reported from her discussion with Mr. Whealdon she was informed this development would be marketed for 55 years and older, senior homes or retired people. She felt it should be clarified whether it would be single-family homes or marketed for 55 years and older.

Mrs. Chianese reported she was informed that the potential builder has multiple lawsuits pending pertaining to construction defects and fraud. She felt it was very concerning the municipality could have a builder with multiple lawsuits for fraud.

Mrs. Chianese reported she had a statement from Mr. Jim Dallas who is a long-time resident of Garden City who is firmly against this development.

Mrs. Chianese pointed out she tried to schedule a meeting with the developer who wanted to meet during the day and have team meeting. She reviewed the developer was picking times not conducive to the residents so they tried to schedule a night meeting then the residents decided to attend the Citizens' Night instead. She stated there has been no communication since that time and she requested this be tabled to re-assess the traffic so it is correct from all points of entry in Garden City and allow for the residents to meet with the developer.

Mr. Paul Parks, a resident of Blueberry and Buttercup, came forward to express his concerns. He inquired how the construction vehicles on the road would impact the other roads. He wanted to know which roads would be used for construction. Mr. Hugus reported the developer has not declared which roadway system would be used and explained when they do, they will have to post a bond on any local roads that they are using. Mr. Parks inquired whether any damage to those roads would be paid for with the bonds and Mr. Hugus answered affirmatively.

Ms. Theresa Brandt, a resident of Quince Road, came forward to express her concerns. She read a statement concerning the potential housing development for 95 single-family homes in Willowcrest near Garden City. She reported she gathered 321 signatures from concerned residents of Garden City

about the development. She felt this matter has already been decided and questioned whether it has been approved. Mr. Bertoni answered negatively. Ms. Brandt inquired why no research was done to get feedback from the residents who will be impacted by this development.

Ms. Brandt reported she has researched and found no information about this project and she felt it is important to keep the community informed of important matters like this proposed residential development. She was adamant that the residents of Garden City should have been notified and invited to express their concerns and ask questions in advance of this approval. She referred to an article concerning the community impact of new construction with both positive and negative factors regarding the development of 95 single-family homes. She mentioned the environmental impact, soil erosion, water quality and ground water hydrology. She reported other concerns were expressed while she was gathering signatures including: increased traffic and the potential of heavy construction vehicles to residential streets due to the increase in residential traffic once the development is completed, how 95 families will impact property values and taxes for Garden City. She mentioned the storm water management, the foresting impact and how it will impact water and sewer costs. She stated there were lots of dead-end streets and the privacy is treasured and sought by the residents. She mentioned possible concerns for the greater Monroeville area is the impact on hospitals and impact on the school district.

Ms. Brandt inquired whether any Garden City homeowners would be represented on the planning commission in the development process. She questioned whether this residential development would be subsidized housing like Willow Hedge. She inquired how it will be guaranteed. She wanted to know what guarantees or agreements are in place for the 15 acres or 30 percent that are not included in the potential development plan for the 95 homes. She respectfully proposed that they be considered in further discussions.

Mr. Bertoni inquired whether any residents had specific questions that can be addressed by the professionals and experts.

Ms. Diane Echegarey, a resident of Evergreen Drive, came forward to express her concerns. She reported Evergreen Drive is already impacted by traffic coming from other developments that is cut-through traffic going across Garden City Drive, and up Woodhaven or onto Center Road. She suggested it would be further impacted by people coming down on Garden City Drive. She disagreed with having a traffic light at Old William Penn Highway and Garden City Drive which is a four-way stop. She reported a traffic light would only make the back up from Duff Road worse.

Ms. Echegarey mentioned that last year there was a water restriction in Monroeville. She inquired who would supply water for that area with the increase in population.

Mr. Brian Cappuccio, a resident of Hazelnut Drive, came forward to express his concerns. He reported he lives in the last house on the right and this proposed development would impact him directly. He showed a picture with Hazelnut Drive and he pointed out his house and his neighbor. He stated all the pink lines are the mines and the developers are proposing to pour grout into the mines to support the new homes. He felt it would affect the mines and he was concerned with how it would affect his home and questioned who would be responsible if his house shifts.

Mr. Bertoni pointed out the expert for the developer indicated it would be an additional benefit to reinforce the homes on the outer side. Mr. Capuccio stated it is possible but questioned what if it does not and asked who would be responsible. He reported he has mine subsidence insurance but he was concerned the insurance company would say it was fine until the development was started. He was concerned that he would have to retain a lawyer to defend himself.

Mr. Capuccio was concerned about the retention ponds and felt they would only attract insects and disease. He suggested it is located too close to the homes. He disagreed that there should be three detention ponds. He reminded everyone about the incident with the State Store six years ago with the mine subsidence. He reported the whole building started to crack away. He was concerned that would happen to the resident's home once they start the development.

Mr. Capuccio referred to the location of the mailboxes which will be at the corner of his yard. He suggested they be moved because he did not want traffic lined up in front of his house getting their mail at all hours.

Mr. Whealdon reported the post office requires mailbox clusters now for new developments.

Ms. Carrie Boyer-Millie, a resident of Dahlia Drive, came forward to express her concerns. She inquired why the developer is proposing to use their streets and not accessing the development from Logan's Ferry Road. She explained they built 50 buildings with garages around the outside of it then on the outskirts of that there are two roads that come up and could go into the proposed plan. She pointed out it has not been started yet and questioned why it could not be flipped so the traffic goes around out to Logan's Ferry Road. She suggested the mailboxes could be placed on both sides and the traffic could go around the garages and houses that already have ten-foot fences. She reported they already bring all the construction equipment up those roads to build the senior citizens' houses and they could be extended to go up to the homes. She questioned why no one is doing that and inquired why they have to come down their streets when there is already a road there which just needs to be paved that the residents can access on Logan's Ferry Road. Mr. Whealdon stated it is private property and it is a parking lot. Further discussion ensued. Mr. Whealdon explained everything on the apartment complex property is private and the municipality does not own or maintain any of it. Ms. Boyer-Millie still could not understand why it could not be used for access and Mr. Whealdon again stated it is private property. Further discussion ensued. Ms. Boyer-Millie felt there is a way to bring the traffic around if it is reviewed further. She reported she has walked in the area and the trucks travel up that way. She stated there is another option where the trucks can come up the road like the ones that come up the road to construct the other homes. She indicated all the people on the planning commission represent the residents and she questioned why they would not help the residents. She stated there are options other than what is proposed.

Mr. Keith Watkins, a resident of 410 Hazelnut Drive, came forward to express his concerns. He reported he has lived there for 58 years and felt Garden City is a wonderful area. He could not understand why they want to ruin it by building these homes in the area and open up three dead-end streets. He reported they tried to open Hazelnut Drive several years ago but the residents fought it and they were told it is a permanent dead-end. He suggested it is a nice neighborhood and Monroeville is a great place but recommended they not destroy Garden City or everyone will move out. He felt the planning commission should be concerned with the citizens that live there not the ones that might move in.

Mrs. Nancy Gormley, a resident of Greenleaf Drive, came forward to express her concerns. She reported of water running down her property during the wet weather and a swampy area in her lawn. She felt the swampy area changed since they are building up at the airport. She questioned if that results in a landslide or her property floods and her foundation is cracked who would pay for it. She mentioned how there have been developers in the Pittsburgh area that have taken short cuts, created a landslide then declared bankruptcy. She suggested a bond be put in place for 10 or 20 years for protection to the municipality and the residents.

Mrs. Gormley mentioned the traffic and described the development where it feeds into Dahlia and Valleyview. She felt the traffic study needs to address the intersections of Dahlia and Garden City Drives because they will get traffic from three roads leading to the same place. Mr. Stehle answered they did look at Dahlia and Garden City Drives. He explained they analyzed Garden City Drive with Dahlia Drive and determined the impacts to the intersection relative to delay and level of service with increases in overall intersection delay has less than one second per vehicle during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. He stated that means there will be negligible traffic impacts at that intersection. He agreed all three streets feed into one central location.

Mrs. Gormley suggested that made no sense because he reported there would be a car every two minutes out of the three roads. Mr. Stehle added it would be over the course of the entire day and explained it is approximately one car every minute during the peak hours which is from 7-9 a.m. and 4-6 p.m. Mrs. Gormley pointed out that is 60 more cars in the morning when children are at the bus stop.

Mrs. Gormley reported she has been reviewing the Allegheny County Real Estate portal, and Clover Commons owns both parcels, the Willowcrest Parcel and the apartment building. She suggested they are owned by the same company and they just do not want to connect them. Mr. Whealdon contended it is owned privately. Mrs. Gormley asserted the owner of Willowcrest is the same owner as Clover Commons and those two parcels are owned by the same company. Mr. Whealdon explained they are currently owned by Clover and they are trying to sell the undeveloped portion for the Willowcrest development.

Mrs. Gormley suggested the planning commission consider the big picture in Monroeville not just this small area of Garden City. She mentioned the big apartment building that is going to open shortly and reported how when she attended the council meeting at 7 p.m. the other night the traffic was backed up from Business Route 22 down Duff Road to Karen Court which does not include the additional traffic when the apartment building will be occupied. She mentioned the four or five proposed apartment buildings over by Giant Eagle that will suck resources out of Monroeville. She stated the municipality was not planned for this many cars.

Mrs. Gormley reported when she moved here as a newlywed when they bought a house in Garden City and has lived there for 40 years. She explained it is a community of small houses and she was offended by some of the comments made.

Ms. Colleen Everett, a resident of Heartwood Drive, came forward to inquire about the number of cars per day that will be coming through that area from the plan. Mr. Stehle explained they use the IT Trip Generation Manual which is the standardized data base for all the data produced by multiple land uses and for this 95 single-family unit development it will produce approximately 964 vehicles per day over the course of the day. He asserted in traffic engineering that is considered minimal with minimal

impact and would have minor impacts on the surrounding area. Ms. Everett requested he define impact. Mr. Stehle explained when they perform their study they look at delay and how the delay is increased at intersections in the study area. He stated the delays are measured based on a school's grading system A through F with A, B, C and D are acceptable and E and F are unacceptable then they perform an analysis to determine the difference in delay from no-build conditions to built conditions. He explained no build conditions is the current area to built which is when the development is fully in place and fully constructed with vehicles traveling up and down the roads as projected. He stated their study determined that Garden City and Dahlia Drives overall intersection delay will increase by approximately one second which is considered negligible when considering traffic impacts. He referred to the other intersections and for Garden City and Evergreen Drives they projected two seconds per vehicle of delay increase during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours then at Old William Penn Highway and Garden City Drive where there is the most traffic will have be greatest increase in traffic delay. He added at Garden City Drive and Dahlia Drive there will be an overall increase of one second during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Ms. Everett inquired whether that considered that the road is only 22 feet wide and Mr. Stehle answered affirmatively. Ms. Everett explained Garden City Drive has the yellow line which is wider and people park on the smaller roads. She inquired whether the proposed street would be the same width and Mr. Moore answered they are proposed to be 22 feet wide.

Mr. Stehle referred to how lane widths do affect their analysis and they use the highway capacity manual which is a standardized analysis methodology utilized to determine traffic impacts and it considers lane widths. He reported the narrower streets have a longer traffic delay and the lane widths are not a substantial affect on the analysis but they are considered.

Ms. Everett reported she lives on Heartwood Drive and it is a tough decision because she wants progress but she was concerned with the people who are impacted on the streets. She was hopeful that they could find a balance and everyone can come together.

Mr. Bertoni asserted the planning commission tabled this item last month to give everyone the opportunity to meet and the parties were unable to schedule it. He wanted everyone to come together and it was tabled for that purpose but nothing took place. He reported this is at a standstill and he was uncertain how much progress could be made if it is tabled again. He stated the parties are very far apart and he did not think all of the points could be met and all the residents would be pleased regardless of what the developer does. He suggested this would have been an easier transition if the parties could have met but it did not happen.

Mr. Donald Ghetian, a resident of Snowball Drive, came forward to express his concerns. He expressed his appreciation to the planning commission for listening and he was aware a vote would be taken. He wanted to hear from the experts concerning the future of Monroeville.

Mr. Massung felt it would have been better if the residents could have gotten together with the developer.

Mr. Bertoni referred to his comments last month about how beautiful Monroeville is, everyone's concerns, making the community grow, the increase in the tax base and the police patrol. He asserted Monroeville is a great place to live but progress must take place. He indicated there is a balance of give and take for the community to continue with planned developments for building new homes and increasing the tax structure. He stated this is a delicate situation and he understood and respected

everyone's opinion but the planning commission is a recommending body with no legal authority. He reported of how the vote could be taken this evening or another tabling could take place which he disagreed would accomplish anything. He again felt everyone needs to come together but it is difficult with everyone is so far apart. He stated Monroeville is a beautiful place but at some time decisions have to be made to move forward. He felt everyone would come together for the good of the community.

Mrs. Montgomery inquired about the price point of the units. Mr. Moore stated they do not have a builder currently but he estimated them to be \$300,000 to \$400,000. Further discussion ensued about the affordability. Mr. Bertoni inquired whether there would be a price range. Mr. Moore was uncertain because they do not have a builder but he again estimated between \$300,000 to \$400,000.

Mr. Ghetian inquired whether the experts would give their opinions.

Mr. Dan Deiseroth, the municipal engineer, reported he has reviewed the plan for the storm water management and the subdivision plan. He felt it is important to understand that Monroeville has ordinances and laws that the developer has to follow and his job is to make sure the developer meets those standards regarding stormwater. He reported he has reviewed the plan and gave the developer some comments but he does not see any fatal flaws in what was presented. He stated he heard concerns about the location of the stormwater management facility but it will be higher in elevation from the homes on Snowball and will be at a distant of at least 100 feet from the closest point of a home to see it. He added there would be vegetation that remains in the corridor which will be an advantage to obscuring the view.

Mr. Darren Meyer, traffic engineer from HRG, reported he reviewed the traffic study for the municipality. He concurred that the Trans Associates study met the requirements per the municipal ordinances. He understood the resident's concerns about the dead-end streets. He asserted currently there are no traffic concerns and it will be a big change when the street is open. He explained the ordinances and requirements are to maintain capacity more on higher volume streets so he agrees with the data presented which is why an increase in delay is not significant on the streets studied because there will be extra capacity on those residential streets. He explained the traffic engineering is looking more toward when the traffic gets to Route 22 and congested corridors and trying to maintain it. He reported the study complies with the ordinances and from a traffic engineering standpoint there are no traffic issues. He understood the resident's concerns with the increase in traffic.

Mr. Ghetian inquired whether there would be any vote at this meeting and Mr. Bertoni again stated the parties are so far apart that tabling this another month would not accomplish anything. He felt it would be in the best interest to take a vote at this time.

Ms. Pamela Stephens, a resident of Greenleaf, came forward to express her concerns. She reported she has lived here since 1988 and she loves it. She stated she has her own personal ice-skating rink and the mines have somehow found her house and the other houses on that block. She explained how her driveway has been an ice-skating rink. She disagreed that the mines would not be a problem because she was told the same thing when she moved in but unfortunately the mines dumped the water in her house. She reported how she had to cut out her walls downstairs three times and get new walls in the bedroom, family room and the bathroom. She stated no one offered money when she talked to the municipality or the state. She reported people from Harrisburg came to verify that it was their mine water but they did not offer her any money. She stated the wall in her driveway needs to be

replaced but she cannot afford it. She reported she had to tear down her deck because so much water was in her back yard that it rotted out the foundation so it had to be removed for safety reasons. She wanted some assurances that all the water would not be dumped in her house again and inquired who was going to reimburse her for all the repairs she has had to make. She wanted to know that the mines will not just dump the water even though all those pillars were installed.

Dr. Alvi inquired where her home is located and Ms. Stephens answered Greenleaf Drive. Dr. Alvi suggested she may have completely different reasons for all the water coming to her house that have nothing to do with mines. He stated water is currently coming to her house. He suggested based on the facts and knowledge they have that the mine is not flooded. He stated something happened at the bottom when that occurred and if there is a mined-out area at the bottom some water could trickle down and if it is significant it would be flowing downhill not uphill. He reported currently all the rain water is soaking into the surfaces and when this area is developed a lot of that infiltration area will be gone. He stated the houses and roads will be collecting all the surface water and going to the sedimentation prohibition. He reported it would reduce the infiltration of the water into the mine. He asserted just because she is having the problem does not mean it had anything to do with the mines. He indicated they have to look specifically at the location of her house and its relationship to the mine.

Ms. Stephens stated the mines are definitely her problem and she reported when she called Harrisburg they sent representatives that did testing. She reported the mines sometimes can break loose from where they were going to find somewhere else to dump and it dumped on her house. She explained they ran pipes all around her home all the way down the right-hand side to the sewer line. She indicated she is not currently getting water in her house but in her back yard and it cannot be used. Dr. Alvi indicated someone needs to look at the property. He reported in that general area there are buildings on that road that have had mine subsidence problems and they used the same method to support the mines to reduce the risk. He stated in the greater Pittsburgh area there is not one house in thousands of houses that is not built on a mine flood area. He stated the mine grout program is one of the most affective programs. Ms. Stephens indicated that does not solve her problem. She inquired if they have all of these things to do to keep the water out, why was it not done for her house. She reported she went to her state representative and she was referred to a program to get help. She wanted to know when these things happens to their homes why she was not given anything to fix it so she does not have to worry about it.

Mr. Bertoni suggested this problem is from a prior issue but has nothing to do with this development. Ms. Stephens stated she lived there for a while with no problem and now she is trying to figure how it happened and where it came from. She understood there are no guarantees. Mr. Kossol referred to drawings and pointed out Greenleaf Drive and explained the green line is the outcrop of the Pittsburgh Coal, the mine, and their site is by the pink line. He agreed there are water issues and he showed them in his photographs. He stated to suggest those issues are coming from the deep mines and future improvements to the deep mine, is speculation. He explained there is likely to be strip mining and strip mine spoils in between their development and the location of her house. He stated the soils in the strip mine areas are very saturated and water lays in them. He reported it has all the coal spoils from the mine refuse and it is all mixed in and the water flowing through there can pick up the coal, iron and acidity. He suggested that could be what is coming out of the spoils floating onto Greenleaf Drive. He referred to the coal outcrop and explained the bottom of the coal is at 1110 and the top of the coal is at 1120 which is at the bottom of the hillside going behind her house. He reported

water tends to follow coal seams regardless of mining and grouting the abandon mine beneath Willowcrest will not push more water that way. He added it would not hurt or help her water issues but her concerns are valid. He felt they would not be impacted by the current study.

Mrs. Iris Morio, a resident of Greenleaf Drive, came forward to complain about the public address system and how it is hard to hear anyone on television. She was concerned that the planning commission already decided this issue. She pointed out it was never in the Times Express or on television. She felt it was done without notifying the taxpayers. She agreed with progress but she felt the municipality is putting it on the residents. She agreed there are water issues on Greenleaf Drive. She expressed her concerns for waiting at the hospital and the number of police officers. Further discussion ensued. Mrs. Morio again stated she felt this issue was done undercover and the planning commission is selling out the residents.

Mr. Brian Goppman, a resident, came forward to express his concerns. He expressed his concerns for comments made earlier about the age of the houses. He reported the majority of the houses in Garden City were built between 1950 and 1970 and he works from home which works well. He was uncertain about the benefit of what the newer houses would do to their current houses. He reported, as a board member, Gateway Schools did not lose \$68,000 in assessment revenue during the pandemic but \$1 million may have been lost due to the mall. He asserted they are not losing a lot of revenue.

Mr. Goppman reported he lives on Garden City Drive and as a kid he spent time riding bikes on Dahlia and now they play softball at the park. He disagreed with the suggestion of having a traffic light at the intersection of Garden City Drive and Old William Penn and he mentioned the stops signs at Duff Road and Charles Ice Cream. He suggested increased traffic in the area will be cause for additional people getting hurt. He reported they have already seen an increase of traffic due to the Evergreen Apartment Buildings that are currently being constructed and the ones behind the American Legion that are currently under construction. He stated they have already seen an influx of traffic in Garden City and he is concerned because now there would be more. He mentioned how no one currently follows the speed limits.

Mr. Goppman referred to Greenleaf Park and inquired whether it was going to be converted into a recreational pickleball facility for the new housing area. Mr. Moore answered they would improve it but will be for the whole community not just for this housing area. Mr. Goppman asserted there are already a bunch of courts at the Monroeville Community Park. He reported the families in the area use Greenleaf Park and he was concerned they would be losing their park for a housing complex. He disagreed with them losing their park.

Mr. Goppman also disagreed the \$300,000 to \$400,000 proposed cost of the housing is affordable. He was concerned because the residents have to take all the burden of this development. He suggested other alternative ways should be considered for access into the plan instead of straight through Garden City. He was concerned about which fire department would be responsible for that area.

Mr. Goppman referred to the meeting that did not happen between the developer and the residents. He requested the planning commission give this issue one more month and set a date to

decide to let the community have a fair shot. He mentioned there may be alternative routes that could work on a longer street.

Mrs. Montgomery inquired whether anyone was present from Willowcrest and Mr. Moore answered negatively. Mrs. Montgomery questioned what happened with the scheduling. Mr. Moore reported the meeting was scheduled but the resident cancelled it to attend the council meeting. He was unaware of any further scheduling.

Mrs. Chianese reported she coordinated the scheduling and she tried to work with the developer but he only wanted to meet in the middle of the afternoon when none of the street representatives could attend. She explained the only night meeting was cancelled because the residents wanted to attend the council meeting. She requested this be tabled another month to allow time for a meeting to take place. Further discussion ensued.

Mrs. Montgomery referred to the mention that the developer had multiple lawsuits and inquired whether it is a factual statement. Mr. Moore was unaware of any and felt it was a big accusation.

Mrs. Deborah Becker, a resident, came forward to express her concerns. She reported Mr. John Spagnola is not in attendance at this meeting and that was who Mrs. Chianese was trying to schedule the meeting with the developers. She added the citizens did not get to meet with the developer but had a productive meeting at Evergreen Park and the community came together. She noted that the residents in attendance support Monroeville and what makes it great but various concerns have been expressed. She stressed they are valid concerns that need to be considered. She asked Mr. Moore if he and Mr. Spagnola are the principles in Sandy Hill, LLC, the owners of Maplecrest and Mr. Moore answered negatively. Mrs. Becker inquired whether Maplecrest is considered Ryan Homes or the builder. Mr. Whealdon stated it is NVR which is the parent company of Ryan Homes. Mrs. Becker stated Ryan Homes is the builder and they are responsible for the massive landslide in North Strabane Township which cost the township millions. She felt that was very concerning.

Mrs. Becker presented a map and explained she obtained the information from someone who is a professional geologist for the state and geological supervisor (see attached). She referred to an image that was a zoomed-in picture of the plate from the 1970s. She pointed out Monroeville, Universal, Garden City and the Pittsburgh/Monroeville Airport. She reported using the legend it shows the area was mined out prior to 1966 with an explanation that states there is an increased risk of subsidence in those areas. She explained there is an increased risk of subsidence wherever there are little circles or little O's. She pointed out there is a little O right after the word airport indicating a past subsidence event took place according to the map legend. She pointed out Garden City and the Pittsburgh/Monroeville Airport and all of the circles indicating that there is a history of past mine subsidence in that area.

Mrs. Becker referred to anyone that is having issues and water concerns and pointed out the coal outcrop located in the hillside between Valleyview and Blueberry where there is a source of water. She did not think this plan was going fit into Monroeville. She again stated there is a history of mine subsidence in the middle of the airport and mentioned the Majestic Hills Landslide in North Strabane Township which is why there a lot of valid concerns with this development. She suggested because of all the concerns expressed there should be some assurances that the resident's homes will be safe. She

recommended a large sum of money be put into escrow to cover damage. She explained how developers can purchase individual lots then declare bankruptcy once they are finished then they do not have to be held responsible for anything. She reported she had reports from residents of Maplecrest that the wetlands have been destroyed. Mr. Whealdon contended no wetlands were destroyed.

Mrs. Montgomery inquired whether there was any discussion around a compromise at the community meeting or was it just that the residents do not want it. Mrs. Becker reported a lot of people shared a lot of valid concerns. Further discussion ensued. Mrs. Montgomery questioned whether another month delay would result in any progress. Mr. Bertoni did not feel that would happen. He explained whatever happens this will be passed on to council where the residents will be able to provide input. He did not think an extra month would provide anything positive to the progress. He suggested maybe the way to do it is the planning commission vote on the issue and pass it on to council then the residents can schedule a meeting with the developer. He felt it was not accomplishing anything to continue to hold it at the planning commission level because eventually it will go to council. He inquired what the residents wanted or what they would agree with to make the development work. Further discussion ensued.

Mrs. Becker inquired what is intended to be done about the schools. She pointed out it was never mentioned at the previous meeting that it was just for senior living and it is presented as 95 single-family homes. She wanted to know where the children would go because Evergreen School is bursting at the seams. Mr. Bertoni stated the Planning Commission has no jurisdiction over what happens with the schools. Further discussion ensued.

Mrs. Annette Cappuccio, a resident of Hazelwood Drive, came forward to express her concerns. She inquired whether she would be able to keep her wood line buffer between her yard and the new development if this is approved. She also questioned whether the mail boxes could be moved further back to where the plan is located. Further discussion ensued. Mr. Moore pointed out the outlines of existing trees. Mrs. Cappuccio questioned whether it will be kept and Mr. Moore answered it would stay. Further discussion ensued. Mrs. Cappuccio asserted she wants to keep the wood line buffer between her yard and the proposed new development. Mr. Whealdon inquired whether there is also a vacant lot in between and Mrs. Cappuccio answered affirmatively. She added it was her property. Mr. Moore stated the trees on that property will not be touched. Mrs. Cappuccio inquired why the tree lined buffer could not be kept up at the end of Hazelnut to keep that space between Hazelnut, Buttercup and Quincy. She explained they all have woods where the new development is going to located and those mail boxes could be moved further into the plan. Mr. Moore indicated if the trees are on his property and there is no development then they will stay. He stated if they are on her property they will not be touched but if they are in the area to be developed they could be. Further discussion ensued. Mr. Moore reported they have discussed moving the mailboxes further into plan and there would be a pull off with three parking spaces and the mailboxes would be located outside of those. Mr. Cappuccio inquired why they could not put a mailbox in each cul-de-sac and Mr. Moore indicated the post office has jurisdiction. Mrs. Cappuccio verified that the mailboxes would be moved further into the plan and Mr. Moore answered affirmatively. Mr. Whealdon asserted that area would not be disturbed because the grading plan does not have any proposed contours.

Mrs. Chianese inquired about the stop signs. Mr. Whealdon mentioned two or three stop signs were proposed. Mr. Stehle explained as part of the development they did site distance evaluations at

the internal intersections which included Blueberry Road with Buttercup Drive, and Quince Road with Blueberry Road and Dahlia Drive with Hazelnut Drive. He reported they did recommend stop signs be implemented on the minor approach on what is considered the T to the main line so stop signs would be recommended and in place by the municipality based on their site distance evaluation. He explained what is considered the main line is at Hazelnut Drive and Dahlia Drive. Further discussion ensued. Mrs. Chianese inquired about the intersection of Chinaberry and Dahlia where the park is located. Mr. Stehle stated that was not part of their scope of study and he reported their scope of study was prescribed by HRG, the municipality's traffic engineer. He explained they discussed it and a scope of study was agreed upon and prescribed which is what they follow according to the ordinance. He asserted he does not determine the scope of the study.

Mr. Meyer reported they did review the Garden City Plan as they put together the existing roads and the proposed connections to determine where they thought traffic would come to and from the new development. He stated that is how scope was prescribed and it is based on the municipal ordinances and requirements. He reported the general traffic engineering threshold is, if it is less than 100 new vehicles going through the intersection, it does not need to be studied and in this case most of the intersections fall under that category so they tried to prescribe extra intersections to get a better idea of what is there.

Mr. Cappuccio stated during rush hour traffic in the proposal of this new plan, school buses are dropping off at the corner of Old William Penn and Garden City Drive and it backs up. He felt it would be worse once the vehicles start going to the plan and the motorists will divert to other options such as Laurel Drive to get around it. He questioned whether they considered studying that area. Mrs. Gormley asserted the apartment residents should be also be considered. Mr. Meyer explained the apartments were done with a previous study and the diversion of traffic even with that considered would not likely meet the threshold to even study the intersection based on the counts they obtained through this study.

Mrs. Montgomery mentioned there have been a number of complaints about the lack of notice to the residents and inquired about it. Mr. Whealdon explained the public notice is required for a public hearing before municipal council. He reported there was a public notice posted for the conditional use for the earth work which was in the Post Gazette last month. Mrs. Gormley stated what was posted was legal but it did not say anything about connecting to the Garden City streets and she felt that is what everyone is upset about. Mr. Whealdon reported there is no requirement under the Municipal Planning Code. Mrs. Gormley agreed the municipality did what was legal but not what was moral. Mrs. Montgomery inquired whether the municipality did what was required and Mr. Whealdon answered affirmatively.

Ms. Penny Cordera, a resident of Dahlia Drive, came forward, to express her concerns. She stated she lives on the corner of Dahlia and Garden City Drives. She inquired whether pedestrian safety is considered when doing a traffic study. She mentioned the comments made about one or two cars a minute is insignificant. She reported she runs on Dahlia, Hazelnut, Chinaberry and Snowball and she bought her house in that area because it was a great plan to do that. She felt she would not be able to walk her dog and see her neighbors. She reported the cars do not stop at the stop sign on Dahlia and Garden City Drive and she has trouble getting out of her driveway safely. She asserted she would sell her house if this is approved because she will not be safe.

Mrs. Montgomery requested the pedestrian safety be addressed. Mr. Stehle explained they do count pedestrians when they do a traffic study and they have volumes of pedestrians that are recorded and are included in their data. He stated they do not look at pedestrian accommodations only what pedestrian traffic would be produced by the development. He reported considering this development is suburban, there will be minimal pedestrian traffic associated with it during the peak hours since a majority of the residents drive to and from their homes. He explained this study purposely looks at delays, level of service and traffic impacts and how it affects the capacity in the overall efficiency of the stated intersections. He asserted they did not perform a strict pedestrian safety study of the existing roadways because it is not required by the ordinance.

Mr. Whealdon added the proposed development had sidewalks on both sides of the street. Mrs. Montgomery asserted the current neighbors could use the new development and the sidewalks and everything in the development. Mr. Whealdon reported the project cannot be denied based on traffic. Further length discussion ensued.

Mr. Massung felt the planning commission is dealing with too many things at once. He suggested the residents select a leader and get a group together of four or five people then get a plan. Mrs. Chianese asserted she tried to do that and requested it be tabled. Further discussion ensued. Mr. Massung felt tabling it for another 30 days would not help. Mrs. Chianese explained she had delegates from each street and the developer could not meet with them because he was traveling. She added the residents decided to attend the council meeting instead of having a meeting. She indicated she would be glad to continue to work on the issue. Further discussion ensued. Mr. Massung suggested the residents need to prioritize things and put it in writing. Mrs. Gormley contended the planning commission should make the developer work with the residents.

Mrs. Lewis-Burke stated she is with Garden City as a member of Garden City. She explained how she listened to everything that was said and she attended the community meeting. She agreed Mr. Massung has valid concerns and the planning commission has concerns but everyone needs to come together. She commended Mrs. Chianese because she worked hard and she needs all the residents' support to get this together to meet with the developers. She suggested the residents need to respect the planning commission members because they are doing a job that does not pay anything. She reminded everyone she is a Garden City resident and supports the residents but it has to be done according to the regulations of the municipality. She requested the residents be more understanding because she does not disagree with them.

Further discussion ensued. Mr. Bertoni inquired whether the residents put anything together like a punch list of the items that they wanted addressed. He assured everyone that the developer will meet with the residents and he did not want any more delays. Mrs. Gormley indicated she sent a list of her concerns. Mr. Bertoni inquired whether a tabling for 30 days would make any difference. Mrs. Gormley felt a conversation with the developer is key. Mrs. Becker again stated the residents tried.

Mrs. Montgomery inquired why the developer was unable to meet with the residents and Mr. Moore was uncertain. Mrs. Montgomery could not understand why the developer could not meet with the residents in the 30-day period. Mr. Moore appreciated the level of sensitivity of the residents. He stated a meeting with the residents will not change the plan 100 percent but there may be little things that could be done. He reported the property is zoned R-2 and single-family homes are permitted.

Mr. Bertoni suggested the meeting needs to be organized and controlled. Mrs. Montgomery felt it needs to be a smaller group of people with a clear agenda. Mr. Whealdon reported that was planned last month and there would be representatives from each street but it did not occur. Mr. Bertoni was concerned because the meeting did not take place and the planning commission is back where it started and the residents are requesting it be tabled again. He inquired what guarantee the planning commission has that the same thing will not happen again because a meeting could not be scheduled.

Mr. Moore reported he was not in charge of scheduling the meeting but he would have attended and the meeting was cancelled. He explained the plan is not going to drastically change regardless of the meeting but they could make little tweaks. He stated they could move the mailboxes but extending the street through the development would not change. He felt it was a good plan for Monroeville and the developer and he understood everyone's concerns.

Mr. Scott Beley, resident, came forward to express his concerns. He reported Mr. Spagnola requested that he send him a list of things that he would want to see done and he sent one but none were addressed. He reviewed the list as follows: Move the mailboxes, truncate the roads, do not have all the roads connected, move the retention pond on Snowball and others. He stated none were addressed. He agreed with the residents that they should be given a chance to meet with the developer.

Mrs. Montgomery inquired whether his list was emailed to the developer and Mr. Beley answered affirmative but he never got a response. He asserted he also texted him with no response. Mrs. Montgomery had concerns with the developer not being responsive and not being able to schedule a meeting in 30 days knowing the plan would not change but a meeting was intended and never occurred. Mr. Beley submitted a copy of his punch list.

Mr. Bertoni felt a lot of information was covered at this meeting and explained how much the planning commission cares about the residents and Monroeville. He indicated he would honor the tabling request one more time and the residents will have an opportunity to work out their differences but there will not be any more delays. He explained there will be a meeting next month and the residents will have any opportunity to speak but a vote will be taken.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Walker duly made a motion to table Application Nos. 24-3-ST, 24-2-C and 24-5-SUB and Mrs. Lewis-Burke seconded it. Upon a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the planning commission, at this time, a motion was duly made by Mrs. Lewis-Burke to adjourn the meeting at 10:03 p.m. and Mr. Massung seconded it. Upon a voice vote the motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Leonard Bertoni

Regular Meeting

21

July 17, 2024

Chairman

LB/sam

This black and white image is a very zoomed-in picture of this plate from the 70's (here is the link of the full plate and map legend: [plate-1.pdf \(usgs.gov\)](#)) Looking at the legend, it shows that the area was mined out prior to 1966. The explanation on the bottom of the full plate states that there is an increased risk of subsidence in those areas. There is also a "O" right after the word "airport" on the map indicating a past subsidence event took place (according to the map legend).

