

Planning Commission- County of Wyoming Pennsylvania

Minutes # 691

September 16, 2026

6:00 pm

WYOMING COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Randy Ehrenzeller
Matthew J. Austin
Jeremy Leaidicker

Ed Coleman
Dale Brown
Paul Rowker

Stacy Huber
Roger Hadsall
Robert Thorne

Meeting Location:

Wyoming County Emergency Operations Center
3880 State Route 6, Tunkhannock, PA

I. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Randy Ehrenzeller calls the Planning Commission to order. The pledge was taken. Staff Director Matt Jones verbally notified all participants that audio from the meeting would be recorded.

II. Roll Call

Chairman Ehrenzeller stated there are six (6) members present constituting a quorum.

Present	Absent	Staff
Randy Ehrenzeller, Chair		Matthew C. Jones, Director
Ed Coleman, Vice-Chair		Meghan Coury, Assistant
Stacy Huber, Secretary		Paul Litwin, Solicitor
Dale Brown		
	Roger Hadsall, Treasurer	
Matthew J. Austin		
	Robert Thorne	
Paul Rowker		
	Jeremy Leaidicker	

III. Approval of Today's Agenda (additions or deletions?)

Mr. Ehrenzeller asked if there were any additions or deletions to the Agenda. Director Jones said the Agenda should be as presented. He has no edit suggestions coming in late. Mr. Ehrenzeller said the Agenda would then stand as present.

IV. Public Comment- (If audience members wish to address the commission, please let the Chairman know which Agenda item you wish to address, or that you wish to address an item not on the agenda)

Chairman Ehrenzeller said the public could ask to comment on anything on the Agenda or any other item they would like to bring before the Planning Commission at any time. He said to just get his attention. He asks if there are any comments at this time. There are none.

V. Announcements:

- (1) The County Board of Commissioners enacted the **Ordinance Amendment** on September 8, 2026. They accepted all recommendations that had been made for it by the County Planning Commission.

Chairman Ehrenzeller stated that Announcement number one was the great one. Director Jones said that it was great news. The County Commissioners passed the new Ordinance Amendment on September 8th that had been worked on for the last four months regarding High-Intensity and Larger Scale Developments including data centers. He is enormously relieved that it was accomplished in a timely fashion. We are now prepared in case we ever see that kind of an application come forward. This county is better prepared to put in safe guards and mitigate some of the negative impacts that those developments pose. He congratulates the County Planning Commission. The County Commissioners have accepted all of the edit suggestions that you have made. He thinks that the final product was a sausage link that everyone could agree upon. It is a fairly good product and provides us with a lot of ammunition for contending with these projects if we see them in the future. It is of enormous relief to him that we are accomplished and prepared for it. Congratulations to everyone is in order.

- (2) The Governor signed Senate Bill 349 into law on July 20, 2026 (becoming "PA Act44"). The new law is expected to go into effect on Jan. 23, 2027 and pre-empt county solar decommissioning bonding then.

The second bit of news is that the Governor signed Senate bill 349 into law on July 20th. A copy of the senate bill is in your packet. He has been reading websites from Harrisburg. It is his understanding that is now called Act 44. How it appeared as Senate Bill 349 is how it is going to appear in the form of Act 44. The Governor signed the Senate Bill that was passed and reconciled with the State House. What this new law does is that it is expected to go into effect 180 days after its passage which is January 23, 2027. When that happens it will preempt counties and municipalities from bonding commercial solar decommissioning bonds. It has import for the first major agenda item for tonight. He wanted to mention it at the onset of the meeting and he'll explain a little more later if you will allow what he believes its implications are for the Bunker Hill Solar Project.

VI. Approval of minutes #690 from last meeting of August 19, 2026

Chairman Ehrenzeller states that copies of the meeting minutes have been provided to the Planning Commission and asks if there are any questions or comments about the minutes from the last meeting. Matt Jones said he received a message from Dale Brown saying he would like the Planning Office to depict State Routes with the full four digits. He said he would be happy to do so and it will be adjusted before it is placed on the county website unless the members have objections. Mr. Ehrenzeller said he would like to thank Meghan Coury, Administrative Assistant for a very good job capturing all the extensive discussions that have been had at the Planning Commission meetings. She thanks him. There were no questions or comments. Dale Brown made a motion to approve the minutes and Stacy Huber seconded the motion. It was passed unanimously.

VII. Correspondence: Review of Chronological Report from August 6, 2026 through September 2, 2026

Mr. Ehrenzeller said copies of the Chronological Report have been distributed and asks if there are any questions or comments on the Report. Matt Jones said the comment on the State Route numbers was actually for the chronological report. Dale Brown states he would like an extra zero added to the State Route Number on the first page, right hand column on the third block down. He is told it will be adjusted before it is posted on the county website. Randy Ehrenzeller has a comment on the third page. On August 31st the Planning Office received an exception approval letter from the DEP regarding a property in Eaton Township for the sewage facility. He asks what the exception is and how does it stand. Matt Jones responds that the project was in DEP's good graces for sewage planning and that the local septic permitter will be able to go forward and issue the septic permit for that project. They sometimes copy us on their progress at the state DEP. Randy asked the DEP's meaning for an exception in that matter. Matt Jones said it either means that a proposed septic has their blessing to be approved or it means that if the project proposed to not build on a particular parcel and that the DEP accepts that determination. Sometimes people want to reserve a residual lot and they are not proposing to build at that time. They are not proposing that it needs to be reviewed for its capacity to have a septic system even though they may wish to build a single-family home on the property. DEP double checks it and he assumes it is within their purview to say the lot is too small or they have concerns about the soil. They could throw a wet blanket on it if they felt strongly enough about it. Mr. Ehrenzeller thanks him for his explanation and asks if there are any further questions on the chronological report. Hearing none it will stand approved as presented.

VIII. Subdivision and Land Development

A. Review Minor/Unique Plans Report from August 6th through September 2nd, 2026.

Mr. Ehrenzeller said members have copies of the Minor and Unique report and asks if there are any questions. Hearing no questions he said it will stand approved as presented.

B. Bunker Hill Solar – Land Development Plan – Tunkhannock Township- File #2024-32

· Director recommends Commission approve Applicant's Time-Extension Request to Jan. 31, 2007. This would provide a means for final project approval to occur in late January when oversight of Solar decommissioning (final condition) is expected to become a function of State government.

Mr. Ehrenzeller said that Applicant is requesting a time extension and the Planning Director is recommending it be given to them. He asks if the extension give the Applicants the ability to fall under the new decommissioning law. Matt Jones responds in the affirmative. He said if the current regulatory situation continues at the State level he is expecting the new law to go into effect on January 23rd. Before he began his position as Planning Director the County Commissioners had passed an amendment to the Ordinance that said any commercial scale solar should have its decommissioning bond in place. He states that the Developer on this project has dragged their feet or has found it difficult to secure (5) \$100,000.00 decommissioning bonds. They have also tried to get sureties to issue them decommissioning bonds that had language that had no teeth. He has been fighting with them for two years to get their bonds in place. They've consistently dragged their feet. The writing is on the wall and the state has stepped in and said this is a state issue of state importance. It looks like they are cutting the solar industry a break but that it the state's prerogative.

The state legislature passed this new law and the governor signed it. The last week of January counties and local towns will turn into a pumpkin on this issue. In the mean time he feels compelled to hold the line on the county's existing rules and make them bond it under the county's rules. In the alternative, he suggests giving them a time extension till the end of January. This will be the last item for them. During the last week of January, he will be able to give them a letter of approval that will say: Bonding has become a state issue, it's under state purview. The county has been cut out of the process you can go and hassle DEP about your bond. You have met all of our other conditions you may now begin clearing, grading and building your construction. You may now begin your project.

Randy Ehrenzeller wondered aloud whether, in the future, if the Commission should also require solar developers to receive a state decommissioning bond in order to obtain final County approval, just like a driveway permit or NPDES permit. He would want to make sure in the future that the Applicant show proof that they have obtained approval for whatever the state required. Matt Jones said that we could, but he didn't recommend it, as it would become illegal for us to do so. He said that the language of the state law was weird. Instead of the state law wanting to hold hands with the counties and towns and have them co-regulate solar decommission bonding with them, counties and towns were cut out of the process. Beginning the last week of January, the State will control the issue. The language of PA Act 44 seems to suggest that the decommissioning bonds can be set up after project construction begins. Because the County will be preempted from doing anything contrary to the State's process, Mr. Jones does not recommend conditioning County approval of solar panel proposals on State decommissioning bonds after the new law goes into effect in late January.

Matt Jones says that the State will take a long time to get their act together and we would hold up the Developer's approval. He thinks their delay could be for noble reasons and that they still haven't bonded but the way that the State law is set up it can be full blown approved and even begin construction and then the decommissioning bond has to be established afterwards. He fears that if the County holds up approval of construction beginning until after the bond is in place it can be seen as us thumbing our noses at the intent of the State law. It is a weird situation that we hold the cards until the end of January and then the County is cut out of the process. He has spoken to Attorney Litwin and the Applicants. If the Planning Commission is in agreement everyone seems to think it makes sense for all parties that they should hang tight until the end of January. The governor has just changed his opinion on data centers recently. It's not out of the realm of possibility that the State could rescind the new law. Stacy Huber comments that to do this would take an act of legislature. Mr. Jones agrees.

Matt Jones said he doesn't see this law being rescinded but he does not have a crystal ball. The Applicants are asking for a four and one-half month time extension when the typical time extension is only three months maximum. It just seems to him that it should be extended until January. If nothing changes in the meantime he can give them the green light letter during the last week of January that they can build and they are within the law to do so.

Ed Coleman said there are not guarantees that this facility will get its decommission bonds into place. Matt Jones agrees and says the State could bungle it. Mr. Coleman said the Planning Commission could approve this and fifteen years from now it could be a mess. Matt Jones said he assumes that is what will happen when the State takes over come the end of January, but he can't be sure, and perhaps PA-DEP will get it right. Ed Coleman makes a motion to approve the time extension request of the Bunker Hill Solar – Land Development Plan until the end of January. Matt Austin seconds the Motion and it is unanimously approved.

Jackie Stockage of the Rocket Courier asked if the decommissioning of the project falls through and they can't acquire the bonds then who becomes responsible the county itself or the State. Matt Jones responds that the State is telling us that on January 23 they will be in charge of those matters. They are assigning it to two people in the State DEP. He has their names and contact information and they are expected to take on that program at the end of January.

Matt Jones said it looks to him like a give-away to the solar industry. The State legislature and the governor are within their rights to pass the laws that they want to see happen. He believes they really cut a break for the solar industry in Pennsylvania. The new law says that the Developer will have to set up a bond working with DEP and the bond will be written out to the host landowner as the payee should the developer/facility-owners fail to decommission the facilities. This means the Lessor whose land the solar panels are being built upon. It is very strange because a government entity would have held the bond as a third party under County rules. He believes it is a strange law.

C. Allen R. Crumb – Minor Subdivision Plan – Lemon Township – File #2026-33

- Director recommends Commission Disapproval Waiver request for the following reasons:
Minimum lot area of 1 acre after Flag Lot flag “pole” area subtracted from total calculation (§606.5I)
The extra 4,000 square feet needed for Proposed Lot 1 can be achieved by adjusting proposed lot line.
Waivers for minimum lot size may set a bad precedent and lead to overcrowding in areas that cannot sustain it.

Randy Ehrenzeller asks if this waiver is regarding lot size. Matt Jones said yes, it is and asks if he can describe the waiver request and then give the Applicant and their agent the opportunity to speak on the matter from their own perspective. He says this is the Allen R. Crumb proposal. It is a little bit west of Lake Carey in Lemon Township. He directs the Planning members to the computer monitors to view the subdivision plan. The existing state of the lands is that it is a pre-existing floating lot in the back in the shape of a parallelogram. He points to a preexisting house and the other preexisting lot is indicated where he is directing the computer mouse, up and over. He shows the initial newly proposed boundary line that they would establish. The other part of this plan is that they are proposing to dissolve one boundary line. He shows the end result of what the new property would look like showing the road on the right side. He indicates the newly proposed boundary line and where it would travel. The pre-existing lot in the corner would be enlarged. The interesting thing about these proposed lots is that they would both be flag lots. They do not achieve the minimum lot width that would be typically expected at the road. The surveyor, working with the land owner, has proposed a secondary idea where there are two potential flag lots. The white areas are considered to be the pole of the flag pole. These are thin narrow bands that run out and then you have a more block shaped actual building lot in the back. The dotted area demarcates where the top of the pole is located. He shows where the pole and the flag are.

They start off with a little more than two acres combined between the two lots. Both lots are owned by Mr. Crumb. After the back lot's borders are dissolved and it is enlarged the proposal would be that the flag portion of the flag pole would have 1.6 acres not including the pole. In our ordinance the pole area is not to be included in the block shaped area when you are adding up your acreage totals to try to achieve the one acre lot size minimum. It would be quite sizeable even after the pole is cut away in your calculations. After the larger, longer pole is removed it finally meets minimum lot width at this stage. The core block-shaped portion of the other newly-proposed lot would only achieve .91 acres so it's missing a tenth of an acre. As the county planner he feels compelled to recommend disapproval of waiver requests such as this. There is a one acre minimum in our ordinance and it's one of the most

fundamental red lines in our ordinance. It was passed by the duly-elected County Commissioners with the idea with we are trying to prevent overcrowding of lands and areas that might not be able to sustain it. It's a subjective thing and it's a quality of life thing. Some people could argue for half acre lots. Maybe that's desirable to people and their neighbors. The County Commissioners passed the Ordinance and the one acre minimum has been listed in it for many years. If you cut someone a break then everyone wants three quarters of an acre or nine tenths of an acre. Where do you draw the line? His response is that you draw the line at one acre because that's the Commissioners' wishes. That is his opinion as the Planning Director. As the Planning Commission you reserve the right to entertain all waiver requests. Applicants are within their rights to propose a waiver request. He must bring them before the Planning Commission and then they make the final decision. It is true that the lots do have access to public sewer, but not public waterlines. Lawrence Lindy LaRue, PLS, the surveyor for the Crumb subdivision, states that is true.

Matt Jones asks rhetorically: If there is only one acre or less than an acre- Is a landowner going to be able to put up a house, meet yard setbacks, put in a septic field, and drop a well? These are the things people want with a single- family lot. Or would it create crowded unworkable conditions? Would people be able to get in and out of the lot? Does it have steep slopes? These are things that would be considered. If you do not have access to public water and public sewer together the minimum acreage is one acre. They do have public sewer available but they don't have public water.

Mr. Ehrenzeller asks Mr. LaRue if the Applicant is committed to connecting to public sewer. He responded yes. Ed Coleman comments that he knows the property was on the market not too long ago. He asks if there is a stream that goes through the two lots. Lawrence La Rue answers yes, and that is why the lot line is bent strangely between the two lots to follow the stream. He states the Applicant did obtain a driveway permit through PennDot to gain access on the south side of the stream. The existing access to the northern lot is just after the bridge. Ed Coleman asks if the .91 acres is where the stream is located. He responded that the stream runs down the line between the two lots and shows an ariel image map which he believes will show the area better. He points to the area where the stream flows through. He acknowledges this is the home recently on the market with the garage. The Applicant would like to try and keep some buffer distance between his house and the property line he shows which is why he didn't extend the line out any further. There is around seventy-two feet between these two points. The County Ordinance does allow for smaller lots if there is sewer and water like Matt Jones said. They do have an allowance for that. This proposed lot total is 1.47 acres. There is a half-acre extra within what we will call the flag pole. This is a non-typical flag lot just because of the width. If I was to provide a flag lot I would prepare a narrow flag pole that just contains the driveway. The way that this yields it does widen out as it comes up. Much of the building area is within the flag pole which you wouldn't typically see on a flag lot.

The owner also had a wet land delineation done on this property. There were no wetlands present on the survey they had done. The proposition here is that the gentleman purchasing the property would like to put in a small cabin. He's friends with the gentleman who owns the house. He lives in the city now and would like to come out for the weekends.

Randy Ehrenzeller asked if he could move the survey line. Lawrence LaRue responded that the Landowner did not like the property line being closer to the house or encroaching on the lawn to the side of his house. Matt Jones said there would not have been a waiver required if the proposed line was moved to include the 4,000 square foot needed. If he starts moving the line he would have to check the setback requirements between the house. He and Mr. Jones concluded that with the line

change they would have 4,000 square feet (the extra tenth of an acre needed). Including the setback line he would be right on it and it would be okay.

Randy Ehrenzeller said there should be a simpler way of adjusting these lines. Mr. LaRue said it was just their preference not to encroach upon Mr. Crumb's side lawn. It was mentioned that the parties are friends. It was said they are friends today but there should be consideration for future holders of the property. Discussions are made between the members. Lawrence LaRue states that even if the property had public sewer and public water they still wouldn't meet the minimum lot width requirements in the pole because they don't hit one hundred twenty-five feet. If he rotates the line he could meet one hundred twenty-five feet. He could have an acre but he tried to show it as responsibly as he could.

Randy Ehrenzeller suggested bringing the lot line over would be the easiest way to accomplish what they wish. Matt Jones said the other constraining feature is the shed. He can't get too close to the garage. If he drew the line differently he would have had an extra 125 feet and he would have had the required acre. Randy Ehrenzeller and Ed Coleman suggested he draw his line in this fashion, he has the required acreage and he is done. It is agreed among Planning Commission members that this redrawing of the property would be acceptable and no waiver would be needed.

Mr. Coleman made a Motion to Deny the Waiver request. Paul Rowker seconded the motion. The motion was unanimous.

[Editor's Note: This plan was subsequently given Conditional Approval; revised accordingly by the Surveyor per Commission discussion; received Final Approval; and was recorded].

D. Jeffery D. and Susan T. Burns – Minor Subdivision Plan – Lemon Township – File #2026-34

- Director recommends Commission Disapprove Waiver requests for the following reasons:
 1. Minimum lot area of 1 acre for Proposed "Remaining Lands Parcel 1" (Table 606.4) As currently arranged, the parcel already comprises 1.36 continuous acres. Director believes that cutting it into smaller pieces may set a bad precedent and lead to overcrowding in areas that cannot sustain it.
 2. Minimum travel width of 18 feet for Minimum Access Drive (Table VI-1). Private Ferncliff Lane extends into a shared two-way driveway that narrows to approximately 10 feet of width as it snakes uphill through a switchback across properties. The proposed addition of another lot, home and associated traffic on this substandard shared driveway may make a hazardous situation even less safe.
 3. Maximum Slope of 14% for Minimum Access Drives (Table VI-1). The narrow two-way driveway in the area of the switchback encounters a steep slope of approximately 20%. Adding increased traffic onto this steep driveway brings safety concerns. It is doubtful the area could be graded to achieve a safer slope.
 4. Minimum lot area of 1 acre for newly-proposed "Lot 1" after Flag Lot flag "pole" area subtracted from Total calculation (§606.51). Cutting this pre-existing lot into small substandard pieces may set a bad precedent for overcrowding in areas that cannot sustain it.

Randy Ehrenzeller said that they would move onto Jeffrey D. and Susan T. Burns Minor Subdivision plan in Lemon Township file #2026-34. There are multiple waiver requests on this situation and a map. Lawrence LaRue is asked if the property is to the north of Hillbilly Village. He responded that it was way north. Randy Ehrenzeller said they would look at each waiver request individually. Item one is again a minimum lot size issue. Currently arranged the parcel comprises 1.36 contiguous acres. According to the Director, cutting it into a smaller piece could lead to overcrowding and other issues. He asks for discussions or comments on waiver request number one regarding lot size.

Ed Coleman asks Lawrence LaRue to explain why he would need the waiver. He introduces Mr. Rich Lawson here this evening who is the potential buyer of the larger lot. He owns land adjacent to the proposed lot one. What Mr. Burns is proposing is to subdivide the house lot which sits down by Shore Drive from the remainder of the land which sits back. If anyone is familiar with Ferncliff Lane it goes up a slope and gets to various parcels uphill. Currently existing right now there is 1.37 acres. It is in two pieces in the deed. He indicates a separate deeded piece by the lot. He indicates the piece proposed as a new stand-alone lot for sale to Mr. Lawson and the proposed residual that would be left as a stand-alone piece containing the house. They show another map depicting the size of other pre-existing parcels in the surrounding area, some of which would be considered smaller and noncompliant with Ordinance requirements if newly-proposed for creation nowadays.

Randy Ehrenzeller asks where the lot would be that would not contain one acre. Lawrence LaRue said it is another situation where the back lot is proposed as a flag lot. He shows where the core "flag" portion of the lot would not amount to one acre. It would be 0.57 acres after the staff area is discounted. One lot doesn't meet the size requirement and the other lot does meet the total size requirement however it does not meet the core size based on the flag issue and another requirement of one hundred twenty-five feet (125') minimum lot width. The other two waivers are requested because of the exiting drive. It is not 18 feet wide as required. It is anywhere from ten to twenty feet and it is paved intermittently. It is steeper than 14% in some spots. There is a little section that is gravel and then it goes back into pave again.

Mr. Lawson is asked why he wants to create and purchase the second lot. He responds that he bought another house nearby on the top of the hill and the property line is very tight to the upper part of the Burns property. Years prior, Mr. Burns had subdivided the back side of the property in a peculiar shape. The reason Mr. Burns held onto that portion of the property was in case they ever needed a septic system. Now that the public sewer had come in, the extra land is not needed by him. The Burns live in Tallahassee, Florida now and they are at the Lake Carey property at most once a year.

The Commission members view the map. It is noted that part of the property is steep driveway. Dale Brown notes that it does not accommodate two-way traffic in a safe manner. Matt Jones said it is used for two-way traffic, but is hazardous. Lawrence LaRue said that is the present existing condition.

Dale Brown asks to view it again. He is shown the area that is deeded lake access. Dale Brown confirms which land is deeded with the house. Matt Jones said before there were any rules some of these pre-existing lots were made purposefully small. Everyone, including himself, wants a lakeview house or cottage. He understands the motivation but if it's chopped down to one-third of an acre everyone asks why aren't they entitled to the same sized lot at Lake Carey. This plus the substandard two-directional driveway that is steep with a switchback is his concern. Dale Brown asks the Director if he has driven back to the area. He states that he did not view the property but has driven around Shore Drive and has seen several situations that are like this developed before there were any rules.

Dale Brown said he went to view the area. Even though he knows where the property is located he went slowly knowing how it snakes uphill. Mr. Brown said a lot of people want to live on a lake and are willing to risk substandard conditions like dangerous driveways. He said a UPS truck drove up behind him while he was traveling the driveway and wondered where he was going to turn around. Matt Jones asked whether Mr. Brown drove up Shore Drive or Ferncliff Lane and asked what his experience was like. Mr. Brown responded that he drove up the Ferncliff Lane driveway. He said when driving it, one must sneak up around a house on the right, and it is very steep with the middle of the driveway all washed out. It is not a pothole but completely washed out. He questioned how many pre-existing houses are back there. He was told there are three total. Mr. Brown opined: There are three houses using a driveway that it is substandard and barely wide enough for one vehicle, much less two-directional, especially going around the house on the very first corner.

Matt Jones said travel there in the winter would become even more difficult. Dale Brown said the area has mushroomed in growth over the years. There are people buying old houses and people putting in new houses increasing traffic. He asks if this is a municipal road. He is told that it is a private drive so there are private easements held by individuals. Mr. LaRue said all the easements are written to have access to the shared driveway. If it was required to achieve the 14% maximum slope listed by Ordinance, they would be chasing grade out “for miles” in order to get something meeting standards. In other words— It likely could not be done.

Randy Ehrenzeller asks for a motion on waiver request number one after the review. Dale Brown makes a motion to deny waiver request number one. Ed Coleman seconds the Motion. The motion was unanimous to deny waiver request number one for the minimum lot area.

The Chairman states that Item two and three are part of the same issue. Item Two is the paved width of the travel-way. Item 3 is the 14% maximum slope requirement. They have spoken a lot about the shared driveway and Dale Brown has given us an inspection report. He asks Mr. Brown if there is any room for improving those and make it wider. He is told tearing down buildings is the only way to correct the width of the road. He asks if the slope could be corrected. Lawrence LaRue said it would have to begin at lakeside in order for the slope to be chased out.

Dale Brown said he’s heard this driveway discussed for many years. His father was the township supervisor for eighteen years. There was always somebody trying to do something down there. He wanted to make sure that this recent subdivision did not have any municipal road-improvement involvement. On nearby Holbrook Road, interested parties were better able to work on road improvement matters. The requests for improving the Ferncliff Lane driveway were always impossible.

Randy Ehrenzeller said he would ask for a motion combining Item Two and Three since they have the same impact having a substandard driveway and a steep slope causing a hazardous situation. Matt Austin makes a motion to deny the two waiver requests. Dale Brown seconds the motion for denial of Item Two and Three. The motion was passed unanimously.

Randy Ehrenzeller states Item Four brings us back to lot size. He asks for questions or comments. Ed Coleman makes a motion to deny Item four of the waiver request due to the lot size being substandard, the traffic and potential overcrowding. Stacy Huber seconds the motion. The motion was unanimous. All the waivers have been denied. He asks if there are any other items under Subdivision and Land Development and there are none.

IX. Old Business:

There is no old business to discuss.

X. New Business

The Chairman asks if there is any new business to discuss from the Commission members or the Planning Director. Nothing is raised.

XI. Visitors & Guests:

Ms. Jackie Stockage asks another question regarding the solar panel project on Bunker Hill Road. She asks if the amount of bond requirement will change between what the county had negotiated and what the State of Pennsylvania will require. Will it be the same, more or less? Director Jones answers that the State will likely require much less. He encourages her to read State Bill 349. The State legislature has a website and it can be found on the web. He says that the short answer to her question is that it phases in the first 10 years of the project life and only a portion of the total value of how much it would cost to decommission the whole site and tear it all down. It would be required to be floated like an insurance instrument or financial bond. In later years assuming it continues to operate then the obligation goes up. It's a very strange law in his opinion. He gives her a copy of the new PA law.

Visitors and guests present this evening: Lawrence LaRue, Milnes Engineering, Inc., Lucas Carpenter, Milnes Engineering, Inc., Richard Lawson, Landowner, Jackie Stockage, Rocket Courier/Resident.

XII. Adjournment:

Randy Ehrenzeller asks for a Motion for Adjournment. Stacy Huber makes a motion to adjourn and Ed Coleman seconds it. The meeting is adjourned at 6:59 p.m.

Commission staff may be reached at:

WYOMING COUNTY OFFICE OF COMMUNITY PLANNING

1 Courthouse Square, 3rd Floor * Tunkhannock, PA 18657 * 570-996-2268

WyomingCountyPA.gov/board