

Bond Case Briefs

Municipal Finance Law Since 1971

DEDICATION - PENNSYLVANIA

In re Township of Jackson

Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania - August 1, 2022 - A.3d - 2022 WL 3021688

Township petitioned for leave of court under the Donated or Dedicated Property Act to sell land dedicated for use as a public park, alleging that, due to the topography of the land as well as the cost to maintain the lot, it was not practicable to develop the lot as a public park.

After evidentiary hearings, the Court of Common Pleas denied the petition. Township appealed.

The Commonwealth Court held that:

- Procedural requirement that defense of equitable estoppel to be raised in responsive pleading did not apply to Donated or Dedicated Property Act proceedings;
- Evidence supported trial court's conclusion that township actively facilitated residents' belief that land would remain as open space;
- Township did not establish that retaining recreational use for which land was dedicated was no longer physically or financially practicable; and
- Evidence supported conclusion that maintaining land as pocket park continued to serve interest of the public.

Procedural requirement that defense of equitable estoppel be raised in responsive pleading did not apply to proceedings conducted under Donated or Dedicated Property Act, and thus testimony of township residents, as parties-in-interest under Act, could raise issue of whether township was equitably estopped from selling park land, in proceedings on township's petition for leave of court to sell land dedicated for use as public park; while no opponent of sale filed responsive pleading or expressly raised defense of equitable estoppel, Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure had not been incorporated into proceedings conducted under Act, and local rules had not been adopted to cover such proceedings.

Substantial evidence supported trial court's conclusion that township actively facilitated residents' belief that land dedicated for use as public park would remain as open space, as grounds for application of doctrine of equitable estoppel in proceedings on township's Donated or Dedicated Property Act petition for leave to sell park; township approved land development plan designating land as proposed public park, township accepted donation of land and dedicated land to public park use, and township never advised public that it might use land for any other purpose.

Township did not establish, in proceedings on its Donated or Dedicated Property Act petition for leave to sell land dedicated for use as public park, that retaining recreational use for which land was dedicated was no longer physically or financially practicable, as requirement for grant of judicial relief under Act; township's supervisor acknowledged that township could keep land as open space in its unimproved state, which involved minimum maintenance, and township's consulting engineer testified that land could be developed with walking trail and basketball court.

Substantial evidence supported trial court's conclusion that maintaining land dedicated for

recreational public use as a pocket park continued to serve the interest of the public, as grounds for denial of township's Donated or Dedicated Property Act petition for leave to sell the park, where a number of people representing a significant proportion of the development in which the park was located signed a petition seeking to save the park.