

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF COLLEGE TOWNSHIP HELD ON NOVEMBER 5, 1969

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of College Township was held in the Municipal Building at 7:30 p.m. on November 5, 1969. All supervisors were present.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and approved.

Treasurer's Report -- The supervisors approved payment of bills in the amount of \$13, 556.62, leaving a balance at the end of October of \$30,332.02.

Old Business - - The Houserville School Warning Signal is complete with the exception of the lights which should arrive within a few days.

K. & B Electric were notified on October 28th that the controller for the Houserville intersection light would be shipped within 10 days. When it arrives, all the equipment for the light will be ready for installation.

New Business - Mr. Williams said that there have been complaints from residents that it is difficult to reach the township policeman when needed, and he agrees that communication is difficult. He said that he had talked to Mr. Walck of Bell Telephone about the installation of a telephone in the police cruiser. The cost would be approximately \$50 for installation and \$50 per month. It was his recommendation that the township arrange for installation. After discussion, the Board agreed to authorize Mr. Williams to secure the telephone installation, provided it was not necessary for the township to sign a lease for a period of a year or more, since they would like to test its usefulness first.

Development Plans-- Mr. Jack Mitchell presented the final plan for the resubdivision of Branch Road Village and Centre Hills Village with the bypass route shown, and the restrictions on lot sale, provision for redesigning after bypass route finalized, as worked out with Judge Campbell by the Township Solicitor.

Mr. Willard, an attorney, representing Dr. Keithan and Mr. VanGorder, two landowners on Branch Road presented the Board with a written protest against approval of the subdivision. (Copy attached) The two major points of protest were the inadequate provision for drainage from the areas surrounding their properties and Section 2.9111 of the Subdivision Regulations which stated that in resubdividing property, no smaller lots can be created.

Mr. Willard stated that, although the plan as presented showed a drainage easement lying part on Dr. Keithan's property and part on Van Gorder's property, there is no provision in Dr. Keithan's deed for a drainage easement, and he submitted a copy of the deed as evidence. There is a statement added to the deed held by Mr Van Gorder, which mentions a drainage easement but does not describe the size of the easement. In the meantime, Mr. Mitchell has paved the road on Charles Street to a point behind the Keithan property. The roadbed is below the surrounding area, and an immediate drainage problem has been created with more run-off being channeled between the Van Gorder and the Keithan properties.

Mr. Granlund stated that it was his recollection that, when the plan was discussed with the Planning Commission, the drainage was to flow into Branch Road via the road which runs perpendicular to the subdivision from Branch Road. While the area has been in farmland, there have been no serious erosion problem, but once streets and houses are built, the amount of water flowing through this natural drainage way would increase considerably and storm sewers would probably be needed. With respect to Section 2.9111 of the Subdivision Regulations, Mr. Granlund stated that our previous solicitor had advised the Planning Commission that the township could not prevent a developer from subdividing his land since in essence, most subdivisions are for the purpose of creating smaller lots.

In examination of the plan, Mr. Mitchell pointed out that he had restored the lots behind Keithan and VanGorder to the size they were on the 1960 subdivision plan; however, the lines dividing these lots were still in evidence on the plan, and the original numbers had not been obliterated. These corrections would have to be made. In addition, it was discovered that on these lots, Nos. 7, 8, 9, and 10 the boundary lines and areas of lots which were supposed to have remained unchanged from the 1960 subdivision did not agree with the dimensions shown on the earlier plan.

Mr. Trufant who lives on Charles Street also objected to the creation of smaller lots. It was his contention that, since he had bought a lot from a plan showing his lot surrounded by lots of similar size, that he had a right to expect that these lots would remain the same size. The section in which he lives is small and will be isolated from the rest of the subdivision by the bypass; therefore, he suggested that the lots therein be restored to the sizes shown on the 1960 subdivision plan to make for more uniformity.

Accordingly, the Board felt that no action should be taken on the re-subdivision plan until such time as the drainage problem could be resolved between Mr. Mitchell and Messrs. Keithan and VanGorder. The Board also wished the Solicitor to present them and the Planning Commission with a ruling on the applicability of Section 2.9111 of the Subdivision Regulations. The Board suggested that when the plan was resubmitted, adequate copies be provided so that the Planning Commission could review it before submission to the Board.

Mr. Granlund and Mr. James Sherman discussed certain problems created by sewer construction, including a charge that the contractors are not properly tamping the ditches after pipes are laid. Mr. Williams was asked to investigate.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted



Lester M. Weaver, Secretary



6. Charles Street has now been paved facing lots 9B, 9A and 8 which is to the rear of one of the protestants premises increasing drainage from the east.

7. No rights to drain water exist over the premises of John F. Keithan by deed or map. An undefined "drainage easement" appears on the VanGorder deed.

8. Your protestants are advised that a new subdivision has been planned and will be submitted to the Board of Supervisors which after diligent search they have been unable to locate.

9. Any plan submitted should be designed to protect your protestants against flooding by proper drainage.

10. In accordance with the rules for subdivision, lots should not be replotted to decrease size against already sold property such as that of the protestants.

11. Protestants should be protected against depreciation of their property by smaller lots and absence of drainage.

12. Yarda Road should be opened with proper drainage.

WHEREFORE, your protestants respectfully pray that the proposed plan be disapproved by your Board of Supervisors.

William C. VanGorder  
John F. Keithan

EXPENDITURES FOR OCTOBER, 1969

Centre Regional Planning Commission	\$4,539.00
Schreffler Hoy and Smith	195.50
Marriott's Secretarial Service	184.75
Miller's Repair Service	385.00
Reed McCormick	100.00
Corl Coal & Oil	442.26
Alpha Fire Company	1,763.89
Secretary-Treasurer	403.69
West Penn Power	877.00
Frank Glenn	187.96
Bradoo Supply Co.	397.50
Automotive Supply Co.	99.77
Nittany Gas & Oil	167.19
Commonwealth of Pa. Social Security	969.89
Frank Glenn 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ Wage Tax	101.04
Harris Henry & Potter	96.36
Tel. Power, Inc.	160.00
L. S. Weaver, Builder	643.80
Payroll	512.02
School Guards	377.17
Miscellaneous	961.76

Total Expenditures

\$13, 556.62

BALANCE AS OF NOVEMBER 1

\$30,332.02