

Adams County Legal Journal

Vol. 60

August 17, 2018

No. 15, pp. 42-51

IN THIS ISSUE

ERIC KLINEDINST VS. READING TOWNSHIP
ZONING HEARING BOARD AND RANDY R. BLACK
AND READING TOWNSHIP

Invest with Experience.

The right financial partner will help you plan for the future and manage investments with you and your family's best interests first and foremost. No need to look further...you've found the right partner at ACNB Bank.

Securities and Insurance Products are: NOT FDIC INSURED - MAY LOSE VALUE - NOT BANK GUARANTEED - NOT A DEPOSIT - NOT INSURED BY ANY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ENTITY



ADAMS COUNTY LEGAL JOURNAL (USPS 542-600)

Designated for the Publication of Court and other Legal Notices. Published weekly by Adams County Bar Association, Edward G. Puhl, Esq., Editor and Business Manager.

Business Office – 117 BALTIMORE STREET, ROOM 305, GETTYSBURG, PA 17325-2313. Telephone: (717) 334-1553

Copyright© 1959 by Wm. W. Gaunt & Sons, Inc., for Adams County Bar Association, Gettysburg, PA 17325.

All rights reserved.

DISSOLUTION NOTICE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Board of Directors of EAST BERLIN EXCAVATING, INCORPORATED, a Pennsylvania corporation, with an address of 531 West King Street, East Berlin Pennsylvania 17316, has approved a proposal that the corporation voluntarily dissolve, that the Board of Directors has settled the affairs of the corporation under the provisions of the Pennsylvania Business Corporation Law of 1988, as amended, and that on August 30 will file Articles of Dissolution with the Department of State of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

8/17

FICTITIOUS NAME NOTICE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that an Application for Registration of Fictitious Name was filed in the Department of State of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania on July 16, 2018 for NEW OXFORD BODY AND SOUL, located at 11 Lincoln Way East, New Oxford, PA 17350. The name and address of the individual owning the business is Marcia Fowler, 11 Lincoln Way East, New Oxford, PA 17350. This was filed in accordance with 54 Pa.C.S. 3J I.

8/17

NONPROFIT ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that Nonprofit Articles of Incorporation were filed with the Department of State of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, on June 20, 2018, for the purpose of obtaining a Certificate of Incorporation under the provisions of the Nonprofit Corporation Law of 1988. The name of the proposed nonprofit corporation is CUMBERLAND CROSSING HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION.

The purpose for which it will be organized is: To be a unit owners' association, which provides for the management, maintenance, and care of the residential community project located in Cumberland Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania, known as Cumberland Crossing At The Links At Gettysburg, A Planned Community.

8/17

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
OF ADAMS COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIACIVIL ACTION - LAW
ACTION TO QUIET TITLE
NO. 2018-S-824

PHILIP J. WOLF and BARBARA A. WOLF, Plaintiffs,
vs.

GEORGE ARNOLD AND ANY PERSON OR ENTITY CLAIMING ANY INTEREST AS THE SUCCESSOR, HEIR, ASSIGN, OR DESCENDANT OF GEORGE ARNOLD, Defendants.

NOTICE

You are notified that the Plaintiffs have commenced an action to quiet title against you by Complaint filed on July 31, 2018, which action you are required to defend.

You are required to plead to the said Complaint within twenty (20) days after service has been completed by publication or judgment by default may be entered against you.

This action concerns a portion of a tract of land known as 455 Willoughby Run Road, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, situate in Cumberland Township, Adams County and more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at a magnetic nail set at the corner of lands now or formerly of Charles E. Skopic and Lynn H. Skopic and lands now or formerly of Joseph P. Marchetti along the southern edge of Black Horse Tavern Road (T-334); thence along said Marchetti lands, and passing through a rebar set 35.52 feet from the beginning hereof, North 30 degrees 48 minutes 29 seconds East, 333.70 feet to a rebar; thence South 46 degrees 41 minutes 31 seconds East, 165.00 feet to a point; thence South 40 degrees 30 minutes 43 seconds West, 325.81 feet to a rebar; thence North 46 degrees 53 minutes 02 seconds West, 108.67 feet to the point and place of BEGINNING. CONTAINING 1.02 acres.

If you wish to defend, you must taken action by entering a written appearance personally or by attorney and filing in writing with the Court your defenses or objections to the claim set forth against you. You are warned that if you fail to do so, the case may proceed without you and a judgment may be entered against you without further notice for the relief

requested by Plaintiffs. You may lose money or property or other rights important to you.

YOU SHOULD TAKE THIS PAPER TO YOUR LAWYER AT ONCE. IF YOU DO NOT HAVE A LAWYER, GO TO OR TELEPHONE THE OFFICE SET FORTH BELOW. THIS OFFICE CAN PROVIDE YOU WITH INFORMATION ABOUT HIRING A LAWYER.

IF YOU CAN NOT AFFORD TO HIRE A LAWYER, THIS OFFICE MAY BE ABLE TO PROVIDE YOU WITH INFORMATION ABOUT AGENCIES THAT MAY OFFER LEGAL SERVICES TO ELIGIBLE PERSONS AT A REDUCED FEE OR NO FEE.

Court Administrator
Adams County Courthouse
111-117 Baltimore Street
Gettysburg, PA 17325
717-337-9846

8/17

ERIC KLINEDINST VS.
READING TOWNSHIP ZONING HEARING BOARD
AND RANDY R. BLACK AND READING TOWNSHIP

1. In zoning cases where the trial court does not receive any additional evidence, the scope of review is limited to determining whether the Board committed an error of law or a manifest abuse of discretion.

2. A conclusion that the governing body abused its discretion may be reached only if its findings of fact are not supported by substantial evidence. Evidence is substantial when a reasonable mind could accept it as adequate to support a conclusion.

3. The Board's interpretation of the zoning ordinance it is charged with enforcing is generally entitled to a great degree of deference.

4. The ZHB has interpreted the Ordinance as permitting a property owner to cease the nonconforming use and not abandon the nonconforming use, so long as the use ceases or is discontinued for a period of time less than one year.

5. The ZHB determined that because the preexisting nonconforming use of the property was two dwelling units for rental purposes and the proposed new use is still two dwelling units for rental purposes, the proposed new duplex property extends the same prior nonconforming use.

6. The ZHB correctly determined the proper square footage based on the square footage of both the farmhouse and the mobile home. The square footage of the non-conformity is approximately 2,500 square feet.

7. In this case, Applicant testified that the proposed duplex would be 3,000 square feet, which is well within the 50% increase permitted by the Ordinance.

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF ADAMS COUNTY,
PENNSYLVANIA, 2017-S-1087, ERIC KLINEDINST VS.
READING TOWNSHIP ZONING HEARING BOARD AND
RANDY R. BLACK AND READING TOWNSHIP

Melissa L. Kelso, Esq., Attorney for Appellant

Timothy Shultis, Esq., Attorney for Appellee

Todd A. King, Esq., Attorney for Intervenor Randy R. Black

Victor A. Neubaum, Esq., Attorney for Intervenor Reading Township

Wagner, J., July 31, 2018

OPINION

Before this Court is a Land Use Appeal filed by Appellant, Eric Klinedinst (hereinafter "Appellant"), from the October 4, 2017 written decision by Appellee, Reading Township Zoning Hearing Board (hereinafter "ZHB"), concerning the 97-acre parcel of property (hereinafter "Property") owned by Randy R. Black (hereinafter "Applicant") in Reading Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania. For the reasons set forth herein, Appellant's Land Use Appeal is denied.

BACKGROUND

The relevant procedural history and facts are as follows. The Property at issue is owned by Applicant and his three siblings: Jackie Black, Susan McDannell, and Mary Cruse. (ZHB Findings of Fact pg. 2). The Property, previously owned by the four siblings' mother, Dorothy Black, has been in the family for over 100 years and has been farmed for a majority of this time. (ZHB Findings of Fact pg. 2). The Property had a farmhouse and a mobile home situated on it since the mid 1980s. (ZHB Findings of Fact pg. 2).

On January 10, 2000, the Reading Township Zoning Ordinance (hereinafter "Ordinance") was enacted and the Property was zoned as Agricultural Conservation Zoning District (AC). (ZHB Findings of Fact pg. 2-3). The AC District permits only one single-family detached dwelling per lot. (Ordinance, Section 27-403(A)(1)). The Property consists of approximately 97 acres. (R.17). Since the early 1980s, the farmhouse and the trailer have both been rented and have been used as separate rental units. (R.195). The mobile home was used as a rental unit until July 2016 and the farmhouse was used as a rental unit until December 2016. (R. 199). Applicant removed the mobile home in August of 2016 because "it wasn't in a good condition." (R.199-200). The two single-family dwelling units located on the Property constitute a nonconforming use of the Property since the buildings were both used as separate dwelling units prior to the enactment of the Ordinance, and are not in conformance with the Ordinance. (R. 178).

Applicant filed an Application to ZHB requesting a special exception on June 12, 2017. (R.1). Applicant requested a special exception to build a single duplex unit in place of the farmhouse and the mobile home and extend the nonconforming use to house both rental units in a newly constructed duplex that would provide Applicant with rental income to supplement the family farm. (R. 4).

The ZHB hearing took place on August 9, 2017. At the hearing, Appellant was granted party status, over the objection of Applicant.

The farmhouse is approximately 2,000 square feet and the mobile home was approximately 600 square feet. (ZHB Findings of Fact pg. 4). The ZHB found that the proposed residential duplex would conform to the height, area, yard, and coverage regulations of the AC District. (ZHB Findings of Fact pg. 3-4). The ZHB found that two

parking spaces per unit as required by Section 27-1403(2)(B) and Section 27-1202(A) of the Ordinance shall be provided. (ZHB Findings of Fact pg. 4). The ZHB found that the proposed extension of the nonconforming use does not replace a conforming use, nor did the proposed extension extend into lands adjacent to the initial parcel of land containing the two dwelling units on the effective date of the Ordinance. (ZHB Findings of Fact pg. 4). The ZHB found that the proposed extension would not exceed an increase of 50% of the original volume or area of the nonconforming use. (ZHB Findings of Fact pg. 4). Finally, the ZHB found that the proposed extension would not be detrimental to the health, safety, and general welfare of the Township and would not detract from the use and enjoyment of the adjoining properties. (ZHB Findings of Fact pg. 4).

LEGAL STANDARD

In zoning cases where the trial court does not receive any additional evidence, the scope of review is limited to determining whether the Board committed an error of law or a manifest abuse of discretion. *In re Petition of Dolington Land Group*, 839 A.2d 1021, 1026 (Pa. 2003). The Court does not substitute its own interpretation of the evidence for that of the Board. *Pietro Paolo v. Zoning Hearing Bd. of Lower Merion Twp.*, 979 A.2d 969, 976 (Pa. Cmwlth. Ct. 2009). “A conclusion that the governing body abused its discretion may be reached only if its findings of fact are not supported by substantial evidence.” *Sutliff Enterprises, Inc. v. Silver Spring Twp. Zoning Hearing Bd.*, 933 A.2d 1079, 1081 n.1 (Pa. Cmwlth. Ct. 2007). Evidence is substantial when a reasonable mind could accept it as adequate to support a conclusion. *Cardamone v. Whitpain Twp. Zoning Hearing Bd.*, 771 A.2d 103, 104 (Pa. Cmwlth. Ct. 2001).

Moreover, the Board’s interpretation of the zoning ordinance it is charged with enforcing is generally entitled to a great degree of deference. *Ruley v. W. Nantemean Twp. Zoning Hearing Bd.*, 948 A.2d 265, 268 (Pa. Cmwlth. Ct. 2008). The basis for this deference is the specific knowledge and expertise the Board possesses to interpret said zoning ordinances. *Willits Woods Assoc. v. Zoning Bd. of Adjustment City of Philadelphia*, 587 A.2d 827, 829 (Pa. Cmwlth. Ct. 1991).

An owner asserting the protected status of a nonconforming use has the burden of proving that the use pre-dated the pertinent ordinance. *Appeal of Lester M. Prange, Inc.*, 647 A.2d 279 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1994). It is the burden of the property owner to establish that the use existed before the enactment of the zoning ordinance and that the use was lawful. *Hafner v. Zoning Hearing Board of Allen Township*, 974 A.2d 1204 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2009). The property owner must provide objective evidence of the extent, nature, time of creation, and continuation of the alleged nonconforming use. *Jones v. Township of North Huntingdon Zoning Hearing Board*, 467 A.2d 1206 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1983).

DISCUSSION

Appellant's first argument is that Applicant abandoned the nonconforming use when he removed the mobile home in August of 2016. Appellant cites to *Keebler v. Zoning Board of Adjustment* to support this argument. The *Keebler* case relied on the following local zoning ordinance in reaching its decision:

921.02.B.2 Evidence of Abandonment

A nonconforming use shall be presumed abandoned when any one (1) of the following occurred:

(c) *The owner has physically changed the building or structure or its fixtures or equipment in such a way as to clearly indicate a change in use or activity to something other than the nonconforming use*

Keebler v. Zoning Bd. of Adjustment of City of Pittsburgh, 998 A.2d 670, 674 (Pa.Cmwlth., 2010)(emphasis added).

Keebler specifically referenced Section 921.02.B.2(c) of the local zoning ordinance as the basis for determining that the property owner abandoned the nonconforming use. No such zoning ordinance exists in Reading Township. The applicable Ordinance regarding abandonment of a nonconforming use in Reading Township is as follows:

If a nonconforming use of a building or land ceases or is discontinued for a continuous period of 1 year or more, the nonconforming status thereof shall be lost, and subsequent use of such building or land shall be in conformity

with all the provisions of this Part except in cases where the cessation or discontinuance was caused by circumstances beyond the control of the owner.

§27-1405 of the Reading Township Zoning Ordinance

The Reading Township Ordinance includes no language regarding the owner physically changing the land and therefore abandoning the nonconforming use. The ZHB has interpreted this Ordinance as allowing a nonconforming use to continue even if the nonconforming use has been discontinued for less than one year. The ZHB found that it was always Applicant's intention to continue the nonconforming use when Applicant removed the mobile home, that the Application to extend the nonconforming use was filed within one year of the removal of the mobile home, and therefore no actual abandonment of the nonconforming use occurred. Therefore, the Keebler case is factually distinguishable from the case at hand.

Appellant also cites *Korngold v. Zoning Bd. Of Adjustment of City of Philadelphia* in support of his argument. The local ordinance in question in *Korngold* states:

Where a *structure* or any portion thereof is demolished other than by fire, Act of God or under legal condemnation, it shall be rebuilt only in accordance with the area, height, floor area and bulk regulations of the district in which it is located; provided, that where such demolition constitutes two-thirds or more of the gross floor area of the structure, it shall, upon reconstruction, conform to the use regulations of the district in which it is located.

Korngold v. Zoning Bd. of Adjustment of City of Philadelphia, 606 A.2d 1276, 1278, (Pa.Cmwlth.,1992)(emphasis added)

Contrary to Appellant's belief, *Korngold* is also distinguishable from the case at hand. In *Korngold*, the local ordinance deals with nonconforming structures which are demolished. In this case, the nonconformity is the use of the land, not the structures themselves. Therefore, *Korngold* is factually distinguishable because the local ordinance in question specifically addresses nonconforming structures which are demolished, whereas this case deals with the nonconforming *use* of the Property.

“As a matter of Pennsylvania zoning law, the owner of property to which a lawful nonconforming use has attached enjoys a vested property right.” *Pappas v. Zoning Bd. of Adjustment of City of Philadelphia*, 589 A.2d 675, 676, (Pa.1991)(citations omitted). Further, “abandonment of a nonconforming use cannot be established by mere proof of a failure for a time to use the property or of a temporary use of the property not inconsistent with an intention to use it for the original purpose. There must be evidence of intention to abandon” *Id.* at 677 (citations omitted). “The burden of proof of abandonment is on the party asserting the same.” *Id.* at 677 (citations omitted).

In the *Pappas* case, the landowner utilized the property as a sandwich shop/restaurant that had limited counter seating and primarily provided take-out service. The local zoning ordinance in *Pappas* stated that “A nonconforming use when discontinued for a period of more than three consecutive years shall be considered abandoned and may not be resumed. *Id.* at 677. The landowner in *Pappas* ceased using the building as a restaurant for a period in excess of three years because the landowner contracted for installation of new plumbing, lighting, counter space, and seating, to expand the prior nonconforming use to now include a full-service pizza restaurant. The record clearly evidenced that the landowner was intending to use the property as a restaurant. The Pennsylvania Supreme Court in *Pappas* ruled:

“In determining that the restaurant proposed by Pappas constitutes a new and different use, the Commonwealth Court ignored the doctrine of natural expansion which permits a landowner to develop or expand a business as a matter of right notwithstanding its status as a nonconforming use. *Chartiers Twp. v. W.H. Martin, Inc.*, 518 Pa. 181, 542 A.2d 985 (1988). In *Chartiers*, we stated that “once it has been determined that a nonconforming use is in existence, an overly technical assessment of that use cannot be utilized to stunt its natural development and growth.” *Id.* at 188, 542 A.2d at 988.

Id. at 677 – 678.

This case is analogous to *Pappas*. Here, it is Applicant’s intention to expand two dilapidated structures used for rental income into a

new duplex unit, and therefore to continue the prior nonconforming use of two rental dwelling units on one lot. The mobile home was used as a rental dwelling until the end of July 2016 and the farmhouse was used as a rental dwelling unit until December 2016. Applicant filed his Application for the special exception to continue the nonconforming use in June 2017, before the one-year period, set forth in the Ordinance, expired. Therefore, Applicant evidenced his intent to continue the nonconforming use of the property, despite removing the mobile home in August 2016.

Moreover, the Board's interpretation of the zoning ordinance it is charged with enforcing is generally entitled to a great degree of deference. *Ruley*, 948 A.2d 265, 268. The basis for this deference is the specific knowledge and expertise the Board possesses to interpret said zoning ordinances. *Willits Woods Assoc.*, 587 A.2d 827, 829. The prime guideline in every zoning case "is the pertinent zoning ordinance itself. Case law, of course, is a helpful factor, but the principal judicial inquiry must logically be to the language of the statute or ordinance in controversy." *Jackson v. Pottstown Zoning Bd. of Adjustment*, 233 A.2d 252 (Pa. 1967).

In reviewing the ZHB's Findings of Fact and Discussion, this Court notes that the ZHB addressed the possible abandonment of the nonconforming use and correctly decided that Applicant did not abandon the nonconforming use by removing the mobile home. The ZHB reasoned that Section 27-1405 "permits the continuation of a nonconforming status even though the nonconforming use of a building or land ceases or is discontinued, provided that the use ceases or is discontinued for a period of time less than one year." (ZHB Findings of Fact pg. 8). The facts illustrate, and Appellant admits, that the trailer was removed in August of 2016 and the application for special exception was filed in June of 2017, less than one year from the date of the removal of the trailer. (Appellant's Brief pg. 4). The ZHB has interpreted the Ordinance as permitting a property owner to cease the nonconforming use and not abandon the nonconforming use, so long as the use ceases or is discontinued for a period of time less than one year. (ZHB discussion pg. 8). The ZHB is afforded great deference in interpreting their Ordinance and this Court does not have sufficient evidence to overturn this interpretation.

Appellant's second and third arguments are that the ZHB erred in granting Applicant's Application where the real property was conforming and there was no nonconforming use that existed that could lawfully be extended, or to the extent that the farmhouse and mobile home constituted a nonconforming use, the ZHB erred in defining the nonconforming use. Specifically, Appellant argues that the Property was in conformance because the zoning ordinance does not prohibit two rental units from being on the same property, as long as one of the units is an accessory dwelling unit.

Appellant is confusing nonconforming use with nonconforming structures. The Ordinance only allows one dwelling unit per lot in the AC district. The issue is not that Applicant had two buildings located on the lot, nor is the issue the renting of the buildings. The issue is that **both** buildings were used as separate dwelling units. Applicant theoretically could have had the farmhouse and the trailer located on the property and rented out just the farmhouse and the Property would have been in conformity with the Ordinance, if the mobile home was an accessory dwelling unit.

An accessory dwelling unit is defined under the Ordinance as:

A suite, either attached to or detached from the primary dwelling unit on the lot, for occupation by the following members of the lot owner's family:

- A. A parent, grandparent, adult child over age 18, and/or a spouse, partner or sibling of one of those relatives.
- B. A family relative, by blood, marriage, adoption, or foster relationship who requires continuous care due to injury, illness or a serious physical or mental disability that substantially impairs or restricts one or more such activities as walking, seeing, hearing, speaking, working, or learning.
- C. A licensed, permanent caregiver for the occupants of the primary dwelling unit on the lot.

§27 – 202 of the Reading Township Zoning Ordinance

There is no evidence in the record that the mobile home tenants were in any way related to or were caregivers of the tenants in the farmhouse. Appellant has not referenced any evidence in the record

to support his position that the mobile home was an accessory dwelling unit. Second, Appellant is again misconstruing a nonconforming structure with a nonconforming use. The issue, once again, is not that the farmhouse and the trailer were both located on the property at the time the Ordinance was enacted. The issue was that both the farmhouse and the trailer were being used as separate dwelling units. This issue lacks merit because there is no evidence that the trailer was an accessory dwelling unit and the ZHB correctly determined that the farmhouse and the mobile home were “two separate single-family detached structures” or “two rental units.”

Appellant’s fourth argument is that the ZHB erred in extending the alleged nonconforming use where the Board permitted the replacement of two conforming structures (the farmhouse and the mobile home as an accessory dwelling unit) with a nonconforming structure and/or permitted an increase of more than 50% of the size of a nonconformity. Appellant’s argument assumes, incorrectly, that the two buildings are conforming, and therefore the Board erred in permitting Applicant to remove the two conforming buildings and replace them with a nonconforming duplex. As stated above, Appellant has presented no evidence that the mobile home was an accessory dwelling unit.

The ZHB correctly determined that the proposed duplex was a proper extension of the nonconforming use. The ZHB determined that because the preexisting nonconforming use of the property was two dwelling units for rental purposes and the proposed new use is still two dwelling units for rental purposes, the proposed new duplex property extends the same prior nonconforming use. This Court agrees with the ZHB’s reasoning that the duplex was an acceptable extension of the nonconforming use of the farmhouse and the mobile home as separate rental units.

Appellant further argues that the Board erred in permitting an increase of more than 50% of the nonconformity. Specifically, Appellant asserts that the Board should have only calculated the square footage of one of the buildings and used that calculation to determine the proper square footage increase. The issue is the use of the property as a dwelling unit, not the structure itself. The two dwelling units, together, make up the nonconformity. Therefore, the ZHB correctly determined the proper square footage based on the

square footage of both the farmhouse and the mobile home. The square footage of the nonconformity is approximately 2,500 square feet. (ZHB Findings of Fact pg. 4). The Ordinance permits a nonconforming use to be extended up to 50% of the original nonconformity. In this case, Applicant testified that the proposed duplex would be 3,000 square feet, which is well within the 50% increase permitted by the Ordinance.

Applicant intends to maintain the farming use of the remaining Property, using the rental income from the duplex rental units to supplement the farming income. Applicant's intent is consistent with the goals of the Agricultural Conservation Zoning District as set forth at Section 27-401 of the Ordinance.

Therefore, for the aforementioned reasons, Appellant's appeal is hereby DENIED.

ORDER OF COURT

AND NOW, this 31st day of July, 2018, for the reasons set forth in the attached Opinion, the appeal taken by Eric Klinedinst from the decision of the Reading Township Zoning Hearing Board dated October 4, 2017 is **denied**.

ESTATE NOTICES

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that in the estates of the decedents set forth below, the Register of Wills has granted letters, testamentary of or administration to the persons named. All persons having claims or demands against said estates are requested to make known the same, and all persons indebted to said estates are requested to make payment without delay to the executors or administrators or their attorneys named below.

FIRST PUBLICATION**ESTATE OF PATRICIA RAY EMERSON, DEC'D**

Late of Mt. Joy Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Administratrix: Zoe Fox Emerson, 2621 Kentford Road, Midlothian, VA 23113

Attorney: Robert L. McQuaide, Esq., Barley Snyder, Suite 204, 18 Carlisle St., Gettysburg, PA 17325

ESTATE OF JANET E. GUISE, DEC'D

Late of Huntington Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Barry R. Guise, 5405 Oxford Road, Gardeners, PA 17324

Attorney: John C. Zepp, III, Esq., P.O. Box 204, 8438 Carlisle Pike, York Springs, PA 17372

ESTATE OF DONALD E. MILLER, DEC'D

Late of Huntington Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executors: Glenn A. Kern and Douglas W. Kern, c/o Scott L. Kelley, Esq., Stonesifer and Kelley, a division of Barley Snyder, 14 Center Square, Hanover, PA 17331

Attorney: Scott L. Kelley, Esq., Stonesifer and Kelley, a division of Barley Snyder, 14 Center Square, Hanover, PA 17331

ESTATE OF ANDREW R. MITCHELL, DEC'D

Late of Straban Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Andrew Douglas Mitchell, c/o Kevin G. Robinson, Esq., Gates & Gates, P.C., 60 E. Middle St., Gettysburg, PA 17325

Attorney: Kevin G. Robinson, Esq., Gates & Gates, P.C., 60 E. Middle St., Gettysburg, PA 17325

ESTATE OF ELLIS N. YENTZER, DEC'D

Late of Huntington Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Mark D. Yentzer, 40 Bushey School Road, York Springs, PA 17372

Attorney: John C. Zepp, III, Esq., P.O. Box 204, 8438 Carlisle Pike, York Springs, PA 17372

SECOND PUBLICATION**ESTATE OF E. MYRTLE BOWLING, DEC'D**

Late of Cumberland Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executors: Brenda K. Bowling, 243 N. Stratton St., Gettysburg, PA 17325; Jeffrey A. Bowling, 1778 Hilltown Road, Biglerville, PA 17307

Attorney: Phillips & Phillips, 101 W. Middle St., Gettysburg, PA 17325

ESTATE OF JOHN I. DONMOYER, SR.,

Late of Cumberland Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Co-Executrices: Phyllis Donmoyer, 1975 Emmitsburg Road, Gettysburg, PA 17325; Joan Lee Andes, 430 Bullfrog Road, Gettysburg, PA 17325

Attorney: John A. Wolfe, Esq., Wolfe, Rice & Quinn, LLC., 47 W. High St. Gettysburg, PA 17325

ESTATE OF WALTER L. GREER, DEC'D

Late of Oxford Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: John Greer, 943 Parkway Blvd., York, PA 17404

Attorney: Matthew L. Guthrie, Esq., Guthrie, Nonemaker, Yingst & Hart, LLP., 40 York St., Hanover, PA 17331

ESTATE OF RONALD E. LEHR, DEC'D

Late of Reading Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Dolores Barto, 31 Millersville Road, Lancaster, PA 17603

Attorney: Thomas R. Nell, Esq., 130 W. King St., P.O. Box 1019, East Berlin, PA 17316

THIRD PUBLICATION**ESTATE OF JACK F. HERTZ, DEC'D**

Late of Mt. Pleasant Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executrix: Kay A. Hertz, 1938 Hanover Road, Gettysburg, PA 17325

Attorney: Clayton A. Lingg, Esq., Mooney & Associates, 230 York St., Hanover, PA 17331

ESTATE OF CLARENCE J. INTRIERI, JR., DEC'D

Late of Latimore Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Derick E. Rudolph, c/o Robert G. Frey, Esq., 5 S. Hanover St., Carlisle, PA 17013

Attorney: Robert G. Frey, Frey and Tiley, 5 S. Hanover St., Carlisle, PA 17013

ESTATE OF TERRY L. SAGER, SR., DEC'D

Late of Conewago Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Terry L. Sager, Jr., c/o Scott J. Strausbaugh, Esq., Strausbaugh Law, PLLC., 1201 W. Elm Ave., Suite #2, Hanover, PA 17331

Attorney: Scott J. Strausbaugh, Esq., Strausbaugh Law, PLLC., 1201 W. Elm Ave., Suite #2, Hanover, PA 17331

ESTATE OF EUGENE F. SANDERS, DEC'D

Late of the Borough of Gettysburg, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Executor: Ronald W. Sanders, 3900 Saxon Ct., Hampstead, MD 21074

ESTATE OF MARION ELIZABETH SHANEBROOK, DEC'D

Late of Germany Township, Adams County, Pennsylvania

Ellen Louise Baugher, 851 Hanover Pike, Littlestown, PA 17340

Attorney: David K. James, III, Esq., 234 Baltimore St., Gettysburg, PA 17325

