MUNICIPALITY OF BETHEL PARK
MEETING MINUTES

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
AUGUST 12, 2026 @ 7:00 P.M.

COUNCIL CHAMBERS
BETHEL PARK MUNICIPAL BUILDING

A. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Mark Viehman called to order the August 12, 2026, Regular Meeting of the Bethel Park Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) at 7:00 p.m.

B. ROLL CALL

The following members were in attendance: Ms. Katelyn Walsh; Mr. Keith Hoppe; Mr. Peter Grandillo; Mr. Rick Raeder, Vice-Chairman; Mr. Mark Viehman, Chairman; Mr. Adam Foote; Mr. Tom Riley; and Mr. Zach Patterson. Mr. Daniel Gales was absent from the meeting.

Councilmember in attendance: Ms. Alison Piccolino

Staff in attendance: Michael J. Haberman, Interim Municipal Planner / Municipal Engineer

C. COMMUNICATIONS - None

D. MINUTES – April 8, 2026, Regular Meeting

A motion to approve the meeting minutes from the April 8, 2026, PZC Regular Meeting was made by Mr. Raeder and seconded by Mr. Grandillo. The motion passed by a vote of 7-0. Mr. Patterson abstained.

E. CITIZEN COMMENT (Non-Agenda) – None

F. OLD BUSINESS – None.

G. NEW BUSINESS – None.

G. OTHER ITEMS – DRAFT ORDINANCE

1. Review of and recommendation on a draft ordinance amending Chapter 69 (Zoning Ordinance) of the Municipality of Bethel Park Cod of Ordinances to regulate Vape Shops as a permitted use subject to conditions.

   Mr. Haberman provided a summary of the process that Council has gone through in developing the draft Vape Shop ordinance and summarized answers to questions from PZC members from the July 29, 2026, workshop meeting as provided by the solicitor.

   Mr. Haberman further explained that the solicitor provided additional information as it relates to the age restriction. Federal law has changed and the ordinance will no longer include exceptions for members or Veterans of the United States Military. Any reference to that will be removed from the final version of the ordinance.

   Mr. Patterson indicated that generally supports the ordinance but asked if the distance between vape shops could be expanded to a distance further than 1,000 feet similar to Mt. Lebanon's ordinance.

   Ms. Walsh asked for clarification on if a vape shop not only sold in ownership but if the new owner was affiliated with a different name / company would they have to adhere to the new ordinance. Mr. Haberman indicated that he would get input from the solicitor and report back at the next meeting. Ms. Walsh also asked if the distance from another vape shop could be extended to 3,000 feet similar to Mt. Lebanon's recently enacted ordinance.

   A discussion ensued regarding the enforcement of several sections in the draft ordinance. Specifically, Section 69.92.5 regarding Age Restriction. Ms. Walsh asked how this would be enforced. Mr. Viehman questioned how the definition would be audited. If an owner indicates that sales of these devices are only 28%, who is going to audit that?

   Mr. Raeder stated that he liked many of the components of the Mt. Lebanon ordinance and questioned if Bethel Park's ordinance could be 'married' with some of the components of the Mt. Lebanon ordinance.

   Mr. Foote questioned if sections 69.92.7 through 69.92.10 are an overreach or if they are enforceable. Mr. Foote also mentioned that verbiage related to members of the military would also have to be removed from section 69.92.12. Mr. Foote also suggested that section 69.92.5 regarding age restrictions should include "unless

accompanied by an individual at least 21 years of age" instead of simply restricting any person under the age of 21 from being on the premises. Mr. Foote also questioned if the ordinance could restrict games of skill similar to how the sales, service, or consumption of alcohol is prohibited in section 69.92.13.

Mr. Patterson questioned by section 69.92.11 is needed if a person can't even enter a store if you're 21 years old. Ms. Walsh suggested that these products are no different than cigarettes, which state law requires that they be behind the counter and out of reach of customers.

Mr. Hoppe asked if advertising would be permitted on the inside of the windows of establishments. Mr. Raeder indicated that the municipality can't regulate what's on the inside of the windows but can regulate what's on the outside. Mr. Hoppe also asked for confirmation that section 69.92.6 only applies to new vape shops and not existing. Mr. Haberman confirmed that would be the case.

Mr. Viehman indicated that there were too many outstanding comments on the draft ordinance to make a motion or recommendation. No motion was made. Mr. Haberman indicated that he would seek additional input from the municipal consultant and the solicitor on the items and sections discussed during the meeting.

2. Review of and recommendation on a draft ordinance amending Chapter 69 (Zoning Ordinance), Article II (Rules and Definitions), Section 69.8 (Definitions) to add a definition for Adaptive Reuse, and amending Article XXII (Requirements for conditions uses) to add a new Section 69.92 (Adaptive Reuse of Qualifying Buildings) to establish a conditional use framework for the adaptive reuse of certain existing buildings, including qualifying hotel, office, motel, and/or lodging facilities in the C-3 professional-service district and certain former public, semipublic, institutional, religious, educational, and civic buildings.

   Mr. Viehman asked if the draft ordinance changed from the previous version that was discussed at the July workshop meeting. Mr. Haberman indicated that the ordinance was the same as the previous version, but that additional information was provided including a previous draft adaptive reuse ordinance that was recommended by the PZC in February as well as a memo prepared by the former municipal planner.

Mr. Raeder asked Ms. Piccolino if the ordinance was being sent back to the PZC specifically for the Crowne Plaza. Mr. Raeder indicated that in the version from February 2026, the PZC specifically tried to exclude that type of adaptive reuse and focused on schools and churches, etc. Ms. Piccolino indicated that the Crowne Plaza property was part of the consideration of the revisions to the draft ordinance, but not the only reason for the revisions. Mr. Raeder questioned why the Crowne Plaza can't go for a use variance like others in the past have instead of catering to them with this revised adaptive reuse ordinance.

Ms. Walsh indicated that she has mixed feelings on the ordinance and likes the original draft ordinance recommended for approval by the PZC in February 2026.

Mr. Grandillo commented that in section 69.92(d), second bullet point, the word "and" should be "or" before "housing for seniors as defined in this Chapter."

Mr. Patterson declined to comment being a new member to the PZC and not having been part of the discussions on the original draft ordinance in late 2025 / early 2026.

Mr. Foote indicated that the original draft ordinance recommended by the PZC in February was a meaningful ordinance for adaptive reuses within the municipality.

Mr. Jenkins (5658 Kings School Road) spoke as a citizen and indicated that he doesn't understand why the ordinance was revised from the version recommended earlier in 2026.

Mr. Viehman asked if a recommendation has to be made or if the PZC can just stick with the previously recommended adaptive reuse ordinance. Mr. Haberman indicated that if a recommendation is not made, the draft ordinance will remain on the agenda until a recommendation is made, with or without revisions to the draft ordinance as presented.

Mr. Raeder made a motion to recommend approval of the draft ordinance amending Chapter 69 for adaptive reuse regulations. Mr. Grandillo seconded the motion. The motion failed by a vote of 8-0.

H. FUTURE MEETING DATES

Chairman Viehman noted the upcoming meetings to be the August 26th workshop meeting followed by the September 9th regular meeting.

I. ADJOURNMENT – Chairman Viehman adjourned the meeting at 8:06 p.m.