HILLTOWN TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REGULARLY SCHEDULED WORKSESSION MEETING Monday, May 10, 1993 7:30PM

The worksession meeting of the Hilltown Township Board of Supervisors was called to order by Chairman William H. Bennett, Jr. at 7:40PM and opened with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Also present were: Kenneth B. Bennington, Vice-Chairman

Jack C. Fox, Supervisor

Bruce G. Horrocks, Township Manager

Eric D. Applegate, Code Enforcement Officer

George C. Egly, Chief of Police

Thomas Buzby, Director of Public Works

Chairman Bennett introduced the members of the Board and the Township Manager.

A. MANAGER'S REPORT - Mr. Bruce G. Horrocks, Township Manager -

1. Mr. Horrocks sought direction from the Board concerning Spin-A-Round Skating Center, and the initial inspection made by the Code Enforcement Officer. This inspection brought some safety items to light. The property is being sold, and the future owner is requesting a new Certificate of Occupancy. The BOCA Code allows the Township to enforce those issues it feels are crucial. Mr. Horrocks spoke to Mr. Nick Rafferty of the Bucks County Fire Marshall's office, who reviewed Mr. Applegate's memo to the Board noting the violations at the skating facility. Mr. Rafferty agrees completely with the items Mr. Applegate has noted, and believes the Township should be enforcing correction of the violations. In all fairness to the present owner, Mr. Horrocks advised, some of the items listed in the memo may be removed during occupancy, however, this is not addressed in the BOCA Code.

Mr. Alan Meade from Spin-A-Round stated the skating rink has been in operation for approximately 9 years. The applicant has now successfully negotiated a mortgage which will allow them to take possession of the property. Mr. Meade believes some of the items in Mr. Applegate's inspection memo require an explanation to cover the safety issues. An example is the room specified for birthday parties. Mr. Applegate requested that the door knobs be placed on the outside of the rooms. Mr. Meade noted there are presently three exits in the birthday rooms, all properly locked from the inside. Supervisor Bennington asked how the children would get out of the birthday rooms if there was a fire, if the doors are locked. Mr. Meade replied there is always an adult present in the birthday rooms.

Mr. Meade requested that Mr. Applegate conduct another inspection of the site to clarify some of these issues. Mr. James Gill, Hilltown Township Fire Chief, offered to visit the site with Mr. Applegate for further inspection. The Board of Supervisors

5

Page 2 Board of Supervisor's Worksession May 10, 1993

suggested Mr. Applegate, Mr. Meade, and Mr. Gill meet to determine if some of these differences can be resolved, following another inspection.

Mr. Horrocks commented the BOCA Code does not address when a building is occupied or is not occupied. A fire exit is a fire exit, regardless of whether the building is in use or not.

- An item that has come up twice during the last year is the issue of swimming pools and what the Township does or does not require as far as fencing. It has come to Mr. Horrock's attention that the 1993 BOCA Code has changed it's wording to state that if a building wall is utilized as the fourth side of the "fence", it will now be permitted with certain types of alarms installed on the door. If the Board wishes, Mr. Horrocks can give this revision to the Code to the Township Solicitor for his review, and then possibly the Board might wish to adopt this portion of the 1993 Supervisor Fox commented this still would not BOCA Code, circumvent the Zoning Ordinance, which takes precedence over the The Zoning Ordinance states a swimming pool must be BOCA Code. enclosed on all four sides by a fence. Chairman Bennett stated he did not happen to agree with that.
- Concerning "March for Jesus" which was discussed at the April 26, 1993 Board of Supervisor's meeting, Mr. Horrocks advised a meeting was held at Telford Borough. Those in attendance included Mr. Horrocks and Chief Egly from Hilltown Township, and representatives of Souderton Borough, West Rockhill Township, Telford Borough, and the Pennridge Regional Police Department. Mr. Horrocks spoke to Chief Bickel of Telford Borough, who will be writing a letter to the coordinator of fire police for Montgomery County requesting a specific amount of fire police coverage for Chief Bickel has not done that yet, since Telford that day. Borough's approval was based upon Hilltown Township's approval. Mr. Horrocks has also contacted those businesses located along the Hilltown Township portion of County Line Road regarding the parade. Mr. Horrocks visited five establishments, one of which is not open on Saturdays at all, and one business which officially closes at 12:00 noon, though from 11:00AM to 12:30PM is their busiest time of the week. The remaining businesses were not positively in favor of closing County Line Road for those hours.

As a compromise to get Hilltown Township's approval, Supervisor Bennington would like to see confirmation from the businesses located along County Line Road in Hilltown Township, that they do not have any opposition to the "March for Jesus" on that particular day. Supervisor Fox agreed, and felt the Board should obtain a letter signed by those businesses, stating they will hold Hilltown Township harmless for the business they might lose the day of the parade. Pastor Gardner of "March for Jesus" asked if the Board

Page 3
Board of Supervisor's Worksession
May 10, 1993

will give their approval pending receipt of those letters. Supervisor Fox stated he would prefer to have the signed letters in hand before granting approval.

Chief Egly advised the march organizers must have a decision by the Board this evening, or the "March for Jesus" will not take place at all. The final parade route has been established and the written request by Hilltown Township for fire police must be returned by June 12th in order to sign an agreement to authorize use of their fire police. Supervisor Fox asked if Chief Egly is suggesting that the Board give conditional approval, based upon the approval of those Hilltown Township merchants whose businesses are located in Hilltown Township. Chief Egly did not see what choice the Board of Supervisors or the merchants have, and asked what would have happened if the annual fireman's parade was held that day. The fireman's parade would not have been required to produce letters from merchants offering their approval. Supervisor Bennington noted the fireman's parade is held within one single municipality, not several. Chief Egly replied the planning committee for the fireman's parade does not go to every merchant and ask their permission to shut down a whole town for the day. Supervisor Bennington felt that if an event was being held in one community, the merchants would all agree that it is a community affair and would be willing to give up one day of business, but in this situation, there are five municipalities involved. Supervisor Bennington were a business owner affected by the parade, he would not be happy about losing five hours of sales. Supervisor Bennington commented this is a "no win" situation for Hilltown Township, because if the Board denies their request, the people who want to march will be angry, and if the Board were to grant approval, the merchants affected will be angry. Chairman Bennett noted one of the businesses Mr. Horrocks approached stated that 90% of their business was done on Saturday afternoons. Bennett agreed with Supervisor Bennington, and suggested the event be held on Sunday, instead of Saturday. Paster Gardner replied there are church people involved, who are in church on Sundays.

Supervisor Bennington was willing to give "March for Jesus" conditional approval, pending receipt of a disapproval from any of those Hilltown Township businesses located along County Line Road, who will lose business due to this parade. Chief Egly asked what will happen if there is only one merchant against it. Supervisors Fox and Bennington agreed they will go with the majority vote. Chairman Bennett wished to make it clear that the Township is not against this parade, however he feels the organizers of this event are forcing the Township to make a decision. Pastor Gardner is not sure that is true, whether it be them or someone else, the Supervisors will always be pushed into some type of decision making process that is sometimes more difficult than other times. Regardless of what this Board decides, Chairman Bennett suggested



Page 4
Board of Supervisor's Worksession
May 10, 1993

the next time an event of this magnitude is proposed, one single community be chosen, instead of involving four or five municipalities.

Mr. Horrocks stated there is, perhaps, one other condition the Board should consider adding which would be the promise of an adequate number of fire police required by Chief Egly. If, when the letters come back from the various fire police, there is a minimum number offered, there should be a condition for Chief Egly to say yes or no. Chief Egly commented there is a total of 30 fire police needed in order to adequately cover all five municipalities. More importantly, Chief Egly must receive a copy of the liability insurance held by the organizers of this march. As soon as approval is received from Hilltown Township, Pastor Gardner will see that Chief Egly receives a copy of the liability insurance.

Motion was made by Supervisor Bennington, seconded by Supervisor Fox, and carried unanimously to grant approval to the "March for Jesus", with the following stipulations for approval - to require organizers to supply sufficient fire police protection per the requirements of the police chief, receipt of written notification and approval from a majority of the Hilltown Township businesses located along County Line Road, and verification of one million dollar liability insurance, per incident.

B. CORRESPONDENCE - Mr. Bruce Horrocks, Township Manager -

- 1. Notification has been received from Dr. Thomas Cordrey, who is the horticulturalist with Del-Val Soil Environmental Consultants, copying the U.S. Army Corp. of Engineers and the Division of Archaeology and Protection, dealing with the bridge crossing at Pleasant Meadows. The letter states "It is our opinion that no evidence of potentially significant historic or prehistoric deposits was encountered during this cultural resource investigation". Hopefully, Mr. Horrocks stated, construction of the bridge at Pleasant Meadows can now proceed forward.
- 2. Correspondence has been received from the Bucks County Planning Commission after their review of the amendments to the Subdivision/Land Development Ordinance, which included those items needed for the Neshaminy Creek Stormwater Management Ordinance.
- 3. A letter has been received from Pennridge Community Day committee seeking a contribution. With the Board's approval, Mr. Horrocks would like to forward this request to the Park and Recreation Board for their review. Supervisor Bennington believes Hilltown Township donated \$200.00 in 1992.
- Mr. Horrocks noted the date of Pennridge Community Day has been changed to a Sunday, and it is no longer being held near the July

Page 5
Board of Supervisor's Worksession
May 10, 1993

4th weekend. The reason this was done was because the fireworks display will cost much less than if the event were held on July 4th weekend.

Motion was made by Supervisor Bennington, seconded by Supervisor Fox, and carried unanimously to direct Mr. Horrocks to take this request to the Hilltown Township Park and Recreation Board for their review.

- 4. A follow-up letter has been received from Mrs. Burdell, the woman who originally requested naming a street in the Pleasant Meadows development "Schmidt Lane", after her father, who once owned that property. No further discussion has taken place concerning this issue since it was originally mentioned. Mr. Horrocks believes a suggestion was made at that time to name the proposed bridge through Pleasant Meadows after Mrs. Burdell's father.
- 5. At the last meeting, Mr. Wynn had stated Pizza Hut's plan would be expiring, though a grant of extension has since been received.

C. <u>CONFIRMED APPOINTMENTS</u> -

Mr. Charles Kozitzky - Neighborhood Zoning Problem - Mr. Kozitzky asked who the press is representing this evening. Representatives from the News Herald and the Intelligencer were in attendance. It seems, Mr. Kozitzky advised, at a certain zoning hearing meeting, the press did not make a report. This zoning hearing meeting dealt with an application for a variance for a property operated by Bob and Beverly Jones of 1225 Green Street. Mr. Kozitzky and his wife reside at 1305 Green Street. Mrs. Jones requested permission to operate a soil business, which, according to the Hilltown Township Zoning Ordinance, is not permitted nor does it conform to the Ordinance. Following this hearing, not one word was mentioned in the newspapers. zoning hearing, there was a two hour presentation, including the submission of photographs and video tapes, as well as reports by neighbors in the area, objecting to the Jones' operation, yet nothing was written in the News Herald or the Intelligencer. Following that meeting, there was a short hearing concerning the Fulginitti property located on Fairhill Road and Keystone Drive, which received full press coverage in both newspapers.

Mr. Kozitzky noted the Jones' soil business is still in operation, even though they are in violation of the decision rendered by the Hilltown Township Zoning Hearing Board. As a concerned neighborhood, the residents present would like to know what the Township intends to do about it. Mr. Kozitzky and his neighbors feel that Mr. Jones' appeal to the Court of Common Pleas does not



Page 6
Board of Supervisor's Worksession
May 10, 1993

entitle him to continue his present operations, pending the outcome of the same. Mr. Kozitzky quoted Section 50-PS1103, which states: "The filing of an appeal in court under this Section shall not stay the action appealed from." Appellate court law demands that Mr. Jones immediately cease his current enterprise. Mr. Kozitzky explained this operation is a soil farm, which he and his neighbors would like to see stopped. If it is not stopped, they would like to see a retroactive fine placed from the day the variance request was denied, which was December 4, 1992. The neighbors feel this business is a detriment to the community, which is a rural residential area. The Jones' business operates with two dump trucks, and one spare dump truck, which is clearly a violation of being defined as a "truck terminal". There are also two front-end loaders, and an earth mixing machine. Topsoil, mushroom soil, and sludge is being sold from this location. Each time a pile of dirt is moved at the site, the smell permeates the entire neighborhood, with an odor like that of the Hatfield Sewer Authority. Kozitzky wishes to know if the Board is going to take any action against Mr. and Mrs. Jones, and if not, why a fine is not levied against the operation.

Chairman Bennett commented this matter is in court at the moment. Mr. Kozitzky realizes that, however just because it is in court, does not mean a fine can not be levied. Chairman Bennett does not believe it is in Hilltown Township's province to do that. Mr. Kozitzky felt it was up to the Board to encourage the Township Solicitor to do pursue this matter by representing Hilltown Township.

Mr. Horrocks explained Hilltown Township, in this particular zoning hearing, did not put itself on the stand, as it was basically a "neighborhood complaint". Hilltown Township has, in fact, motioned for a conference with the judge in this case, in an attempt to bring the matter to hearing earlier. The second option the Township could pursue, would be to take the matter to District Justice court in an attempt to get fines levied against the Jones' It is the opinion of the Township Solicitor that the Jones' council would have more than sufficient argument to convince the District Justice that the matter is currently on appeal on the Zoning issue, and that the District Justice probably would not levy a fine dating back to the date, pending the outcome of the zoning hearing appeal. The other option the Township could take would be to file for an injunction at Court of Common Pleas. The Township Solicitor's opinion on this particular case is that a County judge, in all probability, would not hold an injunctive hearing because the matter is currently pending in Common Pleas court, on the zoning hearing decision. District Court cost to file is generally \$75.00, and if the Township went through with an injunctive hearing, cost could be up to \$2,000.00. Based upon Chairman Bennett's previous experience, if the matter was taken to the

Page 7
Board of Supervisor's Worksession
May 10, 1993

District Justice, other than our costs, there could only be a maximum fine levied of \$500.00 per day.

Mr. Horrocks mentioned it is the Township Solicitor's opinion that in order to bring injunctive action against the Jones' property, the Supervisors will be required to consider only three main issues, including the health, safety, and welfare of the residents.

A concerned resident stated there could be approximately 12 neighbors who would be happy to testify to the detrimental effect on the health, safety, and welfare of the community, due to this operation. Mr. Horrocks noted the Department of Environmental Resources are the qualifiers on the sludge, and DER will say that the sludge is perfectly safe and contains no heavy metals, which is what the Supervisors will have to weigh it's decision on.

Dirk Berger, attorney for Mr. Kozitzky, submitted that regardless of what DER says about "health, safety, and welfare" of the residents, there are other health, safety, and welfare considerations such as dust and noise, which have nothing to do with the DER "sludge" regulations. Mr. Berger feels this is a consideration the Township Solicitor might take into account. Also, Mr. Berger believes that if the Township Solicitor is not more active in this matter, there will be future problems with enforcing the Zoning Ordinance. People will discover that for the cost of filing an appeal in the Court of Common Pleas, they can continue to violate the Zoning Ordinance, after a zoning hearing board decision has been rendered, and until the decision is made in the Court of Common Pleas. Even then, Mr. Berger noted, if a decision is made in the Court of Common Pleas, saying that the appeal is denied and the applicant is still found to be in violation of the Zoning Ordinance, once again the Township may not be active, and the applicant will continue their operation.

Mr. Horrocks noted Mr. and Mrs. Jones filed an appeal against the Township in the Court of Common Pleas. Supervisor Fox believes that if the neighbors could produce documentation showing that dust, noise, etc. are resulting, and prove it to a judge, this matter could be settled. Mr. Kozitzky advised that information was produced at the zoning hearing meeting, however it should be shown to the judge, as a health hazard which could cause irreparable harm to the residents in the area.

If the neighbors could provide that evidence for the Township Solicitor, Mr. Berger asked if he would then seek an injunction. Mr. Horrocks replied Solicitor Grabowski would only seek an injunction after this Board authorized it. Speaking for himself, and if it was documented from good sources that it could cause health problems to the neighboring properties, Supervisor Fox feels the Township Solicitor should review the situation to see whether

55,55

Page 8
Board of Supervisor's Worksession
May 10, 1993

he would handle the matter. Supervisor Fox is not always in agreement with the Township Solicitor, however, if the Solicitor feels the case can not be won, Supervisor Fox wondered why the matter should be pursued any further. Mr. Berger felt the Township Solicitor could absolutely win this case because the statute Mr. Kozitzky previously cited states that when the appeal is pending, an operation in question can not be continued. Personally, Mr. Berger feels the law says that Mr. Jones must cease operation immediately, even if no health problems are being experienced, because the Zoning Hearing Board ruled that he may not continue If the Township Solicitor feels the health, this operation. safety, and welfare of the Township residents will perhaps be more persuasive to the judge, Mr. Berger would ask that the residents be permitted to submit that sort of documentation to the Township Solicitor.

Unfortunately, Supervisor Bennington commented the courts are very slow, and he sympathizes with Mr. Kozitzky. Listening to the argument this evening, Supervisor Bennington would be willing to seek an injunction to stop the operation at this time. Mr. Berger asked what type of evidence the neighboring residents should provide to the Solicitor. Mr. Horrocks noted it should have nothing at all to do with the zoning decision, which has already been determined and is being appealed by Mr. Jones. The evidence provided must involve only the health, safety, and welfare of the Though the neighboring residents are residents in the area. willing to provide this type of information, Mr. Berger does not understand why an injunction can not be sought based upon the Pennsylvania statute alone, which was quoted by Mr. Kozitzky earlier this evening. Mr. Horrocks believes the Township Solicitor has also supplied the Board with case law that shows that statute might not necessarily hold up.

Mr. John Snyder, Chairman of the Zoning Hearing Board, stated he heard this case in December, 1992, with the Board voting 3:0 to deny the variance request. Looking at the history of some of these cases which have appeared before the Hilltown Township Zoning Hearing Board and then continued on to Bucks County Court, when the Township did try to obtain an injunction based upon health, safety, and welfare, Bucks County Court would not issue an injunction until the decision was made in their court on the zoning decision. fact, during the particular case Mr. Snyder is speaking of, the judge ordered them to come back before the Zoning Hearing Board to get those questions answered, before they would review the Township's request for an injunction. Supervisor Bennington asked if the judge would tell the Township that he will be holding the injunction, pending the appeal itself. Mr. Snyder noted the costs involved would have already been paid at that point. In the case Mr. Snyder is citing, the applicant withdrew their zoning appeal application, admitting they were wrong about the zoning, and the Page 9
Board of Supervisor's Worksession
May 10, 1993

injunction was then obtained. Mr. Snyder believes the less costly route for the Township to pursue would be to take the Solicitor's advice and attempt to get both councils to meet to determine an early court date on that appeal. Supervisor Bennington felt filing the \$2,000.00 fee would show the judge that the Township is serious about pursuing the matter. Mr. Horrocks suggested the neighboring residents produce any type of evidence they can dealing with health, safety, and welfare during the next two weeks. On May 24, 1993, the Township Solicitor will be present at the Supervisor's meeting to address this issue and answer the resident's questions. Supervisor Bennington commented that will mean another two week wait, and instead suggested the Township go to District Court to levy fines against the individual. Supervisor Fox stated it will take two weeks or more to schedule an appearance in District Court.

Chairman Bennett asked for some an examples, other than dust, of violations of health, safety, and welfare that the neighboring residents might submit as evidence. Mr. Kozitzky replied traffic is an issue. Mr. Jones has three trucks of his own, however the material is being hauled in by tractor trailers. Mr. Jones claimed that he operates his business from 8:00AM to 4:30PM, however Mr. Kozitzky can testify that he has heard the tractor trailers arriving at 6:30AM and at 7:00PM, seven days a week. Every time the "sludge" is uncovered, Mr. Kozitzky noted, the smell permeates the entire neighborhood. The odor from the sludge is worse than cow or horse manure. A co-worker of Mr. Kozitzky purchased soil from Mr. Jones and said it took two weeks for the smell to go away from around his home. Mrs. Freed, a neighboring resident, has photographs taken of piles of this odorous soil which were approximately 50 to 70 ft. tall. Video tapes of the dust and the noise coming from the site were submitted to the Zoning Hearing Mr. Kozitzky believes he and his neighbors overwhelming proof of Mr. Jones' violation.

Chairman Bennett recalled notification from DER which advised the sludge coming in from Lancaster County did not contain heavy metals and was not injurious to your health. Mr. Kozitzky stated the report from DER noted that the initial delivery of sludge was tested, and that they did not have a report on each additional delivery. Mr. Kozitzky believes the soil is unsafe soil. Supervisor Fox feels Mr. Kozitzky will have to prove that it is unsafe soil before the case can be won. Mr. Kozitzky said that information is available and was presented to the Zoning Hearing Board, which is what convinced them to rule against Mr. Jones' original zoning variance request.

Motion was made by Supervisor Bennington, seconded by Supervisor Fox, and carried unanimously to proceed to District Justice to seek some type of relief in the way of fines, pending receipt of the evidence from neighboring property owners during the next two

33

Page 10 Board of Supervisor's Worksession May 10, 1993

weeks, and to proceed with a possible injunction with the Court of Common Pleas concerning the Jones Topsoil operation.

In lieu of further testimony by the neighboring residents, Mr. Kozitzky suggested that the Township Solicitor review the transcripts of the original zoning hearing board meeting.

D. <u>DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS REPORT - Mr. Thomas Buzby</u> - Mr. Buzby read the Public Works Report, dated March 21 through May 1, 1993, which is on file at the Township building.

Mr. Buzby noted that the binder course has been installed for the basketball court at Blooming Glen. The top will be installed tomorrow morning.

Concerning the McCormick situation, Mr. Buzby advised the pipe has been installed past the driveway, and the Public Works Department will be returning to complete that job in the near future.

- E. <u>POLICE CHIEF'S REPORT Chief George Egly</u> The Police Report, dated April 1993, was read by Chief Egly and is on file at the Township building.
- F. <u>CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER'S REPORT Mr. Eric D. Applegate Mr. Applegate read the Building/Zoning Report dated April 1993, which is on file at the Township office.</u>
- G. <u>HILLTOWN FIRE CHIEF'S REPORT Mr. James Gill</u> Mr. Gill read the Hilltown Fire Chief's report for the month of April 1993, which is on file at the Township office.

The Hilltown Fire Company received a citation from the House of Representatives and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Gill asked if there will be a Fire Commission meeting this week, as scheduled. Chairman Bennett explained that he will be out of town and Mr. Jack Morgan, chairman of the Fire Commission, will also be out of town. Chairman Bennett has asked Mr. Horrocks to notify the fire companies that the meeting has been cancelled for May.

H. <u>EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT REPORT - Mr. Robert Grunmeier, II</u> - Mr. Grunmeier was not present at this time.

I. RESIDENT'S COMMENTS -

1. Mr. Lawrence Otter, attorney representing Thomas Malishaucki, was in attendance to discuss a minor disagreement with Hilltown Township and Mr. Horrocks over the size of his client's political signs. Mr. Otter believes that he and the Township have

Page 11 Board of Supervisor's Worksession May 10, 1993

reached a compromise in that Hilltown Township is not going to pursue the matter through the enforcement of the Zoning Ordinance, and his client is not going to sue Hilltown Township. Chairman Bennett felt the entire matter was a "tempest in a teapot". Mr. Otter commented Hilltown Township is the one who is attempting to enforce an unconstitutional ordinance. Supervisor Fox noted there may be legal litigation pending in this matter, and suggested that discussion not take place at this time. Chairman Bennett has been involved in Township government for six years. During that time, there have been numerous candidates who have complied with the existing Sign Ordinance requirements of four square feet, and he does not recall experiencing any problems with it in the past. Chairman Bennett wished to make it clear that the \$100.00 received from political candidates is not a charge, rather it is a security deposit which is returned to the candidates once their political signs have been removed. Mr. Otter asked why there should be a deposit for "free speech". Supervisor Fox felt Chairman Bennett should not proceed with this discussion. Chairman Bennett advised he is only stating his personal opinion on the matter.

- 2. Concerning the backboards which will be used during construction of the basketball courts in Blooming Glen, Mr. Dirk Berger asked if they will be square backboards or fan shaped backboards. Mr. Horrocks replied the backboards are not square. Mr. Berger noted square backboards will hold up much better and get more use. It has been his experience that the fan shaped backboards are constructed of cheaper material. Mr. Berger also recommended that the Township contact the firm who installed the poles to support the baskets concerning the standard freezing and leaning.
- 3. Mr. John Snyder commented that normally, at Zoning Hearing Board meetings, no members of the press are in attendance, although the hearings are all advertised. Concerning the Jones' case which was discussed earlier this evening, Mr. Snyder did receive a phone call from the Intelligencer following that hearing and an article did appear three days later. Generally, Zoning Hearing Board decisions are not recorded in the newspaper until the matter is appealed. Mr. Snyder believes the press took a bit of harsh criticism this evening, since very rarely are members of the press present at zoning hearings.
- J. <u>SUPERVISOR'S COMMENTS</u> None.
- K. <u>PRESS CONFERENCE</u> A conference was held to answer questions of those reporters present.

55

Page 12 Board of Supervisor's Worksession May 10, 1993

L. <u>ADJOURNMENT</u> - Upon motion by Supervisor Fox, seconded by Supervisor Bennington, and carried unanimously, the May 10, 1993 Board of Supervisor's Worksession meeting was adjourned at 9:05PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynda Seimes

Township Secretary

Synda Seines

(*These minutes were transcribed from notes and tape recordings taken by Mr. Bruce Horrocks, Township Manager).