

The Peach Bottom Township **Planning Commission** met on **July 20, 2021** at 7:00 p.m. in the Municipal Office Building. Members present Frank Diamond (Chair), Todd Steiner, David Stewart, and Benjamin Hushon.

- **Motion** to accept the minutes as presented was made by Member Steiner and 2<sup>nd</sup> by Member Hushon, vote 4/0.

### Subdivisions and Land Development Plans

#### Knight

Review an updated survey/Subdivision Plan of Map CO Parcel 23, owned by George M III & Paul H & James P Knight & Cynthia A Hall. This survey/Subdivision Plan adds acreage to the proposed property as compared to prior submitted/recorded plans.

The attorney explained review of prior plans with the Township engineer. The prior surveys were based on deed characterization, not an actual boundary survey. To determine building rights, you start with the amount of acres as of January 5, 1976. The new plan is based on an actual, on ground survey. The engineer's office has assessment maps/records from 1976 and it was determined, at that time, Map CO Parcel 23 consisted of 441 acres, which permitted 11 dwelling units also known as building rights. Coming forward, 9 rights have been utilized with 2 rights remaining.

Paul Knight noted that the old deed added up to 484 acres; so from that aspect, acreage was lost from the old deed to new plan, but boundaries did not change. He questioned the Township Ordinance notation "*Number of Dwelling Units Permitted (including those existing as of January 5, 1976 and those located on a "farm")*", are the dwellings, old farm houses, prior to 1976, exempt from the number of units?

Member Stewart informed that the existing dwellings prior to 1976 are counted along with any dwelling units after that date.

Kirk Roycroft, 8484 Woodbine Road, questioned where the 46 acres, found in the new surveyed plan, appeared, did it come off of adjoining property?

The attorney stated that to the best of his knowledge, the acres were found within the plot once surveyed, not just plotting from a deed.

Deborah Snyder, 760 Miller Road, asked how she would know if she lost any land. She was informed that the only line that changed was with the Roycroft property?

Tonia Wright, 8290 Woodbine Road, questioned adjoining property owners getting their land surveyed to be comfortable with the Townships decision on the Knight plan. This should not be an issue for future generations.

The attorney stated that the Township cannot require adjoining owners to get a survey; this plan is just a correction from prior plans.

Sammy McConnell recommended the other property owners find their pins or get surveys.

Kirk Roycroft stated that his property lost 5 acres and questioned the acreage being taxed.

We do not know where the error occurred and the deed does not match the new survey.

Today's technology is a lot more accurate.

Eric Gemmill, 458 Gemmill Road agreed, they should not be paying someone else's taxes.

Member Stewart educated on an assessment appeal he initiated, it cost him more money and the assessment was not changed.

- **Motion** to recommend the Supervisors approve the revised plans, correcting property owners names, acreage and 2 building rights remaining was made by Member Stewart and 2<sup>nd</sup> by Member Diamond, vote 3/1. Member Hushon voted against.

## Ordinances

### Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance

York County Planning Commission and York County Assessments has supplied new terms, phrases and processes.

- Common Ownership Merger, combining two or more lots under common ownership into one single lot eliminating property lines
- Corrective Action Plan, correct an error made during the final approval and recordation process or plan to clarify the Uniform Parcel Identification

The Commission went over the proposed amendment to incorporate the new requirements. Sammy McConnell questioned wording in the proposed amendment and recommended changes which were discussed.

- **Motion** to wait for the attorney to review definitions for clarity was made by Member Diamond and 2<sup>nd</sup> by Member Steiner, vote 4/0.
- **Motion** to eliminate Section 417.c referencing review time was made by Member Diamond and 2<sup>nd</sup> by Member Stewart, vote 4/0.
- **Motion** to eliminate Section 418.d referencing review time was made by Member Diamond and 2<sup>nd</sup> by Member Hushon, vote 4/0.

The attorney will return to the August meeting with revision to the proposed amendment.

- **Motion** to adjourn at 7:54 p.m. was made by Member Diamond and 2<sup>nd</sup> by Member Stewart, vote 4/0.